

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, May 10, 1971 — Friday, June 11, 1971

No. 33

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 10, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Included among our visitors today we have in the Speaker's gallery, from Australia, the hon. J. M. Walton, who is a member of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria State, along with Mrs. Walton. I am sure we would want to extend a special welcome to them.

In our west gallery we have students from the Stayner Collegiate Institute of Stayner, and in both galleries students from the Parklawn Public School of Etobicoke.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Who are we going to ask them of?

ONTARIO TELECOMMUNICATIONS ROLE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could give the House further information on what changes he is going to recommend to the federal government in the control of the telecommunications industry, and particularly vis-à-vis the provincial role in cable television controls.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I made a speech on Friday noon outlining some of the areas of concern and areas of study by the government of the province and indicated that these matters were being considered by government, that we had not made any definite statement and were not making a definitive statement as to what we felt should be done, but that we would be doing so fairly soon and suggesting that this was an area where the provincial jurisdiction had a very real degree of responsibility and that as a province we were pursuing it.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Has the Premier had any communication with the federal authorities on this and, second, would this be a natural emanation from the development of the educational television authority and his dealings with the CRTC and the federal government in his former capacity?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there have been no specific discussions with the federal authority yet, because our own research and our own policies have not been determined. I would question whether the authority that has been established here to deal basically with educational television would be the proper vehicle, as it is presently constituted, to have this form of discussion. I would reserve my thinking on that until we are further down the road but I would question whether it is.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the Premier say that it was a fair newspaper comment when the indication was that he was challenging the federal authority? Would the Premier go that far?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how one would apply the word "challenge." I hope I made it quite clear to the public and to the federal government, if they read what was said, that we felt the province had a right to be interested in the field of communications—a very real right to be interested and to be concerned. Whether or not the member for Downsview would interpret that as a challenge I do not know.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, does the Premier believe that any of the things that the federal government is presently doing in these fields infringes on provincial rights and that the province should assert its course of action in contradistinction to the federal position?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is exactly what we are in the process of determining. I would give the member for Downsview one example where the contradiction does exist. I will not take cable where it is perhaps even more complicated—but take the position adopted by the federal government which was accepted by the then Minister of Education and by the government as being a practical solution to the problem at the time. That is the policy

whereby the CRTC has awarded a licence to the CBC for, basically, the exclusive use of a provincial authority to transmit what is basically an educational situation under the constitutional control of the province. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a very good example of the need to rationalize this and erase any contradictions, because it does not appear to be too logical on the surface to have a federal jurisdiction, theoretically and even practically, in a position to control what, in fact, may be part of a totally provincial responsibility—and that is educational television.

Mr. Singer: A further supplementary: If I understand the Premier correctly, has he now had second thoughts about something that he previously said, as Minister of Education, was a good idea?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I think, if memory serves me correctly—and I cannot give the exact phraseology—at the time this decision was made, I said that from a practical standpoint, in that it is complicated for the federal government—and I am not denying this; I do not think things have gone far enough down the road from the standpoint of experience—but I did reserve the right then or I added—what do we call it in the legal profession, Mr. Speaker, something of a caveat?—that this to me was not necessarily the total answer to the problem and I thought there would be some further discussions about it. I cannot give you the exact phraseology, but it was stated that we would accept it then on an interim basis until some final resolution was found.

Mr. Singer: By way of a final supplementary, at least for me, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier able to delineate to us what particular authority the federal government is presently asserting that the Premier believes it should not assert?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. I can raise two or three years—one of them being in the field of educational broadcasting, whether by radio or television, or educational use of cable television. I think it is very clear to the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Speaker, that cable television has tremendous potential, certainly within communities, for what could be educational programming within the definition of the constitution of provincial responsibility. For the CRTC to be involved, not just in the licensing but perhaps in setting conditions as they relate to the amount of programming, the kind of programming that could be educational and basically provincial in responsibility, I think it must be rather obvious that this in particular is an area where there has to be some resolution of the Province of Ontario's position. I believe my statement on Friday made the problems quite clear; it also made it quite clear that the Province of Ontario intended to develop a policy.

Mr. Singer: But it has no answers at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

AUTHORITY OF CBC

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): With regard to the educational television part of the minister's comments, what has happened since educational television was set up through channel 19 to lead the minister to question the authority of the CBC under the federal government? For example, has the CBC vetoed any programme put out by the educational communications authorities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say from the practical standpoint it has not happened. I am just looking at my notes and I think the phrase I used is perhaps somewhat technical. In February 1968 I used the terms, "We would accept the proposed arrangement without prejudice to what we thought the ultimate or an on-going position."

Mr. T. Reid: But what has happened in the interim to make you think there should be a change in direction or policy? Nothing? Has there been no cause?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was not content then, as a matter of total policy, that this was the best solution, but I was also prepared to accept, as the Minister of Education, what was for that time a practical solution to the problem.

But we are now getting into cable television, Mr. Speaker. We are getting into the question of satellite communication. Many other changes in technology are taking place, and I think it is absolutely essential for this provincial jurisdiction to accept its responsibilities, determine what its position should be in the whole field of communications as they exist today, and make these views known

and see if there cannot be some rationalization with the federal jurisdiction. I think it is quite a reasonable position to take.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West on a supplementary.

Mr. S. Lewis: (Scarborough West): Supplementary: Appreciating much of what the Premier says, Mr. Speaker, can he explain what he meant when he said that if Ottawa does not co-operate, "we will take whatever action we deem appropriate"? Is he intending to contest it in the courts? Is he aiming toward a different kind of confrontation or assertion of provincial policy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure—I have some of my notes here—I am not sure that I used that exact phraseology. What phraseology I did use, I hope, carried the clear intent that we felt these matters could be and would have to be resolved.

As to the methods, I do not envisage the need—certainly at this moment—for establishing responsibility through the courts. I would like to think that if there is an area of disagreement we can resolve it through discussions. And it may be that the discussions themselves, as our own policy emerges, will be handled in such a way that there will not be any disagreement. I cannot predict that at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has a supplementary? This will be the last supplementary.

Mr. Ben: Yes. Has the minister or his department been in communication with Ottawa with reference to jurisdiction over programmes, transmitted over television, which emanate out of the studio itself, and are transmitted only over wires and not through air waves within the jurisdiction of this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered either the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Downsview that there has not yet been any official discussion with the federal government. This question was raised in a general sense at the time of the application to the CRTC by the CBC for channel 19, but this was discussed in a peripheral fashion at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FIVE PER CENT CIVIL SERVICE SALARY INCREASE GUIDELINE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a new question of the Premier: Under present circumstances is he prepared to make a categorical statement to the House, and through us to the Civil Service Association, that he rejects the concept of a five per cent ceiling or guideline or indication and, secondly, that he is prepared to accept the findings of an independent arbitration board without influencing that board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition means by a categorical statement. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has said on a number of occasions, and so did I, in relation to the general guidelines or desire on the part of the government to restrict expenditures in the field of the civil service a five per cent figure will apply during this current year probably to two or three areas. There is no indication that this government would not consider seriously any arbitration award that would be brought down.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier make it clear that the arbitration awards would be binding on the government as they would be on the civil service and, in fact, will not be influenced by any rise in salaries awarded by arbitration that might go above the average of five per cent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is very hypothetical. We have to deal with the arbitration awards as they are handed down.

Mr. Nixon: It is not hypothetical.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, it is.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay) The statement by the Treasurer was not hypothetical.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier state clearly as to whether government policy considers arbitration binding or whether it is only binding on the government employees?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the statement was made—and I believe it is a legal interpretation — that the arbitration awards are by law probably not binding upon the Crown.

Mr. Nixon: Probably not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. In other words, I do not think anybody has tested them but this is the legal opinion.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps we will have to pursue it with a further supplementary. Will the Premier undertake to make a statement to the Civil Service Association and those 70,000 employees who will be concerned with this as to what government policy will be during the next year; if in fact, the five per cent reference by the Treasurer will be an indication of what the government is going to accept from the arbitration board or what it will reject?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Treasurer will be meeting with the Civil Service Association some time, I believe, this week or the early part of next week, and I am sure the matter will be clarified in a way that they will understand.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary from me: Would not the Premier agree that in a matter of this importance he is the person who must clarify this and it should be done in a public way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I would be delighted to join the Treasurer in his discussions with the association, and it may be that an ultimate statement will be made by myself, the fact is that the Treasurer is meeting with them some time this week or early next week.

Mr. Nixon: The premier refuses to make a statement.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, in view of the outraged reaction of the Civil Service Association of Ontario and its leadership, would the Premier or the Treasurer not indicate publicly that they will reject or repudiate their own guidelines? Does the Premier not think that that is now useful to do publicly?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would think that after the meeting with the association, either I or the Treasurer will have something to say to the House, and I would anticipate that probably a representative of the association will have something to say, too.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the Premier think that an arbitration award would be binding on the civil servants?

Mr. Speaker: I believe that is simply a repetition of previous questions.

Mr. Stokes: No, it is not

Mr. Lewis: It is separate; I am asking a different kind of question. Would the Premier think that it would be binding on the Civil Service Association of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, once again I am going to resort to my knowledge, limited though it may be, of the law. I do not believe that the arbitration award is binding by law on the Civil Service Association either.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementaries? The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the Prime Minister: Does he not feel that the meeting should be held immediately with the heads of the CSAO in view of the fact that they are going to attempt a programme of "work to rule" and other action, in view of the fact that the provincial Treasurer announced the five per cent guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Treasurer.

Mr. Pilkey: Provincial Treasurer, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it quite clear that the provincial Treasurer is meeting with the association, either this week or early next week—hopefully this week.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If it binds neither government nor civil service and the government has already rejected in advance proposals beyond five per cent, what is the whole purpose of the arbitration proceedings? How does the Prime Minister see it?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): It is agreed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for Scarborough West realizes that the arbitration is subject to ratification by both sides under any circumstances.

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So there the hon. member is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition.

OHSIP CHARGES BY MEDICAL PROFESSION

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can he inform the House as to when specific information about the charging practices of the

medical profession in connection with OHSIP will be made public, other than simply the charges that have come from the member for High Park and the responses outside the House, rather specific ones I felt, that were made by the minister?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, under the present legislation the only information that can come forward has to be basically statistical. This will be building up over the months ahead. A lot of statistical information will be available and I shall be able to give it to the House and the public in the months ahead.

There is another question, and it is much more significant, and that is whether or not the legislation itself might have to be amended in order to remove the veil, as it were, from some particular instances and perhaps give the government greater freedom in dealing with breaches of standards in relation to OHSIP if they turn out to be, in fact, occurring.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Can the minister inform the House if he is undertaking a programme to audit the financial practices, and the medical practices of those doctors—50, I believe—who have been billing in excess of $200,000?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I can say, as I said last week, that I will undertake an investigation. But as I understand it, under the present legislation, neither myself nor the College of Physicians and Surgeons has the power to audit, which was the term used by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is the possibility of legislation giving the minister the power to undertake such investigation individually, under consideration at the present time?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe I mentioned this two or three weeks ago. Not only the government, but I, at the moment, feel that this responsibility—both financial and medical audit—is one which I will propose to the profession and to my colleagues in government and to the Legislature in due course.

Mr. Nixon: It will not necessarily have to be accepted by the profession?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park on a supplementary.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Before the minister produces the statistics on these doctors who are receiving these sums of money, will he take the trouble to write to the three dozen insurance companies that are also paying them under OHSIP so that the minister can give us true gross figures and not just a portion of the figure?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think it is a little more difficult than simply writing to the insurance companies. I certainly shall check into it, but my understanding is that it is quite difficult to match or blend the computerized returns of the different companies and ourselves.

But I shall check into it because certainly, as the hon. member suggests, those figures, if they are capable of being rationalized with ours, will give a virtually total picture.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber was going to speak.

Mr. Ben: Yes! This is a question more or less along the same line.

Mr. Speaker: Is it supplementary to the original question?

Mr. Ben: It is a supplementary: We cannot audit the books of the doctors, but surely we can demand of the insurance companies that they report to us the number of occasions in which these 50 doctors were paid any moneys from the government through the companies and in that way determine whether or not the services that the doctor is billed for could have been rendered at those rates and in that quantity.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I am not inhibited in getting accurate information from the insurance companies.

Mr. Ben: Will the minister do so?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, have the investigations conducted by, or on behalf of, the minister indicated, to any extent at all, either breaches of the present legislation, or possible offences against the Criminal Code?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Possible offences against the Criminal Code, I think, is too sweeping a question to involve an answer. Certainly some of the things that we have seen would suggest that there are breaches of ethical standards to which the profession itself subscribes.

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary; is there anything that the minister, or his investigators, have uncovered that could be anticipated would lead to charges being laid at the present time?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

LAYOFF OF TEACHERS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a final question of the Premier, at least as far as I am concerned. Is he now in a position to inform the House as to what has happened in those community colleges which have laid off staff, substantially interfering with and undermining the job retraining programmes that have been so successfully carried out for the last two years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the study has been completed. The Minister of Education, I understand, has a statement to make on this and will be doing so, I believe, tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STATUS OF DENTURISTS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question first of the Minister of Health: Is it the minister's intention and if so, when, to meet with representatives of the dental technicians and other interested parties in order to protect the public interest in light of the dispute between the dentists and the Denturists' Society of Ontario?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is rather a confusing question, because I think we should distinguish between the dentists, dental technicians and denturists. I have met with representatives of all three groups; I think the first meeting was with the denturists.

The denturists are not necessarily dental technicians—they are dental mechanics, unlicensed and unregulated. Dental technicians have met me, operating under their Act, and they have told me that they have no quarrel with the present legislation. Dentists have met with me in conjunction with the dental technicians, and they say that they have no quarrel with the present legislation. We are dealing here with a group which has a very strong argument on its side as it relates to the practice in the western provinces, namely these dental mechanics or denturists, who from our point of view as legislators are a club or a group unconnected with our disciplines in the dental field.

They told me, when they met with me about six weeks ago, that they were opening up a campaign in Ontario similar to the ones they have used in the western provinces. Their chief lobbyist told me of their plans to lobby us in this province and they initimated that, following the western pattern, they would now start a system of massive breaches of our legislation.

Mr. Lewis: Massive? By way of supplementary, how does the minister see these massive breaches of the legislation taking place?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: They simply practice dentistry and hang out their signs in breach of The Dentistry Act and draw public attention to them and in this way stir up prosecutions and the general focus of public attention on their situation.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I take it by the language the minister is using and his reference to them as a club, distinct from the more highly accredited dentists and dental technician clubs, that he is not at the moment in favour of this particular profession.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is not a profession and I use the word "club" to distinguish it from those who operate under laws passed by this Legislature, whether they be dentists or dental technicians. At the moment the denturists per se have no legislation relating to their qualifications, their supervision, or otherwise. Indeed, I believe we require, through The Department of Labour, even a garage mechanic to have some degree of training and licensing.

Mr. Lewis: Are you thinking of regulation licences?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This would be a point, Mr. Speaker, that I would very much like to assess, but to suggest that these people should be practising dentistry of a type without even the qualifications of a garage mechanic—

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not suggesting that.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —does not seem to me to be reasonable.

Mr. Lewis: The comparison with garage mechanics suggests your frame of mind.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: In response to the massive breaking of our regulation which is predicted, is the minister going to supervise the raids —the easiest word to use—undertaken by the Ontario Provincial Police in seizing the records of these companies?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well the word "raid" is used sweepingly. What they are—

Mr. Nixon: Well, do they just walk in and seize what is inside?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is the only way I can understand it where we can obtain the kind of evidence in government that we need.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Pass regulations. Put it under an Act.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say that the key thing in this is that the dental technicians of Ontario are not part of this offensive attack.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the minister will answer my question, and will these raids be undertaken at his behalf and his instructions and under his supervision, as apparently the ones were last week?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, there are two or three different sources of prosecution or of obtaining evidence. From my point of view, as Minister of Health, I simply want to ensure at this stage, and with the kind of background that I have given to the House, that these people do not continue practising dentistry until we have been able to tackle the legislative and the policy aspects that are involved in this very serious question.

Mr. Nixon: Will the minister answer my question, will the minister be the one responsible for instructing the OPP in its activities? Because on Friday the Attorney General said that it was an officer of The Department of Health who instructed the carrying out of last week's raid.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: From a practical point of view, we do not have the apparatus, we do not have the people; obviously the agent or long arm of The Department of Health in this field should be the Attorney General's department or the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. minister said it was the Minister of Health.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We can initiate, the Royal College of Dental Surgeons can initiate and, may I say, activity has been initiated by the dental technicians of Ontario themselves, to prosecute and to assist in prosecutions of these people. There are three or four different sources of initiating prosecutions.

Mr. Nixon: But the decisions so far have been the minister's.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has a supplementary.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister: Did I understand him correctly to say that the dental technicians are satisfied with the present arrangements under the Act whereby they would make, for example, prostheses for $35 and the dentists can then retail them for $250?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The secretary or president of the dental technicians was in to see me and he advised—and I doubt that he would be leading me down the garden path —that the board of the dental technicians of Ontario in no way wanted to be associated with the dental mechanics' efforts to break into this field.

They told me that they were satisfied, on the basis of the present legislation—to serve the dentists of the province the way they have been doing it—which is by dental prescription—and I am only relying on what they told me at our meeting.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one more supplementary. The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: In view of the widespread apparent satisfaction with the legislation that the minister has told us about, is the minister himself satisfied with such provisions of the Act, as in subsection 5 of section 23 of The Dentistry Act, which says that is prima facie evidence of carrying on the practice of dentistry if you have any dental equipment in your possession, and with subsection 10 of section 23 which allows an agent appointed by the dentistry association to go in and break down and tear up and ransack private premises, merely on the warrant of

a justice of the peace? Is the minister satisfied with that?

Mr. Nixon: Any cupboard, any closet, can be broken open.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with this. I find the way some of those whole sections are drafted to be quite offensive and, as I have said in the House before, all the healing arts disciplines in this province are presently having their statutes—definitions of practice, areas of responsibility—redefined. These will be coming through, I hope, this session but certainly in the very near future.

Mr. Lewis: Then the hon. minister should not speak of dentists the way one of his predecessors spoke of chiropractors and had to retreat quite quickly thereafter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

EFFECT OF MARK REVALUATION ON ONTARIO LOANS

Mr. Lewis: Could I ask a question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker? If the West German mark revalues at approximately eight per cent, as has been suggested by some, and Ontario then requires an additional $1 million a year to service its debt on the German foreign loans, where will that $1 million come from in current budgeting accounts?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It would come from the account which is labelled "servicing the public debt," obviously. Do not ask me the vote number, but it is under "Treasurer." That appropriation simply would be increased to cover the amount of purchasing deutsche marks at a higher rate of interest.

Mr. MacDonald: By treasury warrant?

Mr. Lewis: How would the Treasurer increase it—by special warrant?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How would we incease it? The hon. member knows that presumably when the amount was known, if the House was sitting this could be done perhaps by supplementary estimate, depending on the amount relative to the total, I would assume, or by Treasury Board order if that was necessary.

I think, as a matter of fact, it is a statutory item and I do not know that it has to be. It obviously has to be paid; and whether it would require either an estimate or a Treasury Board order, I am not sure. I will get that information for the member. Of course, it would depend on what happens in the meantime to the value of the Canadian dollar.

The last time this happened—of course, the Canadian dollar in the meantime has risen nearly as much as the deutsche mark has risen vis-à-vis the American dollar. Therefore, I suppose it is fair to say that there has been little or no effect on our debt transactions or on the debt transactions of Ontario Hydro.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I wonder if I could ask what is the state of the reserve which the then provincial Treasurer said would be set aside to provide for any change in exchange? As I recall the then provincial Treasurer, a few years ago, gave us an assurance that some reserve was being accumulated to provide for differences in exchange values.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am afraid I am not aware of that particular reserve so I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Scarborough West further questions?

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT TO COVER TAXI DRIVERS

Mr. Lewis: It is a useful reserve to know about, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask a question of the Minister of Labour? Is the minister drafting an amendment to The Employment Standards Act to cover the working conditions and fringe benefits of people who drive and own taxis in Metropolitan Toronto, whose case before the Ontario Labour Relations Board was recently thrown out because it was not covered by the Act?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of drafting amendments.

Mr. Lewis: Will I take it then that the amendments will be introduced this session?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, but I hope so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

DISCLOSURE OF UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURES

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Does the minister intend to implement legislation requiring universities to disclose their detailed accounts of expenditures to the Legislature along the lines of Bill 22 which stands in my name?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking last Saturday evening to the Ontario conference of the university faculty associations at which time I said I would ensure that they had available the annual reports of the 14 provincially assisted universities. A week ago I wrote to the university presidents making mention of my predecessor's undertaking in this House to reveal the full accounting records, not now in uniform form, by way of tabling these voluminous accounting documents here in the Legislature.

In my letter I said that this was my intention and would like to hear from them if they had any particular objection. I do not anticipate such an objection and in fact have had none. I would hope to table those documents within a couple of weeks.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister considering another proposal in my Bill 22 which empowers the Provincial Auditor to establish the form and structure of the accounts so that the public can compare the performance of the various universities and various areas of expenditures such as overhead?

Hon. Mr. White: There is a committee of financial officers of the universities working on a uniform form of reporting these accounts that will be helpful, no doubt, to legislators and other interested members of the public. It will be helpful to the universities themselves internally as they attempt to maximize their efficiency.

It is our hope that within a year or so such a uniform type of accounting will be made available on the recommendation of that particular committee.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it the minister's understanding that the detailed financial accounts of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education will be made available to the public through the University of Toronto? The question is obvious. I want to know how OISE is spending $12 million a year.

Hon. Mr. White: I can certainly account for the portion which reaches them through The Department of University Affairs; they are on the same basis exactly as every other university so far as graduate training is concerned. They are on a BIU count which is identical. The number of students in each of the various classifications is simply totalled up and they receive a sum of money, approximately $4 million, as does the University of Toronto or Laurentian or anybody else. I rather like that approach—it puts them on all fours with a comparable educational facility, and it is self policing the same way that the formula approach is self policing with other university institutions.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Will we be able to find out where the other $8 million is going?

Hon. Mr. White: The member will have to ask the Minister of Education.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the minister if he will guarantee to the House that he will work a degree of co-operation with the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) so that the public will know where that $12 million goes to OISE each year?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: If not, why does not the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park. I am sorry, the hon. minister is providing an answer.

Hon. Mr. White: Tell the Minister of Education and his department; I think it more appropriate for him to deal with that aspect of the matter.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is the one who is concerned.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, do not worry.

REQUEST TO HOSPITAL JOURNAL

Mr. Shulman: Can the minister explain why his department requested the Canadian Hospital Association not to run their article about the care of the mentally retarded in Ontario in the May issue of the Canadian Hospital Journal, and secondly, does the minister agree with his officials' request that the journal "not say anything about the whole matter?"

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I personally know nothing of the two questions

or allegations. As minister, I think the hon. member will allow that they are totally inconsistent with the approach I would take toward the dissemination of information in this field. I can vouch for my senior staff that they accept enthusiastically this approach, I cannot vouch for 50,000 other members of the department.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that any suggestion that this department would act, or purport to act, in the role of censor in relation to a publication such as this, would be completely offensive to me.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the minister investigate the letter which I supplied to him earlier, in which this allegation is made from the Canadian Hospital Association?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question previously asked.

TWO-MAN POLICE PATROLS

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on May 7 a question was directed to me by the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) and inquired if I would initiate the necessary regulations to make it mandatory that a police officer on patrol, and especially on night duty, should not perform his duties unless in company with another officer.

Sir, some time ago the Ontario Police Commission conducted a study as to the desirability and feasibility of two-man police patrol cars. Recourse was had to the studies conducted by the OPP, the Metropolitan Toronto Police force, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the results of studies published in the English Research Bulletin.

The conclusion arrived at was that it was not practical and of very doubtful desirability to have general regulations requiring two-man police cars. Whether there should be two men in a patrol car obviously depends on the time, night or day. It depends on the area, whether it is a high crime area or whether it is not, for instance. It depends on many other circumstances as to whether trouble is anticipated in a given area, for instance.

While the safety of the police officer must be a primary concern, there are, nevertheless, some risks that must be assumed in the nature of occupational hazards. A discretion, we feel, must be left to the chief of police and the police-governing authorities to make the greatest utilization of the manpower of the force having regard to its responsibilities for law enforcement, the protection of the public and the safety of the individual police officer.

Obviously, it is foolish to send 10 men when one can do the job, and on the other hand it would be foolhardy to send one man when 10 are needed. To enact a general regulation would increase the size of police forces in this province by 40 per cent, with its attendant costs and questionable necessity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister has the answer to a question previously asked by the hon. member for York South.

CORNWALL INFORMATION CENTRE

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the member for York South to supply him with information related to the Ontario Government Travel Information Centre at Cornwall. After very extensive research, Mr. Speaker, I discover that at the centre approximately 20 tourist information publications are available completely in French; a number of others, including publications on the St. Lawrence Seaway and ports and a Cornwall area map and information booklet, are available in both French and English.

Those publications are available at the Cornwall centre as well as five seasonal centres in the area. With respect to the language capabilities of the staff, the permanent supervisor at the Cornwall centre is bilingual. All members of the summer staff are also completely bilingual, while those people comprising the staff for the balance of the year can understand French sufficiently well for them to be able to provide visitors with information and assistance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC AGAINST UNINSURED DRIVERS

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Transport. During the high travel season and high accident period of the year, has the department some means of protecting the people in the province from those whose insurance has lapsed and who are not covered by the motor vehicle accident claims fund, or

those who cause accidents and are not covered by the motor vehicle accident claims fund?

The minister is not listening?

Mr. Lewis: That was to the minister.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Me? I am sorry.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My apologies.

Mr. Lewis: The minister made such a fuss on Thursday. Now we ask him a question and he is not listening.

Mr. Deacon: Could the minister report if some means of protecting the public from those whose insurance has lapsed has been developed, because I understand those people who suffer accidents caused by those whose insurance has lapsed are not covered by the motor vehicle accident claims fund.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I will have to find out the answer to that. The motor vehicle accident claims fund, I understand, protects a very substantial element of the public. I am not sure if there are any exclusions or not. I shall have to find out.

Mr. Deacon: It just covers those who are paying into the fund? It does not cover those who are not?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, no.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it covers everybody. The payment is made into the fund when the licences are paid—it is automatic.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

STATUS OF DENTURISTS

Mr. MacDonald: I have a further and new question of the Minister of Health, following our exchange on denturists and technicians.

Since a denturist is simply a dental technician who is retailing directly to the public and, therefore, has the accredited certificate of a dental technician, how does the minister explain the distinction he presented to the House a few moments ago?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As I understand it the certificate that goes to a dental technician is a certificate permitting him to run a laboratory. The denturists, as I understand it, may or may not include amongst their group dental technicians.

Mr. MacDonald: No, they are all dental technicians.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: They are dental technicians by self-definition, as far as I know.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, by accreditation.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I will have to check that. It is the first I have heard of any accreditation. Do you mean governmental, or by their own membership?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, by the Dental Technicians' Association.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is why I referred to them as a club. In other words, they can be accredited by their own friends and their own associates, but as far as I know there is no governmental accreditation given to them or available to them.

I am not saying at the moment that they should not be accredited, but as I understand it at the moment there is no legislative, regulatory, nor governmental intervention, supervision, licensing, registration nor certification involved.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What have you guys been doing for 25 years?

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: Since one-half of the 234 dental technicians in the Province of Ontario are now members of a denturists' society, putting in $100 a month, how can the minister pretend to the House that that association is happy with the present arrangements under the existing law?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not sure that that figure is accurate, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that the licensed dental technicians of this province are almost unanimously opposed to this action by the denturists.

Mr. MacDonald: Half of them are members of the denturists' society.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Dental technicians have, as I understand it, a legal significance insofar as their licensing is concerned. My understanding is that some of these denturists call themselves dental technicians, and in a statutory sense are not so recognized.

Mr. Lewis: But the hon. member for York South is right. The minister has been led down the garden path.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could I draw to the attention of the minister the provisions of The Dental Technicians Act, chapter 90, which provides in section 3 that subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the board may make regulations—that is the board of dental technicians—providing for the admission of dental technicians to carry on business in Ontario. In view of that, can what the minister says be in fact correct?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think so, Mr. Speaker. This is a carrying on of business, and again, I think the carrying on of business by the dental technicians is by way of the operation of clinics. A denturist could be anyone working for, or on the staff of, for any period of time, a licensed dental technician. So at the moment, for good or ill, these people are in no way accredited under our laws.

Mr. Lewis: I think you have been led down the garden path.

Mr. Singer: But are the technicians not accredited?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The technicians are accredited to operate their business, which is the business of running a laboratory.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, and with the consent of the House, I would like to say that in both the east and west lobbies there are some boxes of apples—as the result of prodding by the Leader of the Opposition last week, and not a big advertising display—placed there by courtesy of the apple producers of the Georgian Bay organization. These apples are equal to, if not the best, in the world.

I would like to call order of business No. 15.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

On vote 1102:

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Lands and Forests. When the House rose last we were starting item number 3 on vote 1102; page 190. We will give the minister a chance to take his seat. The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I would like to go on to item 4. I thought we had—

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I am sorry. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): On item 3, Mr. Chairman, I notice an amount of $750,000 allocated for extra fire fighting. I am wondering if the minister would elaborate a little bit more—I do not think I have got his attention yet—would he elaborate on what his expenditure goes to and how much of this is returned by way of payments from outside interests?

As I recall, it is in the amount of $250,000 that comes back. Is this for additional fires that are not budgeted for over the year or sort of an extraordinary expenditure? Would he elaborate on that actual amount of $750,000?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, this amount of $750,000 is divided as follows:

The first is an amount of $575,000. This is for wages and expenses of fire suppression in addition to those contained within the framework of the basic forest protection service. This expenditure is uncontrollable and fluctuates with the severity of the fire season depending on weather conditions.

Secondly, the $175,000 is included for the required replacement of forest fire suppression equipment such as fire-pump hoses, back pumps, parachutes, tents, blankets, fire tools, cooking equipment and so forth.

Mr. Stokes: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would care to elaborate on the amount of money that is being spent for extra firefighting expenditures? As the minister well knows, on many occasions in the past we have

drawn his attention to the fact that people in unorganized territory were left without any firefighting protection whatsoever. In most instances, they are too far from organized municipalities. I know many of them, on numerous occasions, have brought it to my attention and I am sure that they have done so with the minister. In isolated incidents, the department has been able to travel to assist small, unorganized communities that are unable to provide adequate firefighting forces of their own.

The minister mentioned in the opening remarks of these estimates that he does provide services for the provincial land tax that he charges people living in unorganized territories. I am wondering if this amount of money could not be expanded to enter into an agreement with substantial municipalities in unorganized territory whereby the minister could assist them by the use of much of the equipment, particularly during the winter months when fire hazards are extreme in the north because of heating units in homes operating at full blast to counteract the extreme temperatures; some of that equipment could be released, say, on a wintertime basis, to responsible groups of people in unorganized territories.

I know that the government had a full discussion with the fire marshal's office about it and with the Attorney General's office but we have never been able to resolve this acute problem to the satisfaction of those people on whose behalf I speak at this time.

I am wondering has any thought been given to expanding your extra firefighting equipment to make it available to these people for a very obvious need?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, like myself, represents an area that has a large number of unorganized areas and I am certainly very sympathetic to his views.

We have at the moment a study under the fire marshal that is looking into this question of trying to provide more forest fire protection to unorganized areas. As the hon. member knows, especially in the summertime whenever there is a fire in an unorganized area we do co-operate as much as we possibly can. But there is certainly room for improvement and, as I said, with this study under the fire marshal with representatives from my department, I am hopeful that we will come to some satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 3 carried? Item 4, the hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a few comments and a couple of questions to ask the minister.

Firstly, in regard to the whole question of regeneration and the silvicultural programme of the branch, could the minister indicate to me whether a study has been done as to the future requirements from the forests within our province, say up to the year 2,000? What were the results of such studies if they were done? Is the department following the recommendations that would be forthcoming from such a study and what were the results of such studies if they were done, and is the department following the recommendations that would be forthcoming from such a study and implementation of their regeneration programme? I know that one of the statements in his leadoff remarks was that they would reach a record level of 155,000 acres to be treated this year. As I understand it, there will be well over 260,000 acres that will be used during this current year, or used—

Mr. Stokes: Four hundred thousand.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Four hundred thousand? In that regard then, is the regeneration taking place only in about 40 per cent of the area?

I also have another question, along the same line, with regard to last year's programme. I have been given to understand that at Maple, where the seedlings were produced, there were a great number of them that were not used because the department could not find the money to plant the products of the research people or of the farms at Maple where they produced the seedlings and the other types of plantings to be used.

I think the important part of my question, Mr. Chairman, is in regard to whether the department has done an in-depth study to find out just where they should be going as far as regeneration is concerned.

I do not believe that they should spend money foolishly, but on the other hand if there is going to be a need and if the need can be economically viable for the producers within the province, then I think the regeneration programme should be stepped up so the need can be met and so our natural resources will not disappear.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is a good question. We have a study under way looking into the needs up to the year approximately 2000. This study is in the final stages.

I would say, as far as regeneration is concerned, that we are doing a lot. I will admit

that there is a need—there was quite a backlog and we are catching up. We are doing more in this province than all the other provinces put together.

However, aside from that, we are doing this here—I believe it is 155,400 acres that we are regenerating this year—and we are doing a lot of site preparation. Last year, the hon. member referred to Maple and said that we did not have sufficient funds to do all the replanting. That could well be.

This year, I am pleased to say, we have obtained additional funds and, in view of the fact that there is a larger number of students who are seeking employment, we are doing a lot more tree planting this year than we have ever done, utilizing these students.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister is saying then that he will shortly have a study of the future economic use of the forest. Will he then gear his regeneration programme to the results of that study, because I think there is not much point in carrying out this type of economic study if he is not going to follow it through so that the programmes are developed to provide the raw materials that will be needed.

Secondarily to that, what would be the loss to the department last year because they did not make use of the seedlings and so on that were available? There must be some financial loss if they were produced and then not used.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If I may answer the second part first, Mr. Chairman: I do not believe there was any loss. Those trees that were not planted last year were not destroyed. They will be kept and they will be planted this year. As for the first part of the hon. member's question about this projected study, again I would say that we certainly are very aware of the need to do more. This study will emphasize it and give us some accurate information; again it will be a question of the availability of money to do this. But I am optimistic that in view of the importance of the forest industry, which has been well illustrated in this Hedlin-Menzies report and to the province, that we will be doing what we should be doing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A secondary question to that: What percentage of the cutover areas then will be regenerated this year? What percentage will be cut? Was I right in assuming it would be about 40 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In regeneration normally, I believe, one-third is regenerated artificially, one-third naturally, and the remaining one-third—

Mr. Stokes: Through silviculture.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Silviculture, my good friend from Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I was not here on Friday when the minister replied to our opening remarks. I had four meetings and a wedding in my riding and I apologize for my absence.

I want to get into some remarks that the minister made.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Did the member get married?

Mr. Stokes: He says:

> It is quite true that we are not using the full allowable cut, but there are many reasons for it. These are the steps that we have taken to use it. First, negotiations for the past two years—we have had many negotiations with the pulp and paper companies and other industries to continue to expand their existing mills and bring about new ones, and there have been increases in the allowable cut.

Mr. Chairman, every time somebody questions the operation of this department, the minister hauls out the Hedlin-Menzies report. He does not mention anything about the Kennedy report in 1948. He does not mention anything about the Brodie report in 1968, and very, very rarely does he ever make reference to the Ontario Economic Council report in 1969.

I want to know, Mr. Chairman, what have been the results of all of the studies over the years and all of the consultations that he has held with the prime licence holders for maximum utilization of the unused allowable cut. Even the Hedlin-Menzies report says that we are using only about 32 per cent of all species. This means that we are using only about 10 per cent to 12 per cent of the birch and the poplar. We are using between 50 per cent and 55 per cent of the jackpine and the black spruce. Yet, each time we bring this up in the House when we are dealing with these estimates, the minister alludes to ongoing studies that we are having with the prime licence holders and with the operators of pulp and paper mills throughout the province.

I am wondering—and I brought this up I think the first time I had the pleasure of leading off for this party when discussing the estimates of Lands and Forests—about the pulp mill that was going to be established on the Eddy Forest Products limits at Elk Lake, where they were given first chance of

refusal and were given a year either to indicate they were going to build their own mill, or those limits would be released to someone else who was interested in utilizing the resources in that area. I have heard through the grapevine since that Eddy's have relinquished their rights to that, and the minister indicated, I think it was last year, that they had some on-going negotiations with other people who might be interested.

Since then we have had the closing of a mill that threw 300 or 400 people out of work in Blind River. I am wondering whether these limits were allocated to somebody else who was interested in exploring the possibilities of establishing a major wood using industry in that area?

I would like to call the minister's attention to the recommendations of the Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region, Phase 2, which were based on information garnered from The Department of Treasury and Economics. They stated that over the next 20 years, they could provide a maximum of 18,000 new jobs and 4,000 or 5,000 of these new jobs could be found in better utilization of the forest resources in that particular area. In fact, they even went so far as to say, I think, that at least two new paper mills could be established as large or larger than any in existence in the province today, based on the unused allowable cuts.

It makes very little sense for the minister to be talking about a multiple use concept in provincial parks when, even by his own admission, his department is using only about 33 per cent of the allowable cut of all species. The resources that are found, say in Quetico Park, for instance, are not very much different to any that are found any place else in the boreal forest. It is not a similar situation to Algonquin Park where one has a particular species upon which the furniture industry in the province is based, and the livelihood of so many people are dependent upon a multiple use concept in Algonquin Park. But it makes very, very little sense to apply the same concept to Quetico Park when by the minister's admission he is using less than a third of the allowable cut.

I am wondering what has been the result of these surveys that the minister mentions. He said "for the past two years." It seems to me that they have been going on interminably with prime licence holders. Yet I brought to the minister's attention here not too long ago a specific instance where people were denied access to certain species that are only utilized to the extent of about 12 per cent of the allowable cut. The minister mentioned on Friday in my absence that we are encouraging greater use of third-party agreements because this allows for greater utilization of certain species that hitherto were not being used. Along with that he mentioned that there was a reorganization within his department that would permit people at the regional level much greater flexibility with regard to establishing policy at the regional level on things that they were much more conversant and familiar with than people would be down here at the main office or at the headquarters.

He did mention that timber licences will be given out at the regional level, based on value or term. I find that is not the case at all, that ministerial directives are being issued, giving exclusive right to third parties on all of the unused allowable cut of poplar and birch. I specifically brought to the minister's attention one user who had not been able to operate for over two years because he did not have access to timber of a species that is underutilized to the extent of about 88 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is indefensible and I wonder if indeed there is going to be a change in policy whereby those at the district level will be able to determine what the unused allowable cut is and allocate it in such a way that everybody will be given an opportunity to harvest these unused resources and provide employment in so doing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member first referred to the economic reports of the Economic Council, and I can tell the hon. member that out of those nine recommendations the majority have been implemented and the same with the—

Mr. Stokes: What about the integrated forest policy?

Hon. M. Brunelle: Yes, we are working on this and we have accomplished a lot.

Mr. Stokes: They have been working on it for 12 years.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have accomplished a lot. The hon. member goes on about the unused allowable cut: A great majority of unused allowable cut concerns those weed species, poplar and white birch, and there is a very limited market for those species. We are trying to utilize those more and more, and in co-operation with the federal

Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce we have a joint study under way trying to find ways and means to promote the further utilization.

The hon. member also mentioned several things about the E. B. Eddy limits. Those limits have returned to the Crown; they are available. We have—and I have said this before—we have in this province at least four or five areas that have sufficient volumes of timber to sustain fairly good-sized kraft or pulp mills, a minimum of perhaps 500 tons per day. Why are they not built? There are several reasons.

The Province of Ontario—or maybe I should say, more specifically—all of eastern Canada at the present time is very unattractive. Why? There are several reasons. First, there is a slowdown in the economy. Second, the freeing of the dollar last year was probably the greatest thing that adversely affected our plup and paper industry, which depends on exports. Today, you do not have to depend on Ontario to obtain newsprint and pulp. You can get it from British Columbia and all these other provinces where it is sometimes more economical.

The market is mainly in the United States. Most of the mills in the last 10 years have been built in the United States or are being built there now. Why? It is more economical. Specifically, CIP spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on a study of building a large kraft mill in southern Ontario. The wood is there, the market is there, they have all these factors. Why did they not build? One, because it was not economical to do so—again the freeing of the dollar and the return on their investment. Those people on the board of directors—when they sit in Toronto or Chicago or New York, they will build wherever they think they can get the best return for their dollar.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Right. And with lower labour rates because of the closing down of the St. Catharines plant. That had something to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, this had nothing to do with the decision of CIP—

Mr. Lewis: Never mind "had nothing to do"—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —nothing to do with the decision; it was mainly a question on the return of their investment.

Mr. Lewis: Greatly affected.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that today there are certain provinces, and also the federal government, which are giving substantial incentive grants, $12 million, sometimes $15 million. Take for instance in northern Manitoba, The Pas, whereby they guaranteed, I believe, somewhere between 80 to 90 per cent. Again I do not believe that we in this province, that this government, should make those kinds of deals.

Mr. Lewis: You have been making them all along—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, we have not.

Mr. Lewis: —with every multinational corporation that came knocking on the door of the former Minister of Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for this department. As far as—

Mr. Lewis: For this department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —I am concerned, you tell me where we have advanced money, where this government has advanced money which was not for the benefit of the province. I would like to hear this information.

Mr. Lewis: Are you suggesting that The Pas is not of benefit to Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is in Manitoba. That is not the Ontario government.

Mr. Lewis: You have given a million to Kimberly-Clark, Boise Cascade. You have given money to Ontario-Minnesota; to Domtar by the million.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member referred also to Design for Development. Mr. Chairman, I would say that I am optimistic, coming from northern Ontario, that as time goes on we will be supplying more jobs, again, depending on the market, on the economic conditions. No one can foresee what can happen in the next five, 10, 15 years. The wood is there, there is no doubt about it, and our government is doing something about making it more economic.

Mr. Stokes: Outside of the provincial parks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our own department—this is what we have done. I have introduced legislation whereby stumpage dues can be reduced in remote areas. We are building

more access roads. Transportation is a factor. My colleague, the minister of the future Department of Highways and Transport, I believe—

Mr. Stokes: Transportation and Communications.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are looking into this. There is a study under way. They have a lot of information and this is an area, I believe, especially in northeastern Ontario, where we have not got the competition between water and rail. It is strictly rail. This is an area that I believe we should try to assist.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing something about these things and again, just as an example, you know, Mr. Chairman, that in the last four years more than 10,000—to be accurate, 10,760—square miles of Crown timber licences have returned to the Crown. These are licences that were under large pulp and paper companies. Again, more wood is being returned to the Crown and to integration third-party licences. I mentioned the chips; three-quarters of a million tons of chips are being produced annually. This is all making for greater utilization and bettering the forest industries.

Mr. Stokes: I want to pursue this a little bit further. The minister challenged me to show him where anybody who requested timber wanted it and I refer you to a letter—two letters—that I wrote to you just recently about a specific instance. I will not mention any names, but I want to tell the minister—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the Nipigon area?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And have we not looked after that?

Mr. Stokes: No, you have not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we did.

Mr. Stokes: Because what the minister did was give exclusive right to one holder of a third-party agreement—the right to play God on 15,000 square miles of boreal forest as it applies to what the minister calls the weed species. We have got people who are crying for this.

I have one operator who was unable to operate for the last two years because of the directive that the minister issued to three prime licence holders and said, "You no longer have the right to allocate what you referred to as the weed species; that is, the poplar and the birch." This fellow has been inactive for the past two years because of that directive that the minister issued.

The people at the regional level—and that is why I asked the question earlier—were placid, amenable to the idea of allocating certain limits to him so that he might conduct his operations and provide some new dollars in the economy of northern Ontario and thereby provide more jobs. The minister did not allow the three prime licence holders to do this. The minister took it away from them and gave it to the person who held the third-party agreement.

When the minister asked that particular company for a three-year plan of operations so that he would know what the requirements were over this 15,000 square miles, it was not forthcoming so that the fellow again was thwarted in his efforts. He became so frustrated that he went to another company, and the other company made sufficient amount of birch available to him to enable him to operate this fall.

I want to make it quite clear that it was not the result of anything the minister did. As a matter of fact, everything he did inhibited this fellow from getting an adequate supply of timber. I can quote right from the letter, and the minister received a copy of all the correspondence.

I am wondering when he is going to allow these people at the district level, who know much more about the unused allowable cuts than he does, or anybody in his department here, when is he going to give them the authority to allocate timber on the basis of need and availability? The minister has not done this up to date.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the district foresters are being given more and more authority.

Mr. Stokes: In this case, they were not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In this particular instance, the exclusive right was given because it was necessary for the good of the economy of the town of Nipigon.

Mr. Stokes: Fifteen thousand square miles?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am told that is what they had been given, and at the present those in question are looking over the area.

This matter has been looked into. I do not know why the member is making such an issue of something that is being dealt with.

Mr. Stokes: It is not being dealt with. As I say, it was through the intervention of another prime licence holder, who felt that they had more than enough of this weed species, as the minister calls it, that it was made available. It was not through the efforts of the minister's department, or the person in whom the minister invested the authority for the allocation of timber.

I am suggesting that the minister has to allow the people at the district level—timber supervisors and district foresters—to make that judgement. They are in a much better position to do it than the minister is and they would be happy to do it—I am sure they would be.

In connection with that, I talk a great deal to people at the district level. I make it my business to get around to these people and find out what is going on. I find out what the needs of the people are in the area. I find out what the minister's people at the district level think about it. They tell me that there are a lot of things that I suggest that they would like to do if they had the funds.

The minister says that, in addition to the decentralization that he has spoken of, he is going to vest a lot more authority at the local level to make these decisions that I speak of. Along with the authority, the minister has to give them the resources.

I am just wondering what happens when the minister goes before the Treasury Board and says: "Since the orderly exploitation of our forest resources is one of the mainstays of the economy," and it is borne out by the Hedlin-Menzies report that he brings to our attention every once in a while. I am wondering what does the minister say when he goes before Treasury Board? Does he say: "Instead of allocating $78 million in fiscal year 1971-1972 for the operation of this very important department, let us start with about $100 million or $120 million"?

If as much new wealth is created as the result of the activity in the forest products industries as the minister likes to think, and as the Hedlin-Menzies report likes to demonstrate, I am wondering why he cannot convince his cabinet colleagues of the need for, say, $100 million or $125 million, in order to bring about a climate that will foster the kind of development that is so needed to develop the unused allowable cut in the timber industry.

If the tourist industry is going to provide so much new wealth, why does the minister not spend more money on his parks? Why does he not spend more money on fish and wildlife?

I wonder why the minister cannot get more money out of that economic pie which all the cabinet ministers fight over every year. Why can be not do this in the interest of developing the north by the orderly exploitation of the unused resources—resources that are rotting and falling over because of an antiquated forest management policy under the auspices of this department and this minister?

Mr. Chairman: Item 4? The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I think to follow along on the remarks of the member for Thunder Bay with some reference in respect to the policy of decentralization—or the so-called policy of decentralization—especially as it relates to timber management, I want the minister—and I am not going to make a speech about this—I want to ask him how the new policy really can possibly effect so-called decentralization or, in fact, efficiency in the branch. I speak about what seems to be taking place in northeastern Ontario between the district or the regional level and the district forester.

We seem to be superimposing or injecting a new level of authority in there. I wonder, you know, if that is just an addition of authority, another level of authority, that is being placed in between these two levels.

Mr. Chairman, we realize that the strata or the structure of organization is not necessarily put there for the convenience of the local members, especially members of the opposition, but I must say that it has been working. Our contact is, at one level, the district forester, and the next level, anything that needs policy or overall supervision, we go to the regional level. In my case, I deal with two branches, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury, and I must say that we have a very fine and a very workable arrangement with these two levels.

Now we have another level of authority being placed in between those two. That is the way I understand it. That is supposed to be being done in the name of decentralization or bringing the department closer to home. I personally do not see that it is happening that way or that it can have that effect. I may be wrong. I do not know about the minister's plans in that regard.

You know, one of the problems that we, as members, have this year is that we have to retrain all the ministers over on the other side of the House. In a more serious vein, all of us have problems that were half

finished or at a certain level of procedure, and progress, then we find that we have a new minister as a result of the leadership convention, and I was hoping that in this important department this was not going to happen, that we were going to be able to deal with the same people that we were dealing with before.

It is great for these other departments to say, "The files follow the minister," but it is not just quite that simple. In this case the minister stays with us. Whether that is good or bad remains to be seen. Whether he did not get moved up for some reason or whether he did not get moved down for some reason, that is very obscure as far as we are concerned, but in any case we are dealing with the same minister. What I am concerned about, though is, that now the shakeup at the local level, the movement of the district forester up to the next level, a new man going in at the district forester level, a new man going probably at the regional level, I just do not get it. It is supposed to be done in the name of decentralization or efficiency. Personally, I do not see it accomplishing either one. I would like to have some remarks from the minister about it when he is answering the member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first, I appreciate the work and the co-operation with the Sudbury and the Sault Ste. Marie staff. I would like to assure the hon. member that there is no new level being added. We are adding staff. A reorganization does bring about changes and, instead of having about 10, our districts were based on our main organization here, where we have 10 branches that were vertical. In the field, we will have three main divisions. Outdoor recreation, land management and resource development which, of course, will include timber. We are adding staff.

It is understandable that in any change in organization there is a certain period when there is a bit of doubt, but I can assure the hon. member that this is going to work. It has been thoroughly studied and, if the hon. member has any instances where he feels that there is room for improvement, and that things are not working, we will be pleased to look into it. But, again, by giving the people in the field more authority in order to provide better services to those people living in that area, I am optimistic that this will work out. There is no new level; again I must reiterate, there is no new level of administration.

Mr. Farquhar: Well, I do not know. I just have to get a little bit more specific in order to be completely assured that this is not something of a change in structure that is completely unworkable as far as we are concerned. I want to be sure of that, because in Sudbury and in Sault Ste. Marie—and I certainly have no intention of mentioning any names, or saying anything to the detriment of those two gentlemen—district foresters in both cases are being moved, and are being moved right now.

From what I can undertsand, they go up one level but they still do not go to the regional level. Now where do they go? They find themselves in charge of a certain branch but they still stay at the local level. I am afraid that I just do not quite understand what they are there for.

For instance, where does the district forester fit into the picture? That is what I want to know. Up until this point, the district forester in the branch was the boss, unless one needed a policy decision, in which case one went to the regional director. Now one does not. He goes somewhere half-way between.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the authority of the district forester certainly will not be diminished. He will be just as important, probably more important than before. In the case of Sudbury, if I can be more specific, Mr. George McCormack, who was the district forester, will now be in charge of land management on the regional basis.

Mr. Farquhar: That is more specific now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He will come under the regional director.

Mr. Farquhar: But in terms of authority he will be somewhat above the district forester and somewhat below the regional director. Is that what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: When the hon. member says "above and below," I do not believe that I would quite use those words. He will work closely with the district forester and the regional director and he will supervise a larger area. Under this reorganization, for instance, the division of resource products will look after timber, fur and commercial fishing; land management will look after land, water and fire protection, and so forth, and outdoor recreation will include parks, angling and wildlife. So it is an integration which will make for a more efficient operation and also better service to the public.

Mr. Farquhar: I hope so. The fact remains that he is about to fulfil a function that did not previously exist in the field. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. This is part of this reorganization.

Mr. Farquhar: So it is another level or another responsibility and perhaps confusion.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And decentralization. In other words, fewer decisions will be made here at headquarters and more will be made in the field, where, rightly, I am sure the hon. member agrees, a lot of decisions should be made—in the field where people are knowledgeable, since they live there and know the local conditions.

Mr. Farquhar: I do not know whether the other members who are listening to the debate understand or not. I must say that we will do what we have always done. We will find the people who have the authority and the people with whom we can work.

I still cannot quite agree, since he fills a function that did not previously exist, but somehow or another we have got another level of authority in the field. I will take your word for it that it will work better and more efficiently. That remains to be seen.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I should add that if it does not work, the member knows we are very flexible in these matters and we hope it will work better. It it does not we certainly will make the necessary changes.

Mr. Farquhar: It would seem to me that when this level of authority or this degree of responsibility is moved into the field, unless there is something wrong or I am mistaken, there would be fewer people somewhere else, fewer people in the branch. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say there would be fewer people at the headquarters.

Mr. Stokes: I do not want to belabour this situation, Mr. Chairman, but I would like, if I could, to get something more specific from the minister. I think we are discussing particularly timber, item number 4 of vote 1102.

How does the minister approach these people with whom he has been consulting over the past several years? What does he say to these people?

I understand there was some negotiation going on with somebody who was interested in the E. B. Eddy holdings up at Elk Lake. I understand that there were some negotiations—very active negotiations—going on with the limits that were given up around Blind River. I am wondering how he talks to these people. What does he say to them?

What did he say to Kimberly-Clark, for instance, when we thought we were going to get a tissue plant worth about $34 million at either Terrace Bay, or Kapuskasing, in the minister's own riding, and we had had some discussions with the president of that company, Mr. George Carruthers, and we said to him, "What would we have had to do in order to convince you that you should build that tissue plant at the source of the resources or near the resources? What would we have had to do, what kind of incentives would the government have had to come up with?"

How does the minister talk to these people? When it was under active consideration to try to foster the building of a new paper mill up in the Sioux Lookout area, what does the minister say? What kind of little fillips does he hand out to these people or does he offer to them in order to use the resources that are going unused at the present time?

It is a renewable resource but the thing is if you do not use that resource when it is mature it is lost to the economy of this province, and certainly to the regions in the north where we do have wood fibre in such abundance and it is going to waste for the want of adequate activity in that particular field. I am wondering, what does the minister say to these people and what do they demand before they will think seriously of locating in such areas?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman I would like to assure the hon. member that there is nothing mysterious. We have had a lot of meetings. I have had, I would say, since the beginning of this year—at least with officials of my staff and about five other departments involved—we have had at least three or four meetings.

This is not new industries, Mr. Chairman, these are existing industries which are in this province and which are very concerned about the future, and we are having meetings to try and see what we can do to keep in operation. As far as new industries are concerned, we have a lot of reports. The hon. member keeps referring to the Elk Lake area and we had a report a few years ago—I have not got it here, it is a yellow-covered one—whereby we made available a sort of feasibility study on the volume of wood available and so forth.

Last fall there were some German interests willing to put capital in; there was a large pulp and paper company in Ontario who were also interested. They had a feasibility study of their own.

And what was the final outcome? When it came down to the final outcome it was the same as CIP. Today you do not build a mill unless you spend somewhere between $50 million to $100 million in order to have a viable operation and the return on the investment is just not there. It is just not there. As a government, of course, maybe we could do as they have done in other provinces, given incentives of maybe $5 million, $10 million or $15 million. At this time, we do not believe that this is advisable.

In the future, to keep those mills in operation—those existing mills that are here now, that were built in the 1920s, a lot of them are old mills, some of them are in the member's riding, some of them are in my riding—we may have to do more than we have done in the past because the situation is quite serious.

But again, Mr. Chairman, in Blind River—I have the report but I do not have it with me—a firm of consultants, I believe it is Sandwell, just completed their report less than a month ago; and what is the outcome? Again, sure, the wood is there, the people are there and so forth, but the economics are not there, the return on investment.

Therefore, at this time it could well be that we may not have a pulp and paper mill in certain areas in the province for a few years, until the economic situation improves. If the Canadian dollar—I am referring to it as far as exports are concerned—there is no doubt that if our dollar was pegged at 90 cents or 92 cents, like it was a few years ago, the north country would boom a lot more than it is now.

But these are economic factors and the areas we are looking into are transportation —I think this is one area, rail transportation, where we could be of assistance, and there are probably other areas. Maybe we should give incentive grants larger than what are being given by my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman). But it is a question of economics here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On that same point, I made some suggestions last year in regard to this matter and the minister seems to be a little more open to suggestions in this vein this year. There is no question that the other provincial governments are providing large incentives to—

An hon. member: Very large.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —to many of the new manufacturers in their provinces and, of course, we have been doing very little. We have been dependent upon the federal government programme, in northeastern Ontario particularly. I am sure the minister is aware that Abitibi backed away from a provincial grant in his own area because of the economic problems.

But there are two areas which I brought up last year—and the minister agreed with me —where I think the situation is even worse. That is in regard to the cost of power. I indicated the other day that some of the smaller mills in northern Ontario have had increases of almost 100 per cent over the last four years. This is an area that I think the government can become involved in, to assist those who are in difficulty now and to help new ones establish in the future.

I was interested in his remarks in regard to the present involvements in the area. As he said, many of them were built in the late Twenties or the early Twenties and they are not competitive today because of their capacity as compared to some of the new mills, particularly in the eastern parts of Canada. But those new mills in eastern Canada have been established by both federal and provincial incentives.

I think it is imperative, if our people are to grow in the northern part of the province, that the government has to get into some programme to assist the present mills that need to be updated in their production machinery. At least they should provide hydro rates that are competitive with the other provinces. I believe the Province of Quebec is making individual deals with new operators in that province to provide hydro at considerably less cost than is being paid in this province. So we are not competitive in that area as well.

Thirdly, in regard to the stumpage dues. The minister brought in a bill last week, I think, to allow the decrease of stumpage dues in the far northern part of the province. I think this is what he is indicating. But why cannot some method be established whereby the stumpage dues could fluctuate according to the economic conditions of the industry? I believe right now the Province of Saskatchewan is granting stumpage dues

reductions to encourage particular industries to establish there and that the stumpage dues there are 25 per cent or less than those of this province.

If we are going to be competitive and if we are going to keep the people in these areas working at this specific time, then I think we have to make specific adjustments. These are two or three areas where the government can act quickly in face of the economic problems that they are having.

I would suggest also that, in regard to the fluctuation of the Canadian dollar and the upward pressures that have been upon it, this is not the whole problem. Much of the problem is to do with the domestic market, as well as the export market, where we are losing out to the other producers in Canada who are being heavily subsidized by their own provincial jurisdictions.

We have to decide whether we want to continue to provide employment in these areas. If it is going to cost us money in the short term as far as government expenditures are concerned, then I think the government has to start to make them.

When the industry is buoyant and the profits are high, then I think that we can move to increase stumpage and other logging tax charges so that the province will retain an income from the natural resource.

I think the people who live closest to the natural resource are the people who should benefit the most from it and the greatest benefit they have is employment. I think that the programmes of the government should be established to create employment in those areas so that they benefit by the natural resources, not particularly to look at the income to the province as a whole.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like a clarification of the statement the minister made just a moment ago. If he will recall back about two years ago the original announcement that a German company was negotiating for pulp mill rights in the Elk Lake area was made by the Liberal member for Cochrane North, the federal MP Ralph Stewart. When I asked the minister in the House whether he was involved in the negotiations he claimed that he was not even aware of the negotiations at that time.

The minister shakes his head. I think that if he goes back in Hansard that he will find that he did say that he was not aware of any negotiations at that time.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. I agree.

Mr. Jackson: At the same time, just recently, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), who was in the Elk Lake area, made several statements that led the people of that area to believe that negotiations were still actively going on, that The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs were involved with several companies on negotiations for a kraft mill in that area.

What the minister says here today is that returns are just not there, which indicates to me, and I imagine to others in this House, that even though the negotiations did go on, at this moment they are at a dead standstill and that we cannot expect a pulp mill in the area, even though we were led to believe that it could possibly happen in the very near future. I would like the minister's comments on that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: First of all, with reference to my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, I read his speech twice and I must say that it was a very good speech, but I did not see any reference to a pulp and paper mill. It must have been in the question-and-answer period, so I cannot comment on that.

Two years ago, when the hon. member posed that question to me, I was not aware of it. I found out afterwards that there were negotiations that had been done by the federal member, and all the more power to him.

However, again it is a question of basic economics. The return on the investment is not there. The hon. member who lives in that area knows that this is an area where the finished product would have to be transported by rail, and therefore the high cost of transportation plus the high cost of the wood plus the other high costs does not make it attractive.

Mr. Stokes: Just to follow up a little bit, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the minister, that maybe the costs are too high at this moment, but every indication we get from this government whenever any of the ministers come into the area, is that the negotiations are very active at this moment and we can expect an announcement from the government at any moment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We never close the door. We are always optimists. We always hope that there will be—

Mr. Stokes: Do not deceive the people in the process.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have never said, I have never said, none of our people has ever said that—

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, that is not true, because every time one of the ministers from this government come into northeastern Ontario there is always a statement on the Elk Lake pulp mill—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Leslie Frost, for example.

Mr. Jackson: —and whether it is made in a speech, or whether it is made in the question-and-answer period, or whether it is made in a press interview or how it is made, there is always some reference to a pulp mill and the feasibility of a pulp mill established in there in the very near future. Now, if it is not true, then I would like the minister to say right at this moment that there are no active negotiations going on, and we cannot expect a pulp mill in the near future.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we are always optimistic. For instance, my friend would probably say this glass is half empty, I would say this glass is half full, so we are always optimistic.

Mr. Jackson: I hope you are as optimistic in the next election because you are going to need optimism.

Mr. MacDonald: Just on this one point if I may Mr. Speaker. The former Prime Minister, Leslie Frost, fought three or four elections on the prospect of iron mines on Belcher's Island, and that prospect just faded into thin air.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, they are still there.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I know they are still there. That I am dead certain of. But when my friend here says, "Do not deceive the public." The public were deceived for three elections on the proposition that there were going to be iron mines opening in Belcher's Island.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They have great faith in this government.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact, George Wardrope even had diamonds up there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, and some day they will find diamonds up there. The soil lends itself—blue clay.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Certainly, diamonds, columbium, richest area of Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Forgive me. I am overwhelmed.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member has not been looking for them.

Mr. Stokes: Some day, some day.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Are we ever going to see them?

Mr. MacDonald: In a million years the blue clay will become diamonds.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Farquhar: I quite agree it is a question of economics, as the minister said. But, in 1965, the government went into a survey regarding the timber limits northeast of Blind River and that whole area, and they sold it pretty well across the country. That feasibility study was represented, at least to the local people, as a mill just around the corner. It has been that way for five or six years—negotiations and optimistic statements. Now, six months ago, the government was not so sure, so it came through with another brand new survey. It has not even distributed that latest survey.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is being circulated to the various departments concerned.

Mr. Farquhar: Yes, that is the point, but the people in Blind River are still hoping. This is an updated feasibility study and there is no reason they would not still continue to think optimistically. They certainly have not been told and they certainly have not heard the kind of statements the minister has been making here today, which means that they can forget it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I did not say that they can forget it.

Mr. Farquhar: They certainly—well, any time that this department says—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Just tell Mr. Benson to peg that dollar at 90 cents and the member will be quit of it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Let the government borrow money elsewhere than in the United States and it would not inflate it either.

Mr. Farquhar: I am not going to buy that.

The point is that the minister has a survey right now that would destroy the kind of optimism that is there now, and would let them go looking somewhere else and not be holding their breath for a pulp mill. So that report should be released.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That report will be released, and things are not as black as the hon. member is making them, if I understand him correctly. It could well be that for the time being—

Mr. Singer: Like finding diamonds.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —it may not be economic to build a large mill. But, at the same time, we would allocate the timber to other industries in the area and other industries could establish themselves, and still keep in mind, without jeopardizing the possibility of a mill going ahead in, say five years from now.

Mr. Farquhar: The point is that the minister is not doing either one. All that has to be done in order to get things moving in that country is to let the people know there is not going to be any pulp mill around the corner, so they can get some of these other industries going. There are applications—and I could name three or four of them right now—for additional limits, right there for our industries that need it badly. Some of them are almost at the end of their rope.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Can the member convince his federal colleagues to give substantial grants like they have given in Newfoundland, in northern Saskatchewan, and so forth, of $10 to $15 million? Can he convince them?

Mr. Farquhar: I am not doing badly in that regard, much better than I am doing here.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister says that the province has not gone into the giving of grants to these industries, and almost every other province has. Where are we?

Mr. Farquhar: I just want to say that either the minister is working toward bringing in a pulp mill or working in the other direction. That is all I am concerned about, that the people know in what manner those limits are going to be used. Are they going to be held like pie in the sky for an industry that may come or are they going to be used by the people who can use them right now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They will be informed, Mr. Chairman, as soon as it is possible to do so.

Mr. Farquhar: Is the minister going to release that report then and make a statement to that effect?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I would think so. This report is being circulated to the various departments and we are getting their views. I would think that this report will be sent to the municipality or to the municipalities concerned as well as the regional economic council.

Mr. Farquhar: And if this report points up the fact that it is not economically feasible to—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At this time.

Mr. Farquhar: —at this time, then will the minister start to move these limits over to people who do want them and are asking for them now and that have viable industries? I am not talking about people who are applying for great big incentive grants for chip mills—I am not talking about that at the moment—I am talking about small operators that can use them, that are applying for them and are not getting them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I do not need to say that we are certainly interested in doing everything possible to keep the existing industries in operation and so I do not think there is any question about it. We told this to the operators. All we have asked them is to give us a little time. As I said, this report was submitted to us only in the last month or so and we will have more information, I would hope, within the next few weeks, and then the operators will be contacted.

Mr. Farquhar: I am not going to continue this, but I realize that right now several small outfits—and when I talk about small outfits, it is a person with some equipment in the bush and several trucks and a contract with Eddy's and so on—are out of timber. There is not only one, there are several of these. They are not asking for incentive grants, they are asking for timber, that is all, to keep themselves viable—to keep their operations viable.

The branches—the district forester and his branches—are not giving them very much hope. They are saying "no," for the moment. The freeze is on; they cannot move. Now, all I am asking the department to do is to move one way or the other and move quickly, before people associated with these small operators suffer.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. The minister has seemed to claim that the economics of the situation mitigates against the fuller utilization of our forest resources. Need I remind the minister that Ontario is a net importer of lumber and plywood. That is with over 50 per cent of the allowable cut going unused, wasted, overmature, rotting, falling down and becoming infested, we are importing more lumber and more plywood than we produce.

The minister says one of the things that mitigates against the exploitation is the high cost of freight rates. This just will not hold water when the minister knows full well that you can buy BC plywood which has been shipped or plywood that comes from the Orient, all the way across the Pacific Ocean, or all the way across Canada cheaper in Toronto or the New York market than you can buy it in Thunder Bay or Moonbeam or any place in Ontario. Yet we cannot even order our own house in such a way that we can produce our own local requirements. There has to be something wrong with either the operation of this department or—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not this department.

Mr. Stokes: —or antiquated freight rates. There must be something wrong when we cannot even provide for our own domestic needs in this province.

Let me remind the minister that he made an excellent speech—I wish I had thought of it first—he made an excellent speech away down in the Maritimes. I do not know whether it was the council of resource ministers or who it was who had invited him to speak, but I want to know how the minister can equate the remarks he made on that occasion, which I heartily applaud, with what he is saying now and what he says his government—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Economic planning.

Mr. Stokes: Sure, right. Okay, maybe you will stand up here and elaborate a little bit more about applying that concept to the situation as it exists right now with regards to the forest products industry and how we are going to order our own affairs so that we can supply the domestic market even here in the Province of Ontario. What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I agree, Mr. Chairman, with some of the remarks of the hon. member. From my own area it is more expensive to ship newsprint from Smooth Rock Falls to New York, or from Kapuskasing to New York, than it is from Vancouver to New York, when the distance from Vancouver is twice as much. This does not make sense to me, nor does it make sense to you, but this is one of the anomalies, one of the idiosyncracies, of our transportation system.

What is the government doing about it? There are many things that we are trying to do about it. The department which up until now has been responsible is the Ontario Department of Transport. They have made representations to the federal Board of Transport Commissioners, I believe. There have been many meetings held. However, this is one area that does not make any sense.

The hon. member said, and it is quite true, that we bring in more lumber than we export. That is quite true. Lumber from northwestern Quebec comes to southern Ontario. Why? Because in southern Ontario when they buy lumber they buy it, naturally, at the cheapest price possible, and the lumber that is produced in northern Quebec is lower in price than the lumber that is produced in northern Ontario.

There is a series of factors there. Transportation is one. There are other costs. Workmen's Compensation costs are higher in Ontario, I believe, than they are in Quebec. There are probably many other factors. I am not sure about labour costs.

So again, these are all questions of cost, and supply and demand.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of specific questions. Was the member for Thunder Bay going to follow that up?

Mr. Stokes: No.

Mr. R. S. Smith: One specific question that I brought up a few minutes ago with regard to the stumpage charges: Has the minister considered a method by which the stumpage charges could be set to fluctuate with the economy of the industry? If so, what were the results of this investigation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, our people have had a look into this. It has been brought to our attention by the Ontario Lumber Manufacturers' Association. It has advantages as well as disadvantages. I am told that the problem in arriving at a series of market price indications which would be acceptable when one considers that there are many markets and products, for instance, if shipping was just to one area I think it would be a lot easier, but our people in Ontario are shipping lumber to the United States, they are shipping lumber to Europe, so it is sort of difficult to adjust this to the price index. There are different prices.

But it has a lot of merits, and as I said, our people are looking into this and there is a possibility that we may implement this, weighing the advantages and the disadvantages.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It could be most likely implemented for the pulp industry much more easily that it could be for the timber industry. Would that be correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: If the price is there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, if the price is a lot more stable. But it is really the lumber industry that has made representations.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am just trying to cover two or three things that this government can do, specifically, rather than talk about what could be done with transportation. I realize it is a problem but the specifics that are under control of this department certainly should be looked at first.

Last year we had a lot of discussion about hydro rates and this year I brought it up again a couple of times. Your friend is sitting behind you and you indicated to us last year that—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He is a good man.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —you would support a move to supplement industry in northern Ontario by the use of hydro rates. But, of course, I would like to find out just what has happened since then in representations that the minister might have made to his colleagues in the government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, hydro rates, quite true, are important. They are a cost factor. But I would say to the hon. member that it is—in the total amount of cost —only a small percentage. And in all due respect to my good friend, the vice-chairman of Hydro, if they make concessions to the forest industries they have to give similar reduced rates to the mining industries, and to other industries, and then—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Not necessarily.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —who pays for this? It is the public. So that if you lower the rates in one area then you have to raise the rates in another area. So you have to weigh all these factors.

Mr. Stokes: You did it with beer.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I do not think I bring this up as a question to give a specific industry a gift; it is a question of development of those industries to develop jobs. It is pretty apparent that most of the mining operators in this province do not need that kind of assistance.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mining?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The mining operators do not need that type of assistance. Most of the operational mines in this province are producing a fair profit, perhaps except in the gold industry, and they have got other incentives through tax policies of both the federal and provincial governments. So whether you use taxes as incentives or whether you use hydro as an incentive you do not have to give the same to everybody, and this is perhaps the place of government to make the decision for the betterment of the people concerned. And I should think you would have made representations to your cabinet colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What were the results? They just came back, or what?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well the results are still pending.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But how long are they going to be pending?

Mr. Stokes: I have one final comment to make on the timber vote, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the minister's attention to one of the recommendations, or a series of recommendations, made in the Design for Development for northwestern Ontario. It. says:

> The Ontario government, in co-operation with the federal government and private enterprise, should continue to enhance the competitive position of the forest products industries on an equitable basis by:

(a) financial assistance in plant modernization.

(b) financial assistance in plant expansion;

(c) better utilization of exploitable forest resources through a continued programme of timber re-allocation;

(d) financial assistance in access road construction.

And, of course, it mentions the feasibility of building a new mill.

But what kind of consultation has the minister had with other members of his department? I think he indicated about two years ago that that kind of dialogue was going on on an interdepartmental basis. To what extent has this dialogue gone on with, say, his federal counterparts, who obviously should be interested in regional disparities?

What has been the result of it? Or has he just forgotten about it and said, "We will just let the market have the obvious effect that it does," and when the market conditions are right, we may or may not get the kind of activity in the forest industries to create the number of jobs the minister has indicated might be created. In his optimistic frame of mind I am asking him what has been the result of all of this dialogue? Has he, in effect, done what they suggested he should do—looked into the possibility of financial assistance for plant modernization and plant expension?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of dialogue interdepartmentally with officials and also with the various departments. Specifically, as far as grants are concerned for new industries and modernization of existing industries, it is the Minister of Trade and Development who is responsible for the ODC, EIO and the NODC loans. I know the hon. member is familiar with this.

This coming weekend I am meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), the federal Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. He is coming up to northern Ontario. I understand he is going to be in the Elliot Lake area on Saturday, and he is going to be in Kapuskasing on Sunday. There are some real problems in the forest industries.

Pollution was mentioned. I am certain we are all in agreement that you just have to put in the necessary equipment, and the forest industries, I believe, have spent something like $130 million in the last ten years. But at the same time, most of those mills are old mills, and it is quite a financial burden for them to put in this expensive equipment. Again, this is another factor.

There has been some alleviation, as far as I know. I think we have removed the five per cent sales tax on the purchase of equipment for preventing pollution. I am not sure just how much the federal government has done in this area, but within our own department we have a task force of various senior civil servants looking into the problems of the forest industry as they relate to Ontario, and especially to northern Ontario. There have been meetings—I was not involved personally with Mr. Marchand, but I know that the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) had meetings with Mr. Marchand—and we are prepared to meet with the federal people because we just have to keep those forest industries alive in the north.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 4? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Yes, the hon. minister has brought up the problem of pollution and the other day we had the pleasure of the Federation of Agriculture visiting our caucus—and I believe they were with the cabinet. One of the problems that was brought to our attention was the fact that when a farmer had finished working in his orchards and so forth, in one specific case he had to drive 30 miles to the air pollution control people to get a permit in order to burn brush on his own farm.

I wonder, is there a set of rules for the agriculturalists, or the people of southern Ontario, that would have application to those people in the minister's jurisdiction? In other words, do people have to get permits from the air management branch of The Department of Energy and Resources Management to burn brush and so forth? And similarly, do the people in the timber business have to get permits from the air pollution branch for the same purpose?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The air management branch is a relatively new branch and I believe it is the intention that some time in the future everyone will have to have a permit. But I believe at the present time—I am not certain of this—that this is not necessary. I believe it is the intention in the future that every person who burns—if he has, say a burner in a sawmill—will be subject to the regulations of the air management branch.

Mr. Paterson: It seems quite restrictive at this point that the farmers have to comply with this. Of course it is in the built-up areas of southern Ontario. I noticed in driving along Highway 401 the crews that were doing

the brushing under the winter employment programme were burning refuse and so forth. Does the same set of standards not apply to a government agency in this area as it does to individuals? This is the point I am trying to make.

Another area I would like to discuss for a moment is in relation to your silviculture practices in southern Ontario. I am fairly familiar with your endeavours in regard to tree planting, availability of small trees to farmers for wind rows and so forth. I wonder, since the implementation of the mining restrictions in relation to abandoned gravel pits and so forth, is your department putting any emphasis or doing any publicity with the various municipalities and those mining firms or gravel pit firms to make them aware that your department has trees available at a nominal cost? And I assume that you will supply them both to these types of firms and to municipalities for the purposes of screening, to try and hide these ugly eyesores on our landscape? Do you have any comment in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe most municipalities, Mr. Chairman, are aware that we do have the services and—

Mr. Paterson: There is no new emphasis in advising them of this since the new restrictive measures have been put in relation to these unsightly gravel pits and so forth? Have your officials followed up on this to make them—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, I am not aware that this has been done, but it might be a good idea. We will certainly take this member's recommendation—

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Would you also consider private industries that require them, we will even say junkyards, that we are trying to hide from the view of our highways? These trees should be available if your department has them in large enough quantities.

On this same topic, I was quite impressed when we had our tours in relation to the seedlings planted in the tubes. Has this proved to be a very successful method and if it has, have the actual trees grown at any better rate of growth? I believe it was suggested at the time that possibly they would get a much better start. I do not know whether they have had enough years in this programme to determine whether we are going to get more rapid growing and more successful catch in the the tree planting system.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The tubeling planting programme, Mr. Chairman, has been quite successful. It is not that many years since we commenced this type of programme, but I have the figures here some place about the numbers of trees that were planted by this method and I would say that the great majority have reproduced. Last year we planted 12,000,000 tubed seedlings.

Mr. Paterson: One last question, in relation to various species of trees—I know in our select committee on conservation we toured areas in another jurisdiction where they were attempting to propagate fast-growing trees and this was for the purpose of hiding old mine sites and so forth, rather than for the timber industry itself. Are your people doing work in relation to expediting or increasing the growth rate of trees both for timber purposes and for lack of a better term, a decorative purpose?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our timber research branch are doing and have been doing a lot of work in this area. We have a study just completed recently about a fast-growing type of poplar that grows very fast, I believe in something like 20 years, and there are other species that—

Mr. Stokes: That is the weed trees the minister was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. I used the word "weed" but maybe we should use a better word.

Mr. Paterson: We pay a premium for those down our way.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But they are proving to be more and more an economic tree.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 4 carried?

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I wondered if the department is interested or has connection with an organization called the Men of the Trees which is a world organization promoting reforestation throughout the various areas throughout the world? I know that in our particular county there are some people who are currently setting up an organization to promote the same type of tree culture—silviculture, that is the right word?—as is this particular organization. I wondered what help the department is giving to encourage the furtherance of this organization in, say, Ontario as opposed to the world organization?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is the first I have heard about this organization, Mr. Chairman, but I am advised that they have been in to see us. To our knowledge they have never asked for any active support, such as financial support, but we would be pleased to co-operate with them because our interests are common. We certainly want to work with any organization that has as its aim the regeneration of our trees.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 4 carry? The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: One question in regard to to Quetico Park. I think the NDP critic mentioned it a few minutes ago—which licence holders in proximity to the eastern section of the park hold licences which are not being fully utilized but could be fully utilized to provide produce for the mills in the area that are now operating on the cuttings from Quetico Park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is the member asking about licences outside the park or inside the park?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Outside the park, east of the boundary.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Great Lakes and Ontario-Minnesota have licences.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the Great Lakes licence being fully utilized at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, but I would say, though, that Great Lakes have a feasibility study whereby they intend to enlarge their mill substantially. Even though the allowable cut may not be fully utilized, if there is a surplus this surplus is being considered for other future expansion.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But has the department not looked into the question of whether the Great Lakes limits could provide the timber that is required for the sawmills in Sapawe and the other—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This question of looking into whether timber—if I understand correctly, the member is inferring is it possible to find timber outside the park for the Sapawe sawmill?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This matter is being looked into. I have not seen the final report but I do believe that it will show there is wood outside. Mind you, it could well be, though that the wood, if it is not nearby, may have to come—we know there is wood available—say, from the Beardmore area. There is considerable wood from that area which is not being utilized, but the cost of transportation by rail from Beardmore to Sapawe is about $12 per cord. I am not saying, Mr. Chairman, that we may have to go that far to find the wood. We hope we will be able to find the wood, if it is necessary, in a much closer area.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What the minister is saying, then, is that if the department can find the supply outside of the park, it will discontinue operations within the park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not saying this, Mr. Chairman, because in all fairness the advisory committee held a meeting. They are just studying the briefs. They are leaving, I believe, on May 11, which is Tuesday, tomorrow, so in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, I think we should let the advisory committee make its recommendations.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, but on the other hand, if the supply can be found now, could the minister not stop the logging in the park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is no cutting going on right now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, but there will be this winter.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There could be.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There could be this winter.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we will have the recommendations of the advisory committee, I would hope, in the very near future.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But the recommendations of the advisory committee have to go through all kinds of a process, like the recommendations of the other advisory committee are going through, and it does not necessarily mean the minister is going to come to a policy decision.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the matter of logging in Quetico is much less complicated than the logging operations in Algonquin Park. I am sure the hon. member, who is a member of the advisory committee, will agree with this.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I realize that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again I am optimistic, as I said in my opening remarks, that the whole question of Algonquin Park, I hope, will be resolved in the near future.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, but I am talking about Quetico now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I mean Quetico.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, the minister would hope to arrive at a decision with regard to logging in Quetico Park within the next two or three months?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, yes, certainly. As far as the final report on Quetico is concerned, this could well take additional time. I am optimistic as far as the Quetico question of logging goes. I would hope that this would be resolved within the next month or two.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is only one resolution to that problem.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: One final thing then, as a result of something the member for Nipissing has brought up: I think most of the conservationists who have been opposed to the multiple-use concept in provincial parks think that the people of Ontario should pay some of the cost of any inconvenience caused either by way of jobs or relocating. I am wondering if the minister would consider assisting the company in question to relocate closer to the source of known wood supplies, if it was adequate for the use of that and if it fitted in with their market patterns or anything of this nature. Would the minister consider building access roads or assisting them in relocation of the plant closer to the supply of wood? Have any of these alternatives been considered by the department in trying to resolve a very complicated problem as it affects the jobs of those people at the Sapawe mill?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, certainly with regard to these various alternatives, some have been looked into and others will be looked into. We just have to look after the industries in that area.

Mr. Chairman: Will item 4 carry?

Item 5, land. Will item 5 carry?

Mr. Stokes: No.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Getting into the land vote, I know it is only a small part of the announced programme of this department for the minister not to allow any outright sale of recreational land and that the only way that it will be made available to anyone is on a leased basis. I notice the minster, in reply to the opening remarks, said the final plans were not known yet and in due course we would find out what the leasing arrangements were going to be.

I am not going to spend any time on that because we do not really know what we are talking about until we see the regulations or the legislation that will be brought in to cover it. But I want to get into a very specific problem, Mr. Chairman, and that is unauthorized cabins on Crown land. I do not know to what extent it is a problem elsewhere in the province, but I do know that it has caused considerable trouble to the department and to well in excess of 500 people, who over the years—some dating back 50 years—have established unauthorized cabins on Crown land.

There was an organization formed of these people to try to reach some kind of amicable solution with the department, and the group, who called themselves the Wilderness Owners' Protective Association, passed a resolution on November 27, 1970, and it says:

> Whereas numerous persons have, from the beginning of pioneering in the northwestern portion of the Province of Ontario, established cabins and various other structures on wild lands and public commons throughout the area;
>
> And whereas cabins and structures were established with the general knowledge and tacit consent and approval of various provincial departments in existence from time to time;
>
> And whereas the Department of Lands and Forests has recently attempted to establish certain policies in regard to use of wild lands in northwestern Ontario;
>
> And whereas seizure notices from time to time have attempted to be posted by officials of the government of the Province of Ontario upon structures owned and being maintained by citizens of northwestern Ontario;
>
> And whereas land-use permits have been authorized in similar situations in the past by the government of the Province of Ontario in areas other than northwestern

Ontario, and to a lesser degree in northwestern Ontario,

That the owners of buildings and structures situate upon wild lands in northwestern Ontario presently in existence are in no way trespassers, having erected the buildings or structures with consent and as a matter of right are entitled to have that building and structure remain in place;

And that the policy of attempting to zone the wild lands and public commons in northwestern Ontario should be amended by the inclusion of a non-conforming use classification in accordance with proper planning principles;

And that The Department of Lands and Forests take immediate steps to make available to the owners of structures situate upon wild lands, such areas as may be reasonable by granting to such owners the right to purchase the lands upon which such structures are situate.

Now, I know that it is no longer possible for them to purchase those lands, but I am wondering if it would be possible, either under a land-use permit or a licence of occupation, or by some lease arrangements, to allow these people to stay on thise lands as long as it conforms with the overall recreational and land-use plan for that particular area or that region.

I am not suggesting that we make any special concessions to these people. I am suggesting, however, that I think there is room to accommodate these people so that they will not be forced to vacate these unauthorized cabins or lose any equity that amounts to several thousand dollars.

I do not think they were wise in spending large sums of money to improve land upon which they did not hold tenure, but I am just wondering now that the department has ceased selling recreational land, if it would not be possible to accommodate these people by some form of lease arrangement in those areas where it does not conflict with closed areas or prohibited areas? I think that we do have sufficient land up there that you would be able to accommodate these people and I made mention of it in my opening remarks.

I made a copy of a special agreement available to the director of the law branch, an agreement that was entered into with the Longlac Pulp and Paper Company and certain people who found they were squatting on private land as a result of land that was sold by the Crown to the Longlac Pulp and Paper Company some 25 years ago. I am not going to bore you, Mr. Chairman, or the House, with the contents of this agreement, but I made it available, as I say, to the head of the law branch of your department. I hope he has brought it to your attention.

I am wondering if I could not get some kind of comment from the minister as to whether or not he thinks this might be a solution to that situation, which has become such a troublesome one. It has got a lot of adverse publicity in northwestern Ontario because the media has picked it up. They are not fully conversant with the situation and the trouble it has caused your department. I am wondering if the minister would not think this might be a solution to that vexing problem at this time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated receiving this agreement from the member. I have looked it over and I do not need to say to the member that it is a very complex problem. The hon. member attends the recreational land-use zoning meetings.

Today, Mr. Chairman, more than ever, with the advent of the snowmobiles people are occupying Crown lands sometimes 12 months of the year. We are sympathetic. It is understandable that a person who occupies Crown land with a cabin—it might be a cabin that was abandoned by a prospector 20 or 30 years ago which he has improved—likes a little place where he can get away from the noise and so forth. He appreciates that.

We are trying to do our best, Mr. Chairman. Our field people are making a survey of all these cabins, or whatever you wish to call them. Some are located in open zones, some in deferred zones, some in closed zones. We will try and see if we can come out with a policy whereby—at the same time we must uphold the law—in some areas we may be able to legalize them. Maybe we can issue, as the member mentions, a land-use permit or maybe a licence for occupation.

I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is being looked into and we hope to be able to come up with some arrangement that will be satisfactory, keeping in mind public interest. But there are some that are located in, say, closed areas who may have to abandon their—

Mr. Stokes: I just want to make one other comment on this. I am not suggesting that these people who have squatted illegally on Crown land or who have acquired these old abandoned prospectors' or trapping cabins, or abandoned logging camps—I am not suggesting that the minister should give them

the same consideration as somebody who is going to lease Crown land under the new arrangement announced by the government in the Throne Speech.

In areas where they do find themselves in closed zones, and the department does not have any short-range plans for the area, could the minister not do it on a lease basis, renewable annually—something of a much longer tenure, such as 21 years, which I suspect he might be doing with regard to leasing of recreational land with Canadians getting first chance of refusal? I wonder if the minister could not use this kind of an arrangement in the closed zones, where he looks at it, say once a year, or something of that nature, and says, "Well, you have another year."

It has worked out very well in this case, where they do reserve the right to cancel it, at any time. It has gone on, I think it is for 23 years, since 1948, and it has worked very well.

Now they cannot erect any new cabins. All they can do is carry out normal repairs on the existing cabin. They cannot sell it to anybody else, except the company. I think the same arrangement could be entered into with the Crown, and I think it would satisfy the people in question. I am not suggesting for one minute that they be treated in the same way as a 21-year lease, or something of that nature.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the views of the hon. member will be very useful and I would like to mention that the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) also has brought this matter to my attention on many occasions. It is quite a problem for many of his constituents also.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to be very brief.

It is interesting to come to the part of Lands and Forests' estimates that deals with lands. I have often felt that it would be useful if the jurisdiction over the use and perhaps the accumulation of lands were within one department. I think that this department might well be a suitable place. I wonder if any thought has been given by the minister to making some kind of representation to his colleagues to bring things like conservation authorities, who acquire lands continually, within his jurisdiction.

An example I want to give is that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) over the last weekend made some statements—I believe it was Friday last—about the need to acquire lands in the Niagara Peninsula and appeared to be making them on behalf of the government to protect the peninsula against further loss of valuable land. It seemed to me that this kind of operation that could well fall within the jurisdiction of The Department of Lands and Forests. It may be appropriate or it may be satisfactory to the government to have these things handled in a number of different departments and thereby make it more difficult for the average citizen to come to grips with who is responsible. But I would have thought that that government might well have considered having a department that has complete authority over the acquisition and the use of lands in the Province of Ontario.

When I take a look around me, I can see very valuable land—land the likes of the escarpment—which until very recently was being left without anyone really paying any consideration to it and gradually being eroded. I cannot help feeling that the minister in charge of Lands and Forests should have a complete inventory of all lands in the Province of Ontario which, at this point, are not developed—and developed means that they are not being built on or farmed and that those lands should be his lands to look after and that he should be the minister in charge of the determination of what use those lands can be put to. I would like to ask the minister whether this has ever been considered by his department.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe, at one time, Mr. Chairman, that the conservation authorities did come under our department. We do work very closely, but as the hon. member knows, in our department, we are responsible for the management of Crown lands—

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and the conservation authorities look after lands under the administration of the municipalities and counties.

Mr. Deans: They then become Crown lands at some point. They buy them and they become Crown lands.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are not necessarily Crown land. They belong to the municipality and counties. This matter has been advocated by others and it is not a matter that comes under the government policy matter.

Mr. Deans: It does not at the moment. Let me say to the minister that throughout the government there are any number of branches that purchase and hold land. His colleague, one seat over, the Minister of Trade and Development, through his department, purchases land and that land is held.

I wonder just what kind of consultation goes on between other departments and The Department of Lands and Forests in determining—I do not mean in casual conversation—the appropriateness of the use that is intended by that department, and whether or not there is any one department that has any jurisdiction over the use to which that land held by the government is put.

For example, at the present moment, the Ontario Housing Corporation is developing a fairly large subdivision, what might be called another city, adjacent to Hamilton. It will be built to within half a mile, perhaps even closer, of the brow of the escarpment. It has within it a quarry and all of those other things that are obnoxious to development, but there it is. There was never really any determination made prior to the purchase of that land whether the land was best suited for housing development or whether the land was best suited for recreation.

This, to me, seems wrong, and I suggest to the minister that this goes on in any department that is in the business of acquiring land. There is not any body that is responsible solely for the determination of the use to which land must be put. Now we face a situation where I understand that Professor Gertler has handed down yet another report dealing with the use of the Niagara Peninsula. I am worried that this report will go the way of most reports. It goes into a number of departments because there are a number of departments that have jurisdiction and they have to decide for themselves how they will apply the report to their particular department. I think that the minister would serve the people of Ontario better if he were to acquire from all other ministers the management of land in the Province of Ontario, if he would acquire from the cabinet and become solely responsible for the use to which all of the land that is presently within the jurisdiction of government is put.

I think in this regard we would then be much closer to acquiring or to evolving a land-use policy—a policy that could be applied province wide; a policy that could be used to determine whether land is being properly used or is being abused. We would not then have to seek and find whose responsibility it is, whether it rests with the conservation authority of one municipality or the conservation authority of one local area or whether it is within The Department of Energy and Resources Management and one of their projects, or whether the Minister of Trade and Development—for housing—has it in his responsibility.

We could then go to the appropriate minister—hopefully the Minister of Lands and Forests—and get from him, a complete outline of the programme of the government of the Province of Ontario as it is applied to the use of land. Let us face it, land is the most important commodity that we have. It is our most important resource, and once abused it is very difficult to reclaim.

I ask the minister to give serious consideration to making strong representation to the cabinet to become the sole responsible minister for all the acquisition and all of the management and all of the determination of use for land in this province.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I suppose one could be a little more political in dealing with the question that concerns the member for Wentworth. It has been my observation over the years that the only reason I can put my finger on the fact that several departments have the right to acquire their land and distribute in certain sections is that they can shift and shaft the responsibility and the policies as it seems fit at any particular time.

We have one great example in the last two or three months. The minister is well aware that members from this side of the House—in both parties—maybe particularly myself, for many years questioned the minister as to his policy of acquiring the Fifty Point Park project, that 140-odd acres adjoining Saltfleet township and Grimsby township. And, of course, this particular department that could have acquired that land as a provincial park, recreational park, procrastinated right to the point of almost saying, "The cost is too high now."

When we originally raised the question some eight or 10 years ago, the land could have been acquired for something like $4,000 an acre, a great deal less. The government in this department procrastinated until land speculators, developers grabbed an option at some $4,000 plus $200 and finally it was sold to the Hamilton region conservation authority. Now, this seems awful good, you know.

One might say: "Well, at least we got the land. It will be developed into a park." But there were some things that transpired in the meantime.

The Hamilton district region conservation authorities settled for $1 million, as close as I can ascertain. This is a guess from the press releases. First, it meant that the price was now $6,600 an acre. This means that the municipalities had to pick up half the tab, and the municipalities picking up half the tab of that $1 million meant that the citizens of Hamilton have now paid for about two-thirds of the cost of a piece of land that should have been purchased by this department some years ago and all in the immediate area could have enjoyed it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): At least 11 years ago.

Mr. Gisborn: The corporation of the city of Hamilton pays the highest per capita because of its size And there is nothing wrong with that per capita payment to the conservation authorities. But they picked up the $500,000 tab that makes the municipalities responsible for purchases by the conservation authorities. This was one shafting that was done, at a terrible cost to the public because of the lack of foresight and imagination of this particular department some years ago.

Other things transpired as a result of procrastinating in areas of this kind. We read the story of the conservation authorities picking up that park. They said that there was a nice pond on it—it was already developed and could be used for a splendid marina. What we know transpired was that the contractor bought from the developers, who had purchased the option, about one million cubic yards of fill and dug it out of that area at 25 cents a cubic foot to build the ramps for the development of the Queen Elizabeth Way. So they picked another $250,000 out of that deal before it was put into the hands of the conservation authorities—

An hon. member: An abuse of the land.

Mr. Gisborn: And there was a terrific abuse of the land. Now we find that we have a hole there about 30 feet deep—well-terraced, of course, because they had to get the trucks out of it to take the fill out—about half a mile long and a quarter of a mile wide. And if ever there was a clever conservation authority that was rooked and a misconception of what this would do for the people, this was the case.

I dare not make any guess at an estimate of what it would ever cost to turn that into a viable marina. Can you imagine a hole of that size within about 50 feet of Lake Ontario—the lake breaking into it, allowing a lot of water to come in, and the shoring and the preparation of protection that will have to be done? It is outrageous. I am waiting for the time when the plans are set forth by the conservation authorities in this area; in fact, I am waiting until I get the proof of the whole transaction of that deal, because if there were ever serious indictments upon the heads of this government this is going to be one of them.

I think this heads up some of the problems that concern the members. Why should so many departments have the right to acquire land? Why is it that they shift their responsibilities in this manner?

We cannot blame this minister for the overall policy of the government—

Mr. Deans: We cannot blame any minister for the Liberal policy.

Mr. Gisborn: But sometime or other we have to come to a firm, reasonable conclusion that the planning which should have been done years ago said that this area was a prime area. The orchards had been depleted and deteriorated to the point where they are beyond recovery. The people who owned the properties were past the age of handing it down or of redeveloping and making it viable. They were just hooked and had to grab the option as it came along.

I have a letter in my possession—some four or five years old—from one of the major owners, which said she would have been very happy to have the government move in at that time; she would have liked to have seen it preserved for a park and for the historical value it had.

I know I am making only a little speech on a subject that has concerned me to quite some extent, but it does make one a little angry. And this minister knows what I am talking about, because we raised the question with him many times in the past.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A short observation: The conservation authorities were created mainly to look after control of flooding areas. Recreation use has come about more and more in the last few years. The Parks Integration Board is composed of about 10 departments and is sort of a liaison body

which deals with many matters that concern land. Of course, land purchases all have to go to Treasury Board, and again this is another board which becomes very familiar with various aspects of land acquisition.

I agree with the member that as far as land use planning is concerned, this is an area that is very important, but under our own department we have the Ontario Land Inventory, where we classify land by various uses—agricultural, recreational, fish and wildlife and so forth. Also The Department of Treasury and Economics—the regional economic branch—is the one which does a lot of the planning. The government committee, with which the member is familiar—I think it is called the committee on government productivity—I believe is presently studying this whole question of property in Ontario, especially in southern Ontario. So there is a lot of work going on now in studying the important question of proper land use.

Mr. Deans: Just a final comment or two on this.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Wait a minute. How did he get into the act?

Mr. Deans: I was the first one speaking.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, all right, but—

Mr. Deans: That is exactly the point. I raised the point.

Mr. T. P. Reid: After I was so good to the member.

Mr. Jackson: The member for Rainy River just woke up.

Mr. Deans: The minister says that within his department there is an assessment being made, or there has been an assessment made, of the relative values of land, whether it be for farming or for recreation or whatever it may be. The problem I find is that no matter how one assesses the value of the land it does not seem to have any bearing on its use. You can assess that that is the use it ought to be put to but in actual fact it seems when it comes to the application of the use of the land, whatever you assess it, it does not seem to matter. The minister himself has hit upon the key point, that within The Department of Trade and Development, within The Department of the Treasury, everybody seems to be looking at it and no one seems to have the right to make the decision.

We have studies of various kinds that have taken place and they include studies, such as the studies of regional government and how land ought to be used within various regions to determine the suitability of the region, and studies that were done—even the Toronto Centred Region—in the determination of the use that the land surrounding this area can be put to and studies that have been conducted in terms of conservation.

The minister, of course, is right, that the conservation authorities were originally set up for the preservation of watersheds and the accumulation of water for the purposes of future generations. In recent years, we have moved to the position where conservation authorities are basically—or an equal portion of the responsibility seems now to be the acquisition of land for recreational purposes. I just feel—and have felt for some time—that unless there is a drastic change in the approach of the government toward the use of land, not in the designation of how it ought to be used but in the actual application of the use, that we are going to find ourselves some day with each department having set up its own land-use policy with no overall policy of government.

I would just like very much in my final remarks to this minister, to ask, for want of any other, that this minister in particular would undertake the responsibility of the land-use planning for the province—management and application—so that there will be no question ever as to whom it is we speak to when we want to talk to someone about what is being done with the lands of this province, as the planning applies, basically in metropolitan areas, but throughout the province in general.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5. The member for Nipissing was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. Deans: I thought the member for Rainy River was eager to speak?

Mr. R. S. Smith: He could not wait for the member.

Mr. Deans: Good heavens!

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have just a couple of questions.

Firstly, in the development of the leasing programme, are there going to be any changes in the specific amounts of money that a person is going to have to expend on a structure on the property? Will this be upgraded so that in any amounts of money to be spent will be

included enough to provide pollution control facilities?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The present amount, Mr. Chairman, is, I believe, $1800. This was established maybe four, five or six years ago. This is being reviewed, and it is possible that it could be increased to maybe, say $2,000 or $2,500.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Are there other sales of Crown lands anticipated other than those that are to be regulated by the leases of cottage property sites? Are there other sales for other purposes?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The study by the department was on the disposal of summer cottage lots.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The leasing features which will be announced in the near future will deal with summer cottage lots.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is there any change in the policy with regards to the sale of other Crown lands? Larger tracts of land? Like three or four acres? Ten acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Maybe this does not answer the member's question, but first I would like to say to the hon. member that no more than one per cent of Crown land is sold in Ontario to Americans, and that one per cent is mainly cottage lots, which average about 150 lots a year.

We also have an interdepartmental study looking into other aspects of disposal of Crown land for non-recreational purposes. Now the hon. member lives in the city of North Bay, which is a very large area. I do not believe it would be advisable that those people who live within the city limits of North Bay and who want to build a $10,000, $15,000 or $25,000 home should not be able to buy their lot—that they could only lease it.

This is one of the things that this committee is looking into; non-recreational land for residential industrial and commercial purposes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is really no change in the previous policy in regards to those lands other than the cottage lot sites?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our study again, Mr. Chairman, was the disposal of summer cottage lots—that is, lots for recreational purposes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Fine. In the development of the cottage lot sites, are decisions being made to change the method of subdivision? I should think that most of the subdivisions that have been developed by the department, in my area at least, have been lots along the shore of the lake. Is there any thought being given to producing subdivisions for the lots not parallel with, but perpendicular to the lake, with the subdivision running away from the lake to protect the shores of the different water systems?

Secondly, is any thought being given to the development of condominium-type summer cottage housing on the shores of the lake, there again utilizing a small percentage of the shoreline?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Chairman, is yes; we are looking into other types of subdivisions. The normal pattern has been sort of along the shoreline. We just do not have enough lakes to continue this. There are other reasons, such as the sanitation problem, as well as better land use, so we are looking into other types of development.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not understand the second part of the question.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Apparently in some areas they are looking at the development of condominium apartment sites on the shores of lakes because of the ease of service to these areas and to cut the costs. They are then providing a very clear shoreline along the rest of the lake. You can get the same number of people at the lake, without actually utilizing all the shoreline properties for building purposes.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be any further discussion on item 5? There will be?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, it being 5 o'clock, could I ask that the committee rise and report?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call item 10 standing in the name of Mr. Carruthers.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 10, by Mr. Carruthers.

RESOLUTION: That in the opinion of this House The Teachers' Superannuation Act should be amended so that the required teaching period for class A pension, regardless of age, be reduced from 40 years to 35 years.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), resolution No. 10 standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Durham moves resolution No. 10.

Mr. Carruthers: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the House that this resolution does not in any way change the basic structure of The Teachers' Superannuation Act, nor is it an attempt to obtain larger pensions across the board for teachers. As a retired school principal, I feel the resolution has no personal implications, but I believe if approved by this Legislature it would be beneficial not only to the educational system as a whole, but to the members of the teaching profession who play such an important role in the shaping of tomorrow's society.

The sole purpose of the resolution is to debate the need and the advantages of bringing into line the special pension classification of The Teachers' Superannuation Act, the class A type pension, which has been available to all teachers for several years, but which requires, in my opinion, some adjustments to meet the challenge and the changing conditions of present-day society.

The existing class A pension, Mr. Speaker, may be obtained in two different ways: first, after 40 years of continuous service; or secondly after 35 years of service, if this period of service is reached by age 62.

Those teachers who complete either of these requirements are entitled to what is termed a class A pension, which is computed at 70 per cent of the best salary received over a period of seven years. Under normal conditions, this would be the last seven years of a teacher's teaching career.

This fact is of prime importance in consideration of any cost or saving to the taxpayer. At the present time the teacher contributes six per cent of his or her salary to the fund with the government contributing an annual amount. In addition, the Ontario government since 1952 has made a special grant to the fund of $1 million each year for actuarial purposes.

It should be noted also that at the end of each year the funds not used to pay current benefits are invested in debentures or stock of the Ontario government. At the end of a 10-year period the total debentures or stock issued during the period are consolidated into one debenture or stock. This debenture becomes due and payable at the end of a period of 40 years from the date of issue. The proposal could, Mr. Speaker, result in an increased contribution on the part of the teaching profession, but the benefits would more than balance this added financial investment.

In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of many others who have studied this matter for some time, the existing system of establishing a class A pension is outdated. There are a number of reasons for this consensus in support of the proposal that the requirements for a class A pension should be reduced to 35 years of service regardless of the age of the person. In other words, Mr. Speaker, teachers should be able to retire with a maximum pension at any time after serving 35 years in the profession.

I am personally convinced that such a modification of the present regulations governing this type of pension should be undertaken, and I support my contention with the following facts:

First and foremost is the fact that the requirements for obtaining a teaching certificate have increased tremendously over the past few years and indications are—and it is our reality—that this policy will continue until only university graduates will be accepted.

It was not so many years ago that a person desiring to teach would go to teachers' college and, after one or two years' training, become a teacher in the elementary field. In the northern part of the province the requirements were even less strict, because it was more difficult to obtain qualified teachers. It is only reasonable to conclude that the extended years of training should be balanced by an earlier retirement in the interests of the profession and the health and well-being of the individual teacher.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, it that it is rapidly becoming an accepted fact, even by the Ontario Teachers Federation, that after 35 years of service a teacher has, and I quote, "fulfilled a sufficient service period."

It is particularly significant to note that approximately 50 per cent of teachers do not become eligible for a class A pension. This is due to a variety of reasons, but I am of the opinion—and this is borne out by discussions with members of the profession and supported to a major degree by my own personal observations as a school principal—that a large proportion of the teachers, particularly because of the physical and mental demands made upon them daily, are unable to withstand the tensions and are forced to retire. In doing so they sacrifice the full benefits of a class A pension in order to preserve their health.

Society today is subject to constant and rapid change, and nowhere is this more evident than in the classroom. The methods of teaching, the disciplines and the educational needs of our young people are continually subject to radical change. Perhaps no other profession demands the adjustments necessary to meet the changing times, and in order to ensure efficiency and the maintenance of modern educational concepts as well as the development of new and fresh approaches to meet the challenge of alert, young minds, a shorter period of service would be a benefit to the whole system of education.

Certainly the accelerated change in the supervisory field through more rapid advancement to offices of principalship and supervision would tend to reduce the resistance to change and ensure the continuation of the school as a vibrant and influential part in the life of the community.

There are those who argue that a teacher's hours of work are from 9 to 4 and, in addition, they have a longer vacation period than many other groups in our society. May I assure you, Mr. Speaker, from personal experience and a knowledge of the profession, that although there may be abuse, the successful teacher's working day, like that of the members of this Legislature, extends far beyond the eight-hour period. The so-called longer vacation period is to a great extent used to improve teaching skills or the broadening of knowledge and outlook. These important factors should be kept in mind when considering a reduction in the teacher's period of service.

Retirement after 35 years of service, in addition to the benefits I have stated, would alleviate unemployment to a degree, although we trust the present situation is temporary in nature.

The levelling-off of the school population, the impact of automation and the effect of other factors will result in earlier retirement and shorter working hours for all our people.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, would result in a retiring age of 55 to 56 and, from an economic point of view, reduce the number of teachers in the higher salary brackets. This could be reflected to the benefit of the taxpayer in the budgets of local school boards. The increased qualifications being required of teachers, however, no doubt will result in increased salaries at all levels of experience; adoption of this resolution would offset these increases, and contributions to the superannuation fund—even under existing percentage rates—quite possibly could be maintained. In my opinion, regardless of the factors involved, the taxpayer would benefit financially, the educational system would benefit in greater efficiency and the profession in an improved outlook and greater security.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are 8,622 teachers between the ages of 55 and 64 actively engaged in the profession in Ontario. Of these, some 1,158 are 55 years of age. I do not have the figures to show how many of this total have 35 years of service. As I stated previously, however, approximately 50 per cent of our teaching population does reach Class "A" pension. Applying this percentage to the figures I have just stated, nearly 600 teachers would be eligible to retire in this classification at this moment at age 55. Using the same yardstick on the total of 8,622, some 4,300 would be eligible to retire regardless of age if this resolution were adopted.

This would mean, Mr. Speaker, that we could conceivably open up approximately 4,300 teaching jobs in Ontario and would make it possible for those teachers who, one might say, have given of their best in dedicated service over a significant period of years the opportunity to retire. This is not to say that many would wish to and could continue to teach if they so desired.

With the exception of the home, no group in our society has greater influence in moulding and directing the lives of individuals than the profession of which I am proud to have been an active member. A teacher can be the inspiration that can guide young people and put them on the road to success. The opposite can also be true, and Mr. Speaker, I realize the adoption of this

resolution can make the profession more attractive. More consideration must, therefore, in the future be given to attitudes, personalities, and initiative in the choosing of teachers. A piece of paper may qualify one academically, but the factors I have mentioned, in my opinion, are equally important.

On the other hand, adoption of this resolution will attract more young people to the profession and will provide for school boards a greater choice of personnel, resulting in a wider range of creative and intellectual skills.

Practising within the framework and under the conditions now acceptable in a so-called permissive society, the teacher is subject to tensions and frustrations not experienced in the more disciplined pragmatic educational environment of the past. Although perhaps offering a wider field of opportunities to the student, the present system does place a heavier physical and mental burden on the teacher, and particularly on those nearing retirement age.

It is my hope that the department and the teachers' federation will support the principle of this resolution and give the proposal first priority in any proposed amendments to The Teachers' Superannuation Act and its regulations.

May I suggest to the members of this House that in supporting the resolution, as I know they will, they are benefiting, not only the teaching profession, but the students and the citizens of this great province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support to the resolution in the name of the member for Durham. I do so knowing that I probably have a conflict of interest in this regard, being still considered by some as on the staff of one of the schools back in the city of Windsor.

However, it is not for that reason that I support the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I support it because, having been in the profession, I know the trials and tribulations that a teacher must go through—the frustrations, the difficulties encountered in his profession. I know, likewise, that after 35 years of dealing with our younger set, and especially with today's jet set, one is really ready for retirement.

I am more than pleased to see that the resolution was introduced by a member from the government side, because I hope he has a pipeline into the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) and as a result that this will eventually—I should not say "eventually"—I hope that this would become policy on the part of the government. Back in the winter of 1971 there was a series of seven recommendations made in the OTF Reporter concerning superannuation and the resolution we are debating, or should I say discussing, today was encompassed in their series of seven recommendations; that the number of years of teaching required would be reduced from 40 to 35.

Mr. Speaker, teaching today is by far more difficult than it was as few as 10 years ago and it will be by far more complicated and difficult in the future. We expect self-discipline from students today and as a result the teacher does not have the stern, dictatorial approach to teaching that he did in the years gone by. He is obligated today to prepare himself far better because he has to appeal to the students. He has to make the teaching experience a pleasurable one in addition to an extremely informative one, and that encompasses a tremendous amount of research and work on his part.

So when we look upon a teacher as working from 9 to 3 or 4, that is only part of his working day because there is a tremendous amount of work entailed in preparation that would take place in the after-hours of the educational day. Today, with the team teaching, we find it is far more demanding on the teacher. The preparation cannot be compared to the preparation required of a teacher only five or six years ago.

There are new approaches always being used, Mr. Speaker. There is the open concept type of school, which likewise is a new challenge and it makes it that much more difficult for the teachers. There are the rapid advances in methods and technology—new teaching aids, new concepts, electronic hardware—that the teacher must now familiarize himself with, know its operations, know how to use it to the greatest advantage to impart the maximum amount of knowledge to the youngster who, we hope, sits back there eagerly anticipating all of this flood of knowledge that he is going to attempt to absorb after some fashion and to the limit of his abilities. So now, Mr. Speaker, the teachers in the educational system do not have the same type of outlook toward teaching, or generally they do not have.

In addition, they do not have the breaks that teachers had in years gone by. In years gone by an individual with a grade 12 education could get into elementary school teaching and never have to develop. He never had to take extra courses during the summer holidays to upgrade himself.

Today, there is the requirement of a degree before one can teach in an elementary school. There is a tremendous amount of pressure on the teacher, in addition to his regular working day and preparation, for him to attend courses at a university if one is available to upgrade himself so that within a short period of time he has at least his bachelor degree.

In addition to trying to further his qualifications by night attendance at courses, the summer holidays, especially for the younger teacher, are now taken up in attending summer school and upgrading his qualifications to enable him to be that much better a pedagogue. So there is a physical as well as mental strain on the teacher today that was not quite as prevalent in years gone by.

Strictly on the idea of cutting the teaching period from 40 years to 35, Mr. Speaker, even 35 years of dealing with young students, or even the teenage student if one is working in a secondary school, or the post-teenager in a university, is an extremely trying experience. It is extremely difficult, not only physically but also mentally, for the teacher. When we look into other professions we find that one does not necessarily have to teach that length of time.

For example, in many of the police departments and fire departments in the United States they are of a pensionable age after 25 years of working on the job. So here we have cases of 25 and 30 years' on-the-job experience entitling an individual to a full pension. The armed services in Canada do not use a 35-year qualification. An individual, I understand, after 25 years of service in the armed services is entitled to obtain a full pension.

Most countries behind the Iron Curtain provide pensions to all individuals at a substantially reduced amount of service in a profession or even in any type of skill. In some of the countries, at the age of 55 members of the gentler sex are receiving the same type of pensions or being pensioned off just as we in Canada pension them off at 65.

If we want to go to the other end of the ladder, we can simply look to our federal colleagues and see that after two elections—which could be a very short period of time—the federal members of Parliament can receive substantial pensions. So surely those in the teaching profession—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not any more. It is a good thing.

Mr. B. Newman: So those in the teaching profession should be given that added consideration. Even we on the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, after five years of service, are entitled to some type of pension benefits. They may be small in comparison to the federal pensions, but still they are pensions which can be built up with the number of years of service. So I think that consideration certainly should be given to teachers if we are going to make pensions so easily available to members of both Legislature and Parliament.

The labour unions in their recent negotiations asked for "30 and out." The auto workers' unions—and I can recall the Chrysler union back in my own community; this happened to be one of the slogans when they were negotiating with the company, both on the Canadian side and on the American side. They did not win the "30 and out," but they got substantial other improvements. As a result, I can foresee the day when even the auto workers, after 30 years of service to an auto manufacturer, will be entitled to and receiving pensions from the manufacturers. I think theirs was "30 and out" with $500 a month, which was a pension in my estimation they were certainly entitled to—they certainly worked for it.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the comments I have made, there are other things that we should consider in The Teachers' Superannuation Act. There are certain inequities in there, a certain amount of discrimination, where both members of the family, husband and wife, are both teachers and if one passes away, then the survivor is not entitled to survivor benefits. Yet if one were a teacher and the other worked for some other branch of the civil service, worked for that same government, there would be the survivor benefits. So there does exist an inequality that has to be considered when we look into the superannuation picture.

There is one other thing that I would like to mention. Personally, I think the method of calculating teachers' pensions should be reexamined completely rather than having it based on 40 years of service and the best seven years in service. We should eliminate the 40 years, go into the 35 years as the

resolution recommends, and then likewise the pension benefits should always be based on current salaries regardless of when the teacher retires from the profession. By using a current salary basis, there would never be the need for any kind of indexing for a cost-of-living addition to a teacher's pension.

Not too long ago the government, in its wisdom, increased the pensions to teachers by two per cent, extending back for a substantial number of years, so that some actually received I think it was approximately a 30 per cent increase in their pension. Now quite often it is said, how are you going to finance all of this?

My suggestion for the financing is that were the government to have taken the contributions of the teachers and rather than invest it only in its own securities been a little more liberal in its investment and gone into the open market, it could have received for the teachers' fund instead of only 5¼ per cent, probably 8¼, maybe even nine per cent, on the investment. This would have provided sufficient funds not only to lower the number of years of service before a teacher could be pensioned off but also would provide for a greater pension.

Another method could be: the contribution today by a teacher is six per cent of their salary. Were that contribution increased to 6¼ or 6½ per cent it likewise could provide sufficient funds, so that the reduction in the number of years of service would not have had too substantial a drain or would have had no drain at all on the teachers' fund.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has now exceeded his allotted time.

Mr. B. Newman: I only have one sentence, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by hoping that the member for Durham when he introduced this resolution knew that this type of legislation was in the offing and that the government had full intention of implementing it so that those teachers who will be retiring in the future can retire after 35 years of service at any age rather than 40 years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we are all going to be in favour of the resolution. It is impossible not to be in favour. However I would like to examine some of the arguments that were used in support of this resolution and examine them with some degree of concern.

As I listened to the members for Durham and for Windsor-Walkerville I must say I wondered about anyone reading Hansard and wanting to go into the teaching profession. I really do not think that teaching is really quite the hell, the purgatory, which I think has been pictured here this afternoon, or that it needs to be. That is the point.

Sure, we all are prepared to vote for this resolution? If the government right at this moment indicated it wanted such legislation to come to a vote, I would sit down and save my remarks for some other occasion. But the point is surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are so sure that teachers are tired, tense, dragged out, hung up and generally in a state of personal mental disarray by the time they reach the age of 62, I think we should start looking at the job as well as looking at the superannuation policy.

I would say to the member for Durham—and I am sure he would agree with at least some of the things that I have to say—that the pressures we have put on the educational system have been of our making. We have tried to make the educational system some kind of a weird extension of the unemployment insurance office and we have an enforced system of training. We have tried to keep kids "on ice." Many of them could well be out doing very useful things in the community. They could be helping to look after emotionally disturbed children—we have a million of them in Canada—or looking after retarded children. They could be serving older people who are also on pension. There are a great many similar things that young people could be doing, but we insist upon putting them into classrooms and keeping them there and keeping this custodial system operating. We are so hung up, you might say, on this function that we create this kind of a hot-house pressure which is creating so many troubles with our teachers.

One might very well ask the member for Durham why he does not do just one thing: encourage the government to lower the teacher-pupil ratio. That will stop teachers from becoming so overpressured, so overwhelmed by their job. That is what we need to do. I have a certain amount of concern for the whole argument that what we should be doing in today's society is trying to get people out. It is very much like my colleague, the member for Oshawa's (Mr. Pilkey) friends in the auto industry who talk about "30 and out." Well, this is really a piece of legislation to give "35 and out."

I wonder if that is the concept of human development that we should be encouraging in our society, the idea that we should allow people to be pressured and pushed and shoved and put upon for 30 or 35 years and eject them into the society as a kind of flotsam and jetsam that we can try to provide some kind of support to afterward. That is not my idea of the way we should encourage human development in our society and, as I say, I will vote for this piece of legislation because obviously this is the only kind of step that this government is prepared to take.

Why not talk about providing teachers with automatic sabbaticals for six months every three or four years, providing various ways by which people can spend their time in the teaching profession, relieving the tremendous pressure of day after day before dozens and dozens and hundreds of kids.

We could talk about changing the educational system and allowing more people the opportunity to involve themselves in it, instead of putting so much pressure on teachers and principals to make all the decisions, to have all the responsibility. Make it a community school. Give teachers some part in decision sharing. Take some of that pressure away from them.

One could very well see teachers making use of technology in a much more effective way. We talk about educational television, we talk about all the things that come to help the teacher, but it seems to me that most of these things are used to hinder the teacher, to create more pressure for the teacher. It just seems to me that this is the focus which we should be putting upon this particular debate. I want the schools to be "vibrant" and "influential," as the member for Durham referred to them, but I am convinced that we will not make them "vibrant" and "influential" until we change the schools. Stop giving teachers so many roles to play and forcing them to do everything from stopping traffic accidents, stamping out venereal disease and unwanted pregnancies and looking after the family life of the entire community. Give them some kind of a role that makes sense and then you will not have teachers who are virtually, as the member for Durham refers to them, mentally ill by the time they finally stagger to the age of 55.

I just say to the member as well that I am not at all sure it is going to be less costly to the taxpayer, just by retiring teachers before they reach the maximum or as soon as they get to the maximum. By taking, you might say, the high-paid teachers off the rolls is not going to solve the problem of supporting the actuarial needs up to a sufficient level by government contribution. The government is going to have to pay into that area.

There is a method of increasing employment of teachers. We can increase employment of teachers. We know where we need to put teachers if we really want to do something. We know the only places we can really provide rehabilitative opportunities for young people is in elementary school or preschool programmes. We could set up nursery schools across this province tomorrow and hire every teacher who is in the teachers' colleges and in Althouse College and MacArthur College and the Ontario College of Education. We could do it tomorrow, if we really thought that education was important for certain groups of people—and I do not mean keeping everybody in school to the age of 22—what would seem to be our obsession at the present time.

If we want to put up special classes for people in the university, if we want to put up a special class for retarded children—and by special classes I mean classes where you have got three or four children to a teacher—or if you want to put up special classes for emotionally disturbed children and provide the kind of human material which is necessary in that situation, we can solve the unemployment problem. You do not have to try to use the superannuation fund as a means of solving the unemployment problem.

I simply say that as a matter of fact I support the resolution. I question very seriously that we have to get at the solutions by these means the hon. member for Durham has put forward. We can do it; we can do it very easily.

I would like to put one or two points forward in terms of the implications of that particular resolution. There was a California study done just some years ago—I guess two or three years ago—and in that study the decision was really made that there are only four alternatives in the kind of technological society we are moving into, which has already been mentioned: You shorten the work week for everybody and distribute work in a sane, humane, civilized rational fashion; we can create what I call a work-welfare society—this is where half the people work and half are on welfare; a third way we can do it, of course, is we can keep everybody in school to the age of 38; or we can retire everybody at

the age of 45. Now those are four alternatives. Choose the one you want.

I suggest the first one is best and the only kind of society I want to live in, where you do distribute opportunities for work—and we define work in many different ways than we do now. We try to create the kind of society in which you have opportunities for people to live, to have leisure, to work, to learn, and distribute those opportunities in a just and effective way.

The other option is, I suppose, some guaranteed kind of annual income. We do not have any choice in this matter, you know. It is not a matter of whether we will have a guaranteed annual income or not, we have one now, only we call it welfare, and social and family service benefits, and pensions, and so on and so forth. It is all a part of the system. The point is are we going to create some kind of guaranteed annual income system which will allow us to create a society which has as its main interest human development?

The whole production—the growth, production, waste, pollution—syndrome is all over. That and the work ethic are now going. We can no longer hold on to that. Now we have to turn to some form of a system which allows us to distribute opportunities for work and leisure and education. We have to think of human development as the main emphasis of our society.

That is really what this resolution is all about. What you are trying to do—what you are really saying in this resolution is we must allow people to be able to have a guaranteed annual income earlier in life because it would be better for the educational system, which also I am not sure of.

I am not sure I would not prefer the teacher to have a guaranteed annual income perhaps from 35 to 45, and go back and work from 45 to 55.

He might be much wiser, he might know a lot more about the world, and he may very well have a greater rapport with kids, because in many cases it is the older teachers who have a great deal of rapport with the hippy, rather than the teacher who is in his 30s. So I suggest to you that this is what really we should be looking at.

If we are going to take a look at one area of pension which the government does have some control over, what we should be doing is trying to stretch ourselves to take that extra leap, so we could give some kind of indication as to how the private sector should be looking at its employees. What we want the private sector to do is the same thing, surely: to find ways by which they can support their employees over an extended period and distribute work to a larger number of people.

As I say, as long as you make that simple decision, that you are not going to have people starving, that you are not going to let them die, then you have to provide some means to allow them to survive. They can survive as welfare recipients, or they can survive as effective, contributing individuals in a decent, humane society. That is really the alternative that we have here.

Obviously, what the hon. member for Durham is moving toward, one would hope, is a basic guaranteed annual income. And, of course, that term is used in many, many different ways. The former Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) is not here this afternoon—we had a great deal of discussion, as to what that really means, and it is time that we began to sort out exactly what we do mean by that term.

It is time, as well, that we sorted out how we can move toward that kind of a solution. You know the opportunities for doing so are becoming imminent. We have really no other choice.

A few weeks ago I had an opportunity to speak—

Mr. Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I shall provide that little story some other time. I simply state in closing we support the measure. We wish it went further.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have been reviewing the debate on this issue in this place and in the standing committee on estimates of two years ago over the last hour or so and I would like to make a number of points fairly briefly.

The first is that the change in The Teachers' Superannuation Act made recently by the government was an important step in the right direction. That change increased the pensions of the older teachers on a formula based on two per cent per year in retirement. I find that to be a good step.

The step proposed today in this private member's motion, which may be a forecast of a government motion, is also again a step in the right direction and it is very difficult to be against it. But given those two changes, the one that has taken place and the one that hopefully will take place, I still find that the arguments which I have been making concerning the plight of the retired teachers in this province still stand.

It is still true, for example, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at the average age of retired teachers with pensions of $1,800 a year or less, we find that the average age is 73.5 years. This compares with an average age of 67.7 years for those retired teachers receiving $3,000 a year or more.

Even with the changes, and even with a change such as the one recommended today by the hon. member, that basic fact is not changed. What it means is simply this: the older you are, if you are a retired teacher in this province, the less you get. The greater your medical needs, the greater your health care needs, the less money you have, because those needs increase with age. So I fail to see in what this government has done or even in this resolution, sir, which does not have a retroactivity clause included in it, that this government has met head-on that basic dilemma in the way in which retired teachers of this province are treated. There is no escalation clause, sir. There is no retroactive clause, based on that January, 1966, cutoff point.

Basically, it is still true to say that the older retired teachers in this province have less money than teachers who have just retired or who are about to retire. This is unfair. It is inequitable. It is upside down. I say to the hon. member, who is a member of the government caucus, he has got to fight the right battles. He must not fight what amount to paper-tiger battles, even though they are minor changes and even though they are changes in the right direction.

This member, sir, should be raising his voice in caucus and saying to his friends in that Conservative Party and to his friends in the cabinet: "Look, the basic dilemma we, the government party, face with regard to the retired teachers in this province is a very simple and unfortunate dilemma. The older they get, the less they have, the more they need."

Until this government, sir, reverses its priorities to look after the older teachers on a preferential basis compared to teachers who are still earning a living and who may be about to retire, I cannot take this resolution seriously.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution, though, frankly, I do not think it goes far enough.

I say that because I really do believe that if a person is going to retire, then obviously, regardless of how many years of service he has, we have to provide a decent pension that relates to a decent standard of living. You could reduce a pension to 25 years and out, or 30 years and out, or whatever you want to, and say that they can retire. But if the government has not provided the basis for them to maintain a decent standard of living, then the number of years that they can retire with, in my view, becomes irrelevant.

It appears to me that if we are going to provide pensions to teachers who obviously need them, we ought to provide a decent pension. I agree in many respects with the sentiments that were alluded to by the member for Durham. The kind of a job that teaching is is a very wonderful profession, in my view, and a very responsible one.

In the elementary school level, in the very formative years, the teacher has a tremendous responsibility in terms of how that child is going to respond in later years. For those reasons, he ought to be provided, as I said, with a decent pension. It seems to me that he ought to be provided with medical hospital benefits. Even though the pension provides a decent standard of living, we are not providing or would not be providing enough to pay for the additional benefits that are necessary. Particularly as people grow older, they become even more necessary.

I know that this government has said many times that it does not want the people in the public sector treated any differently than those in the private sector. Yet we can demonstrate unequivocally that many industrial pensions, as in illustration, are more beneficial to those retired workers than teachers receive when they retire.

As I said, we cannot obviously vote against the resolution, but it appears to me that 30 years and out, was a slogan, as my friend from Windsor pointed out, and I think a good one. When a person has contributed 30 years of his life, whether it be to an industry or a profession, he ought to be able to retire on a full pension. So, even though we support the resolution, I happen to think it could have been reduced to 30 years as well.

I might also say that I agree there should be some formula tied to the pension that relates to cost-of-living increases, as my—

Mr. B. Newman: On-going salaries.

Mr. Pilkey: I beg the members pardon?

Mr. B. Newman: On-going salaries instead. Then you never worry about the cost of living.

Mr. Pilkey: Maybe on-going salaries, but nevertheless as a person goes out on pension, unless the government reviews it periodically, then the purchasing power becomes less and less as we reach into inflationary periods. It seems to me that one of the ways to protect those pensions, so that the purchasing power is maintained, is to tie them to a cost-of-living formula which, every year, or six months, is adjusted for the pensioners. Then I would support that.

I recognize the difficulties that teachers have, because they must adapt to changes in our society. It is an on-going process. There are changes and they must adapt to them but, as the member for Peterborough pointed out, schools today have a number of benchwarmers, if I could use that term. Teachers have to adjust to that, too, and I do not think it is fair. I think there are a number of youths who are in school today, particularly in elementary schools—I am sorry, secondary schools—that are utilizing the institutions with little success today.

I just happen think that in Europe they come at least part way in terms of finding an answer. It seems to me that we have to have more trade schools. I read the document just put out by The Department of Labour and it seems to me what they are really saying is that there is a shortage of skilled trades. If there is, why cannot some of these people be put in that kind of an educational environment, so we can teach them a trade instead of having them sit there in their seat for two or three years and then push them out into society. They do not fit in and we have problems with these young people.

I think there should be a concerted effort there. In essence, it would relieve the teachers as well of a great deal of responsibility. What is happening is that we do not have enough of this going on in terms of practical work for students. By teaching practice as well as theory, I think that they will become better fitted to the society, in addition it would be much easier on teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that if we do provide earlier retirement for people, then government must find ways of having people adjust to this earlier retirement. We must provide facilities for leisure time. One just cannot say to a teacher, "Okay, you are 55 years of age, and now we will put you out to pasture some place." Then they have nothing to do. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have to provide facilities for more leisure time for people, and I think the government have to come to grips with that now. It cannot just implement or lower the age for retirement without providing something for these people to do in their leisure time. I want to suggest to the member for Durham, the author of this resolution, that there are many of these things that have to be tied in to early retirement. You just cannot say that people should retire at age 55 and that is it. They may have nothing else to do.

It seems to me, in addition to early retirement, we have to provide these other things as well.

Mr. Speaker: In the absence of any other participants, this concludes the debate on the resolution.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: I might say a motion to conclude the debate is not necessary. It is already concluded.

Mr. B. Newman: I would like to ask the House leader the order of business for tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would be very glad to recite that.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The minister is getting up in the world. He is House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, it takes time.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the first item of business will be second readings of items 11 and 12, Bills 36 and 37, standing in the name of the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). Then we will have item 3, and we will consider Bills 2, 5 and 7, also in the name of the Attorney General.

If we are fortunate enough to conclude, we will move back to item 15 in committee

of supply, and the balance of the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

I would also suggest a motion, Mr. Speaker, that the House do not sit this evening. I believe that is by agreement. Then I would move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I would think when there is a motion to adjourn the House in the case of the day's business having been completed, no further motion is necessary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 10, 1971

Recommendations to Ottawa re control of telecommunications industry, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer 1373

Province questioning authority of CBC under federal government, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ben 1374

Five per cent ceiling on civil service salary increase, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pilkey 1375

Public information re charging practices of medical profession re OHSIP, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Ben, Mr. Singer 1376

Layoff of manpower retraining teachers in community colleges, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1378

Meeting with representatives re dispute between dentists and denturists' society, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Singer 1378

Additional $1 million to service debt on German loan, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon 1380

Amendment to Employment Standards Act to cover conditions and benefits to taxi drivers, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis 1380

Requiring universities to disclose detailed accounts of expenditures to Legislature, questions to Mr. White, Mr. T. Reid 1381

Request to Hospital Association not to run article re care of mentally retarded in Ontario, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman 1381

Night policeman not to perform duties unless accompanied by another officer, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Haggerty 1382

Ontario Government Travel Information Centre at Cornwall, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. MacDonald 1382

Protecting Ontarians against uninsured drivers, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Deacon 1382

Definition of dental technician and denturist, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. MacDonald 1383

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1384

On Notice of Motion No. 10, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pilkey 1409

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1418



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 34

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from the Northern Collegiate Institute and Vocational School of Sarnia, and in the west gallery from the Main Street School of Toronto and the Glendale School of Simcoe. In both galleries, we have visitors from the Associated Hebrew Schools of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Please, sir, before the oral questions if I may, a question of privilege?

Sir, the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital is having, on May 21, graduation of the nursing assistants' course. At this occasion the class of students has decided to request that I speak. Unfortunately, following their decision, the staff of The Department of Health vetoed the decision on the grounds that the government had spent a great deal of money in developing this programme and it would be quite inappropriate to have a member of the opposition to give the talk.

Last Friday, I phoned Mr. Temple, who is the director of the Whitby hospital, and he told me that there had been a misunderstanding and this was not the situation whatsoever, I accepted his word, sir, at that time, and was prepared to close the matter.

Unfortunately, yesterday afternoon, after one of the classes, Miss Jan McEachern, who is on the staff at the hospital, called the students together and informed them that a list of six students had been prepared who might have brought the information to me that I had been vetoed as a speaker and that they would be "dealt with" after graduation on May 21.

I submit to you, sir, this is a breach of privilege of members of the House and I request your investigation.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: It would seem to me, based upon the information submitted to the House by the hon. member for High Park, that the privilege he believes to have been breached is that of his right as a member to speak to members of the public, a graduating class. Is this correct?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there are circumstances in connection with the total incident as suggested by the hon. member that perhaps require some investigation. I will undertake to do exactly that and try to arrive at all of the facts on the matter as suggested by the hon. member. I will make a ruling on the matter as to whether or not it is a breach of privilege, if this acceptable to the hon. member.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can speak to this point? Do I have your permission to?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I believe that the hon. minister may, at this point. It might be useful to us.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have undertaken with the hon. member to investigate, as you suggested, Mr. Speaker, the allegations contained in his statement. If it is true, apart from the question of privilege, I would like to assure the hon. member for High Park and all hon. members of the House that insofar as I am concerned there will be a memorandum go out to the whole department and all its emanations underlining the fact that any member of this House, of whatever political party, has, as far as The Department of Health is concerned and as far as I am concerned, the same rights and privileges to accept invitations as any other person, and, as a matter of fact, to preach to some of these people if they have acted in this way, a certain sermon relating to the democratic system under which we operate and equal rights in this respect, which we all have.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That is a change—very refreshing.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FIVE PER CENT CIVIL SERVICE SALARY INCREASE GUIDELINE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: What action does the Premier intend to take to head off the actions by the civil service organization which are predicted to occur this coming Monday, if agreement has not been reached on the five per cent ceiling pronouncement made by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his budget two weeks ago?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is quite hypothetical at this moment. As I said yesterday, the Treasurer will be meeting with the Civil Service Association, so to deal with that kind of question at the moment is really very hypothetical.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier indicate that this meeting will take place before the deadline set by the civil service?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will.

LAYOFF OF TEACHERS

Mr. Nixon: Another question of the Premier: He indicated yesterday that a statement of government policy would be available today on the layoffs of teachers in the community colleges. Such a statement was not forthcoming. Can he now tell us to what extent his investigations indicate that the classes at community colleges have become unreasonably large, and that morale, particularly in the employment retraining classes, is at a low ebb?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I used the wrong phraseology yesterday; it was in the form of a question to me and to the Minister of Education, and I believe the Minister of Education has an answer to the question.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Did Trudeau write it for you?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly lengthy answer, and perhaps in fairness to the House we should revert to statements at this time. Do I have the permission of the House to revert to statements?

Mr. Speaker: I think the normal procedure is that if it is a question that requires a long prepared answer, it should probably be placed on the notice paper. However, since the question was accepted, I think that since there is a lengthy statement at this time, with the concurrence of the House, we will suspend the oral question period and revert to statements by the ministry. And we will extend the time. Is this agreeable?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the majority of the adult retraining students in colleges of applied arts and technology are sent there by Canada Manpower Centres through an agreement between the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada under The Adult Occupational Training Act. The colleges are therefore entirely dependent on close co-operation with federal agencies for an efficient flow of students through these retraining programmes. During 1970-1971 Ontario's colleges of applied arts and technology arranged for some 4.8 million man-days of adult retraining for the federal government, and in fact this is a very sizable portion of the total college operation.

Unlike the customary secondary school graduates who commence classes in September and complete their programmes in May or June, unemployed adults should be able to start retraining with a minimum of delay. Consequently, the adult retraining programme is sufficiently flexible to receive intakes at monthly intervals and often more frequently.

Enrolment in adult retraining programmes exhibits seasonal variations. For instance, during 1970-1971 on any one particular day, enrolment ranged, I am told, from a minimum of 14,500 in August to a maximum of 18,300 in January. Consequently, in the interests of maximum service to unemployed adults a considerable portion of the teaching staff in the adult retraining programme has always been engaged on a casual basis to teach a specific programme with the understanding that the course may not in fact be repeated.

By the very nature of the programme the mix of courses offered must change very rapidly as well in response to available employment opportunities. As a result, it is not unusual to find staff for a discontinued programme being laid off at the same time that staff are being engaged to teach new skills. Again, the nature of the adult retraining programme is such that federal officials have not in the past been able to tell us prior to the commencement of a fiscal year just what mix of courses will be required. This obviously makes staff planning very difficult.

Ontario is proud of the fact that our post-secondary educational system has always been able to respond to the needs of the adult unemployed in spite of the lack of planning data. To accomplish this it has been necessary to lean toward some overstaffing. So for the past five or six years, there has been a steady increase in total volume of adult retraining which tends to offset the inefficiency which would otherwise result from too many teachers.

For the fiscal year 1971-1972, for the first time, we have been able to reach agreement with federal officials on some relatively firm figures at the beginning of the fiscal year. So, for the first time, the colleges can plan staff requirements ahead of time for efficient utilization of their time and their talents. Even though most of the cost of the adult retraining programme is borne by the federal government, I can assure the members that The Department of Education is interested in keeping unit costs within reasonable limits. The ability to plan in advance is, of course, one factor contributing to staff cutbacks at the present time.

Under the terms of The Adult Occupational Training Act, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is not required to commit itself to more than 90 per cent of the previous year's volume of training purchases, excluding special projects. During 1970-1971 about 10 per cent of this activity was designated as special projects. The net result for the 1971-1972 fiscal year is that the federal government has committed itself to about 85 per cent of the training volume purchased last fiscal year.

Another factor that has to be considered is the changing pattern of employment opportunities. Spreading the committed volume of training according to employment opportunities can also create an overstaffed position in some colleges, and it is no longer prudent to retain staff as training quotas are known this year in advance.

The availability of planning data also allows the colleges to know to some extent ahead of time the change in mix of courses for the coming year. Hence, some instructors being laid off at present will be replaced by others who happen to have different specialties.

The opportunity to plan for efficient use of teaching staff resources on the adult retraining programme, has, therefore, resulted in precipitating, at this particular point in time, layoffs which in former years were spread over a longer period of time. Most of the teachers being laid off at present were fully aware of the seasonal characteristic of the adult retraining programme when they were engaged.

The current layoffs have obviously required some adjustment in timetables for both staff and students. However, I can assure the House that no students have suffered any loss of either quality or quantity of the retraining they are receiving. In fact, the increase—

Mr. Nixon: The minister is ill-advised on that one.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The increase in efficiency now possible should, in the long run, allow more students to benefit from the education dollars.

If, for some unknown reason at this time the volume of training required by the federal government does pick up later in the year, we can only hope that the colleges will be able to respond as rapidly as they have to other post-secondary educational needs of the communities they serve. Some staff members currently being laid off may be recalled if the additional training requirement materializes.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, some comments should be included in connection with the post-secondary school programme itself, because during the first 3½ years of their short existence the post-secondary education of secondary school graduates in the colleges of applied arts and technology was financed by operating grants determined through a budget review process. Once the government's estimates had been presented, the colleges were then advised of their operating grant for the fiscal year. These grants were, of course, based on anticipated enrolment and permitted the colleges to staff accordingly.

There was no mechanism for reducing the grants if enrolment distribution left some classes only partially filled. The colleges had already made commitments for instructors' salaries for these programmes. To tie the budgets of the infant colleges directly to actual enrolment during these first two or three years could have been disastrous in some cases.

I believe that the hon. members are now aware that the colleges of applied arts and technology are being placed on an operating grant formula similar to that used for universities commencing with the 1971-1972 fiscal year. So here, once again, as a consequence the colleges have had to be much more cautious this year in making firm commitments for teaching staff requirements than

they were in previous years. College officials have now been provided with details of the formula factors for the current fiscal year and they will now be in a position to start making their staff requirements known during the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker: There will be eight minutes added to the oral question period.

Oral questions.

LAYOFF OF TEACHERS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement just read to us by the Minister of Education, did he consult specifically with any students who had brought their complaints to his attention through petition, or from any other source?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Is he not aware then, that there are groups of responsible students attending these colleges—I know specifically the case of the Braneida campus of Mohawk College—who would completely refute the statement of the minister that they have suffered no loss in either quality or quantity of the retraining that they are receiving?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to meet with the representative group of those students.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Is the minister aware that the teachers who have been laid off on what he has explained to us was a part-time contract, or a contract with terminal clauses built in, have in fact been employed by the community colleges, at least in certain circumstances of which I personally am familiar, from the inception of the college and that in fact their dismissal—or layoff would be better, perhaps—has left the classes sometimes in excess of 40 students trying to learn bookkeeping, typing, accounting, and in other circumstances, which has certainly decreased the quality of the instruction?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, yes, I understand that some teachers may have been on staff for a period of time. I was not actually familiar with the class sizes and I do not accept as a matter of fact the direct relationship between class size and quality of the programme within those classes.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker: The minister has said that he will meet with the people who are concerned about this. Is it possible that with the expanded budget for community colleges, which the Treasurer put before us just two weeks ago, funds could be found at least to move the quality of education in the retraining courses back close to where it was during the winter months when the unemployment levels were high—and they are continuing high?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I mentioned in the prepared statement; namely, as far as the manpower retraining programme is concerned, we are now in a position to know what the commitments of the government of Canada are in this regard. And, in consultation with Canada Manpower Centres, we will be in a position to know the types of courses that should be offered, so this will obviously reflect itself in the programmes of the community colleges.

Insofar as the programmes for the secondary school graduates are concerned, I have already mentioned that the colleges are now in a position, now that the budget is known to them, to plan their courses and therefore to make their staff needs known.

As far as meetings are concerned, I should mention that I have already met with the representatives of the faculty of Niagara College, who were in to see me on the weekend. I am very happy to have the point of view of other representatives, as the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale was up previously on a supplementary.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question: On the basis of the information from which the statement that the minister just gave to the House was prepared, what is the net reduction, on the latest information available, in the teaching staff of the community colleges over, for example, a comparative period a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not in a position to give actual numbers but I will be glad to get that information for the hon. member. Does he want that information college by college?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, in number.

Hon. Mr. Welch: In the manpower retraining area programme?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary question on the minister's statement: What is the anticipated volume of training increase for the current year, 1971-1972, over the period of the last fiscal year, 1970-1971?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As mentioned in the statement, Mr. Speaker, as far as the manpower retraining programme is concerned, it is only 85 per cent of the former years.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification of the question I put; I understood the 85 per cent figure, at least I thought I did. My question is, what is this government's anticipated increase in the volume of training requirements through the community colleges, having regard to the current rate of unemployment and the likely increase in that rate?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The purchaser of this particular training is the government of Canada under the statute to which I make reference in the statement, Mr. Speaker. I have already mentioned that we already have some indication now for the first time what those requirements will be.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Scarborough East a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have there been greater cutbacks in the area of personnel at the community colleges concerned with the basic upgrading of people to the level of grade 10, relative to the specific training courses which they take after they have reached that basic level of grade 10? I guess I could put that another way.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that many of the people who apply for manpower retraining programmes do not have grade 10 formal education and are therefore ineligible for specific manpower training programmes, could the minister enlighten us on whether the cutback in staff has been in the area of basic education upgrading or whether it has been more in the area of specific courses?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member directs a question to me which really should be directed to the government of Canada. Part of this particular programme—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The minister should know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right. It is obvious that the member for Windsor does not understand the question. Would he like to have the question repeated for him?

Mr. Nixon: The minister does not have an answer for it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The question had to do with what were the conditions of admission to our courses. We sell the course and we provide the space in the community colleges for the course. Part of the Canada Manpower course is, in fact, academic upgrading and they purchase training at the adult centres in order to help people to be upgraded to take advantage of further courses. If there has been any modification with respect to this, this is a question which might well be directed to the Canada Manpower people as to what percentage of the overall programme they will allocate for academic upgrading as compared to specific occupational training.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, further to my question, I have asked the minister a question concerning the people who have been laid off. My question is a very simple one. Have there been more people—or put it this way: Have there been greater cutbacks in the area of basic upgrading, compared to the specific training programmes, after grade 10?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now who does not understand it?

Mr. T. Reid: I would just like to know whether the minister understands his department, sir.

Mr. B. Newman: He does not understand it now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the member for Scarborough East cannot restrain his sarcasm. I cannot answer that particular question. I do not know the relationship between staff layoffs and the types of programmes that are being offered. I understood the question perfectly. What relationship has grade 10 with the staff?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how that programme works. The minister does not know!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister aware of reports emanating from Mohawk College that it is not being fully utilized in regard to space and yet pupils are being told that there is no desk space available? What is intended by that statement?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I cannot address myself to that specific point, but I can remind the hon. member from the statement which was read, that it is not ususual for certain staff teaching certain courses to be laid off while new staff is being brought in to teach new courses which, in fact, reflect changing needs or changing manpower requirements in the specific area where the college may be located.

Mr. Deans: That was not the answer I wanted.

Mr. Speaker: I think there has now been a reasonable number of supplementaries on that particular question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Premier. Can he give the House more information as to his communications with the government of Canada on the preparations for the federal-provincial conference in Victoria? Has he made some suggestions for inclusions on the agenda, such as a discussion on the changes in control of broadcasting and financial matters specifically relating to capital gains taxes? Has he communicated with the government of Canada, by way of his suggestions for inclusions on the agenda?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have communicated with the Prime Minister of Canada in a confidential letter asking him to include another item on the agenda. Without disclosing the contents of the confidential letter, I would say that Ontario is asking that the question of economics and unemployment be added to the agenda for discussion in Victoria in June.

Mr. Nixon: Right. A supplementary: Can the Premier indicate when the agenda might be made known to the House and whether there would be an opportunity to discuss the government stand on the subjects relating to the agenda before the conference is actually convened?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as soon as we have some finalization with respect to the agenda I will be delighted to so inform the members of the House and particularly as it relates to the matter of constitutional reform, which I feel will be the main area of interest or will occupy most of the time spent in Victoria. There will be an opportunity to deal with the proposed discussion of the constitution before a committee that we will appoint here in the House.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: That committee would be specially appointed; it would be a select committee for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, it will be a standing committee of the House and at which time those people who have had some knowledge of this over a period of time would be delighted to discuss it with the members of the committee.

Mr. Nixon: Is the Premier going to make it exclusive?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

CLEANUP OF MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management further to his statement in the committee yesterday or the day before: Is he prepared this summer to undertake some programmes to clean up the mercury pollution in the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River section of the Great Lakes system, or is he going to wait for the outcome of the court case which the government is presently putting forward?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, we have no plans for dredging in the St. Clair area this summer.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister clarify the confusion associated with the number of statements made as to whether or not there is specific technology presently known which would permit the government to proceed with the cleanup of the mercury pollution in that area?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, there have been certain scientific methods that have been recommended for reclamation of the bottom of these rivers that have an accumulation of mercury; these have been backed up with a certain amount of scientific expertise and recommendations have been made to us to carry out some of these reclamation methods.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Why would the minister not then recommend to the government that they proceed with the cleanup without waiting for the court case, which presumably the minister hopes the government would win? Surely it should be paid for with public funds and the reimbursement would come from the results of the case.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, no, I think it would make much more sense to await the outcome of that litigation that is now before the courts because, as the hon. member knows, this is a very costly process and certainly I have not got money in my budget to undertake reclamation methods. But it is quite possible that if we do any dredging for this specific purpose, it would be done in the Clay Lake area of northern Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Is it to be understood then that the minister is speaking government policy when he says that there will be no cleanup in the Great Lakes system unless the court case is won, even though the technology exists for the cleanup?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate government policy to the hon. member. All I will say is that there is certainly no plan at this time for the government to undertake dredging or reclamation methods in the St. Clair area.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know how they do it. Would not the minister agree that in the best interests of the fishing industry and the whole community that has been plagued with this kind of pollution, it is his responsibility to move forward with steps which would clean it up? And, since he assures us that such technology exists, how can he possibly justify this kind of a delay?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, it is a very costly process, and in view of our litigation, of course, in the St. Clair area, it was quite normal and natural and logical that the government would not undertake any reclamation methods in that area this summer. But as I have indicated, it is quite possible that we may undertake some reclamation in the area of Clay Lake this summer.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia was up previously on a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: In view of the unequivocal commitment to this House that the minister has given, that he has technical expertise available to warrant the removal of the mercury from the beds of the river, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Interior of the United States is now undertaking a programme, through private enterprise, to arrive at such a technical availability, would the minister perhaps convey his information to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): They can learn a lot from us.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary—

Mr. Bullbrook: But will the minister convey his information? He knows how to do it. He says he knows how to do it. Will he tell the American authorities, who are presently spending $10 million to investigate how to do it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will check that story that comes out of the United States he will—

Mr. Bullbrook: It is no story, I have the material in my office.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member will see that it indicates there are methods recommended in that information; it is just a matter of getting the equipment on site and proceeding with some form of reclamation undertaking. Only through doing and at the same time experimenting, will they be able to decide whether or not it is absolutely possible to do this.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary: Would the minister not agree that The Department of the Interior of the United States has itself stated unequivocally that there is no ecologically acceptable method of removing the mercury at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If the Department of the Interior said that it lacks certain information.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then why does the minister not give it to them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would be happy to.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary: If the minister is able to tell us that the system is very expensive, could he tell us what system he is referring to and what "very expensive", in fact, means?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All systems are very expensive. They cost around $10 million.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister specifically tell us, if he had unlimited funds to spend, does he know of any way in which mercury pollution could be eliminated from Lake St. Clair?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that is the usual broad statement that we usually get from the hon. member for Downsview. He is saying "any way that mercury pollution can be eliminated from Lake St. Clair—"

Mr. Singer: That is specifically what I asked.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Is the hon. member talking about removing mercury from the bottom muds of that lake or the river? Is he saying that? If we had unlimited funds, certainly we would proceed, we would have proceeded long ago, to remove the mercury mud from the bottom of that river.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary: I asked the minister what method he would use and he has dodged that question for about six weeks. Does he know of a method that could be used?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There are at least three methods that have been recommended by our advisers, by Swedish experts and international experts, and they have recommended from the three that the dredging method is the most effective.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there has been a sufficient number of supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Still apologizing for Dow, eh boys?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The hon. member for Riverdale is the acting leader of the New Democratic Party? If so, does he have a question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

BAIL PROCEDURES

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart), I have just one question for the Minister of Correctional Services. Is he now in a position to advise us specifically of the detailed instructions which are given to the jails in Ontario under his jurisdiction, so that prisoners or persons charged with offences and not released on bail will have clear instructions as to how they may make application for bail and the times within which bail can be granted?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have received from the Attorney General's department the notices they wish to be put in the jails giving just that information.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question: Will the minister of Correctional Services accept the responsibility for instituting a system in the jails which will make certain that no person is held within the jails on charges without having had clear and adequate instructions about the methods of how he can apply for bail; and make certain that the system then works?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the instructions we are going to post in the jails will make it abundantly clear to anyone the procedures they have to use and what is available to them in relation to bail and how to receive it.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question, will the Minister of Correctional Services table in the Legislature, tomorrow or today if possible, the detailed instructions with respect to bail procedures?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I think in co-operation with the Attorney General's department, we will table in the Legislature the instructions we have received from them for posting in the jails.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a final supplementary question: Will the minister table not only the instructions which may be posted to be available to persons in jails under the jurisdiction of that minister; will he also table the instructions which are given to the staffs of the jails to make certain that the system of bail granting is, in fact, carried out expeditiously? Are there such instructions?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, we will table in the Legislature everything that we have done in order to make certain that bail will be made available to those who request it.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of my very final supplementary question—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the difference between final and very final?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And in conclusion—

Mr. J. Renwick: —it will be equally laconic —when will the minister table the documents?

Hon. Mr. Apps: It will be very shortly, within the next day or so.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Riverdale have further questions? I will call the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) next. The Minister of Lands and Forests has a reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) who is not present, but is it agreeable to the New Democratic Party to accept the answer today?

TEACHERS EMPLOYED AS JUNIOR FOREST RANGERS

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I believe it was last Monday the hon. member asked me:

> What is the government policy with respect to high school teachers in Kirkland Lake taking over the jobs as junior forest rangers previously held by people trained in the area, but not already unemployed?

Mr. Speaker, some school teachers are hired as junior ranger foremen because of special demonstrated qualities to deal with a large group of 17-year-old boys. However, school teachers make up a very small percentage of the total number of foremen engaged, and in the case of the Swastika district in which Kirkland Lake is located there are only two teachers who are being employed in this capacity.

Some senior students are hired as foremen, but they must be mature in their thinking and have the ability to control the younger boys. This is particularly important because of the many social problems with which they must deal, such as drugs, liquor, girls, and so forth.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Could the minister tell us how they advertise for these supervisory personnel, and how they arrive at hiring teachers when they do no advertising in the area for qualified personnel?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if we advertised, because there are only a limited number of positions available. I would think that many of the persons —the teachers and others—have written to our department, especially to the local district, and have inquired about those positions. As I mentioned in my remarks, we hired only two teachers, and they are teachers with special qualities for this type of work.

Mr. Jackson: Even though only two teachers have been hired, can the minister assure me that no other qualified persons applied for that job who are at present unemployed?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question, to say whether there are no other qualified persons. I am sure there must be a lot of other qualified persons, but in this particular case these two teachers met all the requirements. They were available; they applied for it; they are knowledgeable; they are competent and, therefore, we decided to hire them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

CONGESTED SUDBURY COURT BUILDING

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Thank you. I have a question of the chief law officer of the Crown. Would the Attorney General consider going to Sudbury this week or next while the high court, the general sessions of the peace, the division court and two magistrates' courts, are all in session, to observe the congestion in that building, and the inadequacy of the premises for the proper administration of justice?

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is using the plane this weekend.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is aware of the problems of congestion in the Sudbury court docket, and we are doing our utmost within the limitations of various financial strictures to relieve that congestion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

LOWERING VOTING AGE IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. May I ask the Premier whether he has received a resolution sponsored by the city council of Oshawa, and now supported by the city council of Thunder Bay, requesting that the voting age in municipal elections be lowered to 18; whether he is finding similar support from other municipal authorities across the province, and what he plans to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recall, I believe, the one from Oshawa. I am not sure that I have seen the one in support of this from Thunder Bay yet, nor can I indicate to the hon. member how many municipalities, if any others, have endorsed this resolution. I shall find out this information for the hon. member and advise him.

Mr. Knight: By way of supplementary, is the Premier yet ready to tell us whether his government plans to lower the voting age in this province for voting at any level?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, he is not.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Not ready, or not going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not ready.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

DANGEROUS TYPES OF FIREWORKS

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in view of the continued absence of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister a question in relation to the danger of certain types of firecrackers which are being now bought by children in Metropolitan Toronto? Is he aware that children are now buying Champagne Party Poppers in corner stores in Toronto and that they are of a kind which are dangerous to the children concerned? They cannot light them. They must be exploded by the pulling of a string—in this way. I will demonstrate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not aware of children buying these, in that my own children have not purchased any. I guess they have not reached Brampton yet. I will certainly take it up with the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and I shall suggest to him the hon. member for Yorkview wishes to create another demonstration within his office.

Perhaps the member will avail himself of the opportunity to explode one of those firecrackers when the minister is available. I would hope that they would all work.

Mr. Young: In view of the forthcoming firecracker day I think this is important because parents are now becoming very concerned about this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

OFF-TRACK BETTING

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question of the Attorney General. Could he bring the House up to date in connection with his liaison with the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, for the necessary amendments to The Criminal Code which would enable the Attorney General to do something relative to the chaotic conditions with respect to off-track betting?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I have had no further liaison with the Minister of Justice at Ottawa since my last report to this House on that subject.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

STANDARDS FOR POLICE VEHICLES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General. In view of the Police Association of Ontario's long-standing request for a professional police car—a vehicle that is solely for police services—is the minister preparing a code of minimum standards for police vehicles; vehicles that may be used by municipal police forces and provincial police forces?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the standards required by the Ontario Provincial Police, I would imagine, can certainly be copied by any of the municipal police forces in this respect. It is my understanding that they take pretty stock cars with the exception that the roof beams are slightly strengthened. There is a little bit of interior work done in respect to a few extra pockets and perhaps some of the engines may be souped-up a little bit. Other than that, these requirements, I think, are certainly well known to the automotive industry and I believe they are well known in municipal police circles. Any of these requirements are well known to any of the purchasing officers in any of the municipal governments.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: From the minister's remarks, am I then correct in assuming that there are no preparations being undertaken concerning a code of minimum standards for police vehicles? The Police Association has come out with a fairly long list of minimum standards and this is what it would like to have seen promoted by the department.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am not aware of those representations, obviously. I shall make myself aware of those representations but if the Police Association of Ontario has a list of what they should be—

Mr. B. Newman: For three years they have been trying to tell you.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and they have set down the actual requirements—the object is that we should specify these to the municipal forces; is that the idea?

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will look into it. I have not heard of that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

GASOLINE RETAILERS REQUEST ARBITRATOR

Mr. MacDonald: In the continued absence of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I have a question of the Prime Minister. Is it the government's intention to respond to the requests of the Ontario Retail Gas Association that the government appoint an arbitrator to chair meetings in negotiations between themselves and Imperial Oil to resolve differences, because of the arbitrary imposition of consignment commissions that will force the gasoline retailers into bankruptcy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs will be here later on today and I shall have him communicate the answer to that question to the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I suppose I should come on supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the hon. member for York South going to be around tonight?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I will be here.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

METRO TORONTO POLICE PENSIONS

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Because of the amendment to The OMERS Act of last year, is the statement credited to Mr. Anderson, I believe, who is retired from the Canada Pension Board, incorrect when he said that the pensions of the Metropolitan Toronto Police force are tied to a four per cent interest-bearing rate?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I did not see the statement and I am afraid I cannot answer the question. Perhaps the member might want to ask it of the Minister of Municipal Affairs rather than myself to whom the OMERS board reports in this House.

Mr. Good: As a supplementary, I believe it is the Treasurer who sets the rate. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, the rate is set by this Legislature.

Mr. Good: Yes! All right. Could the minister inform the House what the final outcome was of the rate-setting for last year? I believe last year the House was informed that it would be ascertained at the end of the current year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not off the top of my head. I will be glad to get that information for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

HOSPITAL BED SHORTAGE IN SUDBURY AREA

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question of the Minister of Health. Despite the fact that he chose not to meet with the representatives from the labour council with respect to hospital bed shortages in the Sudbury area, in view of the fact that a telegram was received by the minister yesterday requesting the opportunity for the medical people, the labour council and so forth to meet with them when he is in Sudbury next week, would the minister agree to meet with that group in Sudbury?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I have never turned down an opportunity of meeting with any of those groups. I have asked my staff today to set up a meeting for me when I am in Sudbury next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

PORT DOVER LIFT BRIDGE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport. When will the minister have the answer to my question which I posed approximately a week ago with respect to the Port Dover lift bridge?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member that the Port Dover lift bridge has not as yet been put into operation. It is working, but the department wants to undergo a reasonable period of testing to make sure that it will continue to work.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): It is operating now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot tell the hon. member when it will be made operational because that would enable him to tell somebody in the Kinsmen Club down there who might win the big lottery.

Mr. Gaunt: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to indicate the final cost?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for that information and if I had gone to my office before returning to the House this afternoon I probably would have had it for the hon. member. I will let him have it at the first opportunity.

Mr. Gaunt: That is a big lottery.

An hon. member: Are they not going to move the tunnel over tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Pardon?

Mr. Nixon: Is the minister really going to call it the George Gomme Memorial Bridge?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

SALARIES OF COMMISSION OFFICIALS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Energy and Resources Management whether he would be prepared to table in the House the salaries paid to the top officials in the commissions under his jurisdiction, and particularly the salary paid to the chairman of Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

HUNTING OF ANIMALS FROM VEHICLES

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests concerning his efforts to outlaw the pursuit and slaughter of wild animals from vehicles: Does the term "vehicles" cover airplanes?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have the ad here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Surely common sense dictates that it would.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe that it would at the present time—well, I will wait for the hon. member's secondary question.

Mr. Young: The regulations committee today was told it did.

Mr. Burr: I have a supplementary question.

An hon. member: There was a session—

Mr. Burr: Does the Ontario government intend to continue to promote the Kenora winter carnival, which features a fly-in wolf hunt?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in this House about two weeks ago that I issued a directive—I believe it was the end of March—that no further permits be given for the hunting of wolves by aircraft.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): March 5.

Mr. Nixon: The member is going to have to pay more careful attention.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. member for Hamilton East.

SOCIAL AND FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister discuss with the ministers of the cabinet, and in particular the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), the immediate need to adjust the social and family benefit allowances to the spouse who is recipient of that allowance, where the other spouse is recipient of the old age pension and the guaranteed supple-

ment, to rectify the wholesale reductions when the spouse—one spouse—receives the increase of $24 on the federal supplement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to discuss it with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

EDUCATION COSTS IN WATERLOO COUNTY

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education, I would like to direct this question to the Premier. Would the Premier investigate the situation for four townships in Waterloo county whose education costs have increased by a further 20 per cent this year, representing 13 to 15 mills, due to 1969-1970 deficits which I understand may not be spread over four years but must be collected in the fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particulars. On a visit to the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, a very delightful visit, on—

Mr. Good: Just answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was just going to tell the member some of the background of my visit to his home community.

An hon. member: Yes. Splendid. Great.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Great candidates! I was made aware of certain problems as they relate either to the arbitration awards or the question of deficits and I have asked that the matter be investigated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford was on his feet.

EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS AS BAR ASSISTANTS

Mr. Innes: I have a question of the Prime Minister. Would he consider the possibility of employing university students from the age of 18 to 21, under 21, as possible bar assistants in the hotels across the province? I put it last year to the then Prime Minister who said it was a good idea and he would look into it. Would this Prime Minister consider it? They tell me that approximately 6,000 students could be employed. The operator of one outlet at the moment tells me he would like to employ six or eight.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please. The question only.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will look into it.

Mr. Deans: Does the Premier think it is a good idea?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

OHSIP ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South)**:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can the minister inform the House what the administrative costs were for OHSIP in terms of the plan administered by the government and the plans administered by the designated agents, Healthco?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will ask that that go on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

SUBSTITUTE FOR TIRE STUDS

Mr. Good: A question of the Minister of Highways and Transport: What part does the government have in the present investigation, regarding a substitute for tire studs, being carried out by the Ontario Safety League? Is the government interested in the development of a stud for tires which would have the good qualities of predecessor studs and which would not be outlawed by the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should have to say that we would be interested in anything that will provide for certain elements of safety without the elements of damage to the highways which is a serious matter of concern to all of us. I would also have to repeat what I said in the House a week or so ago and that is that up to this point in time, we are not impressed by any of the lobby overtures that are coming to us from the stud manufacturers. We are not convinced that there is anything in terms of safety that outbalances the basic ban on studs.

Mr. Good: A supplementary: Is the government involved in the present studies being done by the Ontario Safety League?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, my reference was to the study that is being undertaken by the Canada Safety Council,

not the Ontario Safety League. The Canada Safety Council's report has not been submitted to us yet. We hope to have it within a reasonable length of time. We will certainly study it. If it possesses any recommendations that are sensible, we will probably give some consideration to them.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: Can the minister inform the House as to what progress, if any, has been made in reconciling the different approach of neighbouring jurisdictions on this issue on the banning of studded tires?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. member that we have been closely associated in monitoring what is taking place in all neighbouring jurisdictions. Some of them are in very advanced stages of recommendations for legislation to ban them. One state does not have to pass legislation; it simply does not have to introduce what has already been proposed. I think there is even somewhat of a change of attitude and heart in the Province of Manitoba; I cannot define that one yet because I do not know. But certainly there is a strong element in Quebec that would support the view that they are going to ban studs. The State of New York is pursuing this very aggressively.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary: Is it likely that all this reconciliation will take place before we hit another winter so that we will not have this threat of warfare at the boundary?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the legislative processes of the other jurisdictions. We find that the legislative process in certain of the neighbouring states is even more laborious than it is here, notwithstanding the fact, of course, that the government likes to propose good legislation that should be supported generally by the opposition.

The process in the neighbouring states is very difficult to determine. They go through a whole series of congressional and senatorial committees, as the member knows; recommendations are made. The lobby system is strong. We are aware, of course, that the state highway commissioner of Minnesota and his staff are urging the government to move very quickly, but as to the length of time it will take to go through the various processes of making law in the State of Minnesota, for example, it is so different that it is hard to estimate what may transpire.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Before the orders of the day, might I announce to the House that the committee on natural and physical resources, which is considering The Department of Energy and Resources Management, will meet at 4 p.m. this afternoon, and I would ask you to call item 12 on the order paper.

Orders of the day.

WAGES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we agree with the government position that wage assignment should be done away with, with the exception that is set out in the bill, having to do with credit unions.

We have some substantial disagreement, however, with the other section of the bill which does deal with the ability to change the percentage of workmen's income that might or might not come under the jurisdiction of a court order and a court ruling. We intend to discuss this in committee and perhaps offer some alternative, because we still think that the ability of the workman to provide for the requirements of his family should have more protection than is granted under the enactment that this bill puts forward.

I would be glad to hear of the government's justification for the changes, because we on this side feel that considerably more protection should be established by statute for the workman in his main responsibility for providing for the needs of his own family —the housing, the clothing, the food—and to restrict this to a basic income of $2.50 an hour,

I believe that is the limit that is set, seems to us to be inadequate—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A day—

Mr. Nixon: A day? No, it is per hour.

Mr. Deans: No, per day.

Mr. Nixon: A day, oh yes, right. A day. That is inadequate and we will have more to say about that when we have an opportunity to discuss it. The principles of the bill are related; certainly we have approved the wage assignment removal but the garnishment situation still is inadequate and insufficient and certainly I for one feel that the establishment of this minimum amount for the workmen is really just a slap in the face and no protection whatsoever.

We have two minds on the bill, with the two principles there. We intend to discuss it more fully when it is before the Committee of the Whole House, and I would ask the minister to direct the bill to the committee.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Speaker, I have had the experience that people have come to my office who have had their wages garnisheed and the employer, the minute that the garnishee comes through, fires the employee. I am wondering whether the minister might not consider putting into the legislation a section stating that even though a workman's wages are garnisheed, the employer is forbidden from firing him?

I think this is where this very Act creates quite a bit of hardship. A creditor is chasing a particular workman, he finds him, garnishees his wages and then the workman loses his job and it makes it doubly difficult for the workman to pay back the debt. I think this is one of the aspects that the hon. Attorney General might consider when he considers this type of legislation.

I would like to know primarily why he is singling out the workmen again and saying that some creditor can move in the courtroom and abrogate the 70 per cent concept under The Wages Act? I would like to know why he is doing this? I would like to know why he has not really taken a closer look at this legislation in order to prevent the hardships that are caused by this legislation.

I respectfully suggest that he might look at this whole picture, and this party will take a close look at this whole Act in committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I only want to speak briefly on the bill. As I understand it, the first point made by the member for Dovercourt has in fact been covered by The Employment Standards Act which was passed by this House during the last session. My understanding of it, if I can recall it correctly, is that it is now a prohibition in the employment of any person that if a garnishee order is directed against the employer of an employee, and served on the employee, that in fact the employer is precluded by statute from discharging that employee. That is my understanding, but perhaps the minister would confirm it when he speaks.

I would like to make the further extension, however, on what the member for Dovercourt has said, and that is that we stand here in this party anxious to see the garnishee as a procedural method eliminated entirely from the methods by which moneys owing are collected. I think that any such form of self help is an injurious method of collecting debts under the present system of the administration of justice in this province and I do not think that any creditor should be put into a position where he can exert that kind of pressure, short of a person being fired simply by the use of the garnishee process.

I think that if there is to be any garnishee process issued—we believe it should be abolished—then I think it should be made abundantly clear that under no subterfuge can an employer get rid of an employee, and that is, of course, the danger of the present amendment as it was passed a year ago in the House.

So I would commend to the minister the suggestion that he take a look at the garnishee proceedings entirely and see whether or not they cannot—consistent with the other provisions which have been introduced from time to time—just simply eliminate them.

I had difficulty in the amendments which are proposed by the minister in connection with section 7 of The Wages Act. I did not have any particular difficulty with the balance of the statute. Indeed, the provision with respect to wage assignments made before the coming into force of The Wages Amendment Act was one which we urged upon

the government at the time that amendment was originally put forward and we are delighted to see the amendment included in this bill.

But I cannot understand the first part of the change in section 7. I cannot understand whether that assists the workman or adversely affects the workman. It appears to me to eliminate the protection which he formerly had to the extent of $2.50 for each working day represented by the wages seized.

Perhaps the minister in his comments, or in committee, would clarify that matter, because I simply do not understand the language which has been used to accomplish this purpose. As I understand the 70 per cent provision with respect to protection of wages, that exemption is maintained but the floor provision with respect to $2.50 per day as a minimum appears to have been eliminated as well as the provision with respect to the exemption being only in the case where the amount of the exemption exceeds the sum of $2.50 for each working day.

Again, perhaps in committee, the minister could clarify the point for us subject to that comment about not understanding the effect of that proposed amendment, we see no objection to the bill and will support it subject to that explanation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I am always optimistic by nature and I assume that the subsection that deals with wage assignment means that they depart into oblivion forever.

When we made that tremendous advance a few years ago, when the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart) was in the office of chief law officer of the Crown, memory tells me that April 4, 1967, was the critical date and all assignments given after royal assent—that was the day of royal assent—would be rendered nugatory by the operation of the law. But that left in limbo those assignments that had been given before royal assent was given to the bill.

And it was interesting to note, of course, that there was an ambiguity of the language. I happen to have experienced that. Some of the more progressive judges interpreted the wording of the amending Act to mean that if they had been made—that is the wage earner had made the assignment—before the date of royal assent, April 4, 1967 but they had not been delivered to the employer at that time, they should be held to be invalid. That is in keeping with the philosophy of the times.

Those judges felt that wage assignments were a very onerous stricture promoting a great disability upon the workman and they did not find favour in the courts. If the subsection means that all of them, for all time, forever hereafter, are invalid, this is fine. We have achieved the objective that we strove for in this House over a period of many years. We heartily support that.

Now I turn to the other subsection and I see that the new bourgeois element in that party to the left no longer uses rhetoric that promotes the interest of the common man. I say unequivocally that I am against garnishment; I am against it in principle. I would like to see it cast into limbo entirely. I have the belief that the first demands upon a man's wages are the support of his wife and children. They have the first claim, the first priority and their priority is sacred as against the claims of any creditor. I do not care who the creditor is.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is what I said.

Mr. Sopha: That section was probably enacted away back in 1909.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member just does not hear very well.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to think that the Liberal Party of that day opposed it—I hope they did. Historical research would probably show that they did.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I would not bet on it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): On the contrary.

Mr. Sopha: When it comes before the House we will see in this House who pleads for the common man, who speaks for the bourgeois bureaucracy of the trade unions. We will see. But it gives us the opportunity to speak to the principle of it. It is true that Section 8 of the Act gives the workman the right to apply; he has the right to apply to increase the exemption. But this correlative converse right of the creditor is very oppressive, to give him the opportunity to come before the courts and to say, "Look, 70 per cent of his wages should not be exempt." If I had my way, if I ordered these things, I would have no garnishment at all—make no mistake about it. I would repeal it, demolish it.

Look at, etch in comparison, contrast, the differences, the discrimination that exists. You cannot garnish civil servants, at least you

cannot garnish them if they are under The Public Service Act. All you can do is write to the minister and suggest to him that civil servants, like everyone else, ought to pay their bills. And what is the foundation of that? Well, it might be informative to tell you because you cannot levy an execution against the Queen in her own courts. She is not subject to the ordinary jurisdiction of the courts.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I bet that burns the member.

Mr. Sopha: And they set up the defence that she is not liable to garnishee. Well, you get all sorts of odds and sods boards. You get a variety of them. I remember dealing with a community college where it was sought to get a school teacher to pay his bills. I always thought school teachers, above all others, should pay their bills. They probably tell the children they ought to pay their debts.

Mr. Nixon: They sing in the choir.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed they do. But I was told that a community college is an agency of the Queen and therefore not liable to the garnishment. Well, this Act, you see, imposes the burden on the workman, and he is singled out, making his wages liable. There has grown up a whole body of jurisprudence about garnishments and one can only hope when the matter comes before the courts that you get a judge that is of that sober and courteous mind, that flexible understanding, that he will interpret these things as much in the workman's favour as he can. But we in 1971, sitting in this Legislature, should have no part of the continuation of this archaic provision of rendering wages liable to attachment.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Why did the member not put in an amendment?

Mr. Sopha: What is bothering the member?

Mr. Gisborn: When has the member ever put in an amendment to repeal this section?

Mr. Sopha: I was—

Mr. Gisborn: The member has been here long enough.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member for Hamilton East has been here longer, why did he not?

Mr. Sopha: I was the one who offered the first bill to abolish wage assignments.

Mr. Singer: Where was the member at that time?

Mr. Nixon: The CCF did not support it.

Mr. Sopha: It was not the secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers who did that, it was not the member—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): The record will show where the United Auto Workers stand.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Back in Detroit again.

Mr. Sopha: No, no. Someone in this House has to speak out on behalf of ordinary people.

Mr. Pilkey: Check the records.

Mr. Sopha: Now that group has gone to the right of Goldwater. Somebody has to. Oh yes, they all wear $250 suits now and $15 neckties.

An hon. member: They have $15 haircuts.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Some of them drive Cadillacs.

Mr. Sopha: Did you see them in living colour?

Mr. Pilkey: What about $15 haircuts?

Mr. Sopha: In fact, it is going to be a condition of membership that you have to be a millionaire to get on the executive of the party.

Mr. Nixon: And if you are not, they will show you how to become one.

Mr. Stokes: You spend more in one evening at the races.

Mr. Sopha: I do not go to the races.

Mr. Stokes: I have been misinformed.

Mr. Sopha: Let the record declare, for my constituents in Sudbury, that I say categorically, unequivocally, that I do not go to the races.

An hon. member: And I can get four or five affidavits from the bettors.

Mr. Speaker: Meanwhile back to the bill.

Mr. Stokes: I think that touched a sore spot.

Mr. Nixon: No; he has the opportunity to set the record straight.

Mr. Sopha: A very tender spot.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When did you stop going?

Mr. Sopha: Because as a professed believer in the Christian religion, I believe in reform and rehabilitation.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): You always change a little when you become a bencher.

Mr. Sopha: All right, you got me off the track, but that is an interesting aside.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let the record show it. You have got that on the record.

Mr. Sopha: I say the Minister of Justice ought to be somewhat ashamed to bring forward a provision such as this instead of a statute to repeal it. But, unfortunately, we cannot vote against the bill in principle, because of that provision about the wage assignment. So all we can do is say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the bill reaches committee that we will line up some form of amendment that will fix it up.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the wage assignment that the hon. member for Sudbury talks about, since I have been in this House our party has opposed the wage assignment proposition and garnishees, and particularly as it affects workers' jobs. We have said many times that a number of people have been dismissed from their employment because of garnishees. We just happen to think that we were partially responsible anyway because of the representations made by this party for the government introducing that exemption in Bill 96 last year.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do support the proposition that there should be a prohibition against wage assignments, but I want to talk particularly to the section about the 70 per cent of the debt for which the worker cannot be garnisheed. I want particularly to point out to the minister who is introducing the bill, that many workers in this province are trapped as a result of credit programmes.

You read about them all over—easy credit, buy now, pay later—and yet we provide a provision by law that these people who put on these brainwashing programmes are able to retrieve the money that people owe. If they are going to spend, not thousands, but literally millions of dollars, in that kind of propaganda, then I do not think that we should make workers subject to repayment by law, not through this kind of legislation in any event. Obviously they have to repay, but it should not be by law in terms of any assignment of their wages.

As a result of this arbitrary figure that the minister uses of 70 per cent, I would hope that he rises in his place, and gives us the rationale for the 70 per cent, because I just do not really understand the 70 per cent at all. Why not 80 per cent or 90 per cent, or 60 per cent? There must have been some rationale for coming up with 70 per cent.

I do want, in that regard, to support the hon. member for Sudbury and his proposition that the family has first call on the wage earner's salary and that should be the paramount factor. What does he have to pay out? There is the question of paying the rent, buying the food, paying for the clothing and the medical needs that families have today. I want to submit to the minister that there are very few workers in this province who are able to lay aside 30 per cent of their wages and that is what he is asking them to do through this garnishee legislation that is being submitted to us here today. I would hope that the minister would change that figure. As a matter of fact, I submit that it should be eliminated entirely, that garnishees should be outlawed and that there is no way that a worker could be assigned 30 per cent of his wages.

If my memory serves me correctly, I was under the impression that previously one-third of a worker's wages could be garnisheed or assigned. If that is correct, then obviously all this government has done is increase this by 2.5 per cent—very little in terms of protecting the workers in this province. I would urge once again that the minister revise that percentage figure in the interests of the working people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This kind of legislation is so typical of the government party. It proceeds by long precedent, broadening down slowly over the ages, and it is a slow, halting measure that we have before us. A year or two ago in a groping, purblind, worm-like way, this government came before us with the proposals on wage assignments. In principle, they said, placing their hands over their multiple heart, which needs a transplant badly, that they were opposed to wage assignment, but they were not prepared to wipe out those wage assignments that were already in effect but they were prepared to move into the future. Today, with a change or a transplant of heart up to a point, they come before us saying: "Oh, no, we

agree with what you said back in those days. We will wipe them out, carte blanche. We do not like wage assignments at all any more, except in the case of credit unions." So we reach a great milestone after years of human endurance and considerable pain as we stand here this afternoon.

But, Mr. Speaker, they have not moved at all, as has been pointed out by that tribune to the people who arrogates to himself peculiarly demagogic powers in this House, namely the member for Sudbury who, pontificating on this particular issue, places words in the mouths of his opponents about bourgeois virtues, or some such nonsense.

We have, on every occasion I have stood in this House, taken the severest possible umbrage with the perpetuation—

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member is touchy today.

Mr. Lawlor: —of the garnishee system. Does the hon. minister who is in charge of justice—

Mr. Sopha: No wonder the Waffle people are angry with him.

Mr. Lawlor: —in this House know about the garnishee procedures under The Division Courts Act where, before you go to trial—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not what the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) thought a couple of years ago.

Mr. Lawlor: —before the issues on their merits are even adjudicated, it is possible in this province and in this age of history to seize a man's bank account, such as it is, to make seizure of whatever wages are owing to him, to make a seizure in advance of the trial? I would have the minister look at that particular iniquitous section of The Division Courts Act.

In the slow, as I say, halting way in which the government proceeds, perhaps next year or the year thereafter, if it should persist in being the government in face of all grace and human decency, if it should, then it might get around to taking its first hesitating steps toward eliminating the garnishees as they presently stand. In this particular legislation, apart from some persiflage—some small stuff about $2.50—the government does not make any fundamental statement. It leaves it at 70 per cent, and a man is attachable. Not only that, but it leaves it to the creditor.

This is a business-oriented government is it not? It leaves it to the creditor to say, "No, 30 per cent of the man's salary is not enough for me. I want half of his salary, and I am going to take him to court and place him before a busy judge who has not got adequate time to listen to these multiplicity of complaints."

Has the hon. minister, as a practising lawyer, ever experienced the treadmill, the conditions in the division court, on say a Friday or a Thursday morning? They line them up to the end of the hall and out down the corridor and into the snowy street, one after the other. We get about three and two-thirds seconds to adjudicate each of these matters. A man driven out of his mind with anxiety cannot really consider the issues.

The judge sees the garnisher standing there who appears and says, "Yes, money is owing to me." He sees the judgement creditor standing there rubbing his hands saying, "I want a pound of flesh." And he sees the creditor unable to get a word in edgewise with respect to his claim, and he has to make a judgement on the spot with respect to these.

Judges find them infinitely irritating. They do not have adequate time to make any circumspect investigation as to the merits one way or the other as to whether the garnishee should be taken.

If credit facilities at this time in history are not prepared to bear the brunt of the customers with which they deal, then the whole nature of credit arrangements in our society falls to the ground. This government is perpetuating an antediluvian doctrine in this particular legislation and I would ask the minister to give good thought in the next few months to moving in on this situation in a forthright, full-blooded way, of which he is capable on occasion. If he wants to get this crusading image really going, move into something like that, but not in this half-baked, half-hearted piece of business before us today.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that when I introduced the bill I said this was a routine housekeeping piece of legislation. I think we can get into a discussion of the individual sections in committee. I merely point out—and I appreciate that this is the complaint—that nowhere here does this deal with the garnishee proceedings at all.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be directed for third reading?

Mr. J. Renwick: No, let it go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the Whole House.

EXPROPRIATIONS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 36, An Act to amend The Expropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 36 and to urge upon the House and particularly upon the Attorney General, the prompt and speedy passage of this bill.

The necessity for this bill is perhaps a matter that is at least as familiar to me as it might be to anyone else in this House. It revolves around some questioning of drafting The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1968-1969.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, two items arose. One was in relation to the taxing of a bill of cost and a rather interesting judgement of Mr. Master McBride, the taxing officer, who refused to accept the direction of the Ontario Municipal Board and wrote a caustic opinion saying that he did not think, in his, the Master's opinion, he had any legal right to tax the bill. We ran into a brick wall really, Mr. Speaker, in connection with expropriation matters when it came to determining what the amount of costs should be. As a result of that, section 2 of the bill clears up what has been this very serious difficulty and will let some very important matters that have been pending be now determined.

A second principle in this bill relates to the right of the Ontario Municipal Board to deal with a certain group of cases which arose within a fixed period of time. Fascinatingly, Mr. Speaker, and these are some of the unusual happenings in the legal world, this question only came to be an issue when a lawyer, who I am advised had very little else on which to rest his case, asked the Municipal Board for an adjournment of a particular case that was due to start. When the Municipal Board said, "We do not think we are going to do it," that lawyer questioned the right of the Municipal Board to carry on with that particular hearing.

As a result of that, there is a whole group of cases held in abeyance, pending the passing of this statute. There is a considerable number of citizens of Ontario whose rights are being held in abeyance pending the passage of his very important statute.

Those two matters, Mr. Speaker, I think indicate the need for substantial expedition of sections 2, 3 and 4 of the Act in particular. I do not know that anything more need be said about them.

In connection with section 1 of the Act, there was a very substantial objection that we made when the Act originally went through.

This designates the Metropolitan Toronto School Board to be an elected school board. The intent of that, of course Mr. Speaker, is to let the Metropolitan School Board be the body which will determine the appropriateness or otherwise of an expropriation made, interestingly enough, by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board.

Now that principle, I think, is wrong. It has been carried out throughout the Act and I do not think it is going to make very much difference that the Metropolitan Toronto School Board, the same as the North York School Board or the Toronto School Board or the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, passes on the wisdom of its own expropriations in the so-called trial of necessity. But I think the principle is wrong, and Mr. Justice McRuer has so indicated on several occasions. We argued very strenuously but were unable to convince the previous Attorney General that the idea of an appeal from Caesar to Caesar had any meaning at all. If a body has come to the conclusion that it is going to expropriate, what possible use can there be in going before them in a trial of necessity and saying: "You made the wrong decision"?

If the trial of necessity is going to have any purpose at all, then it should be before someone other than the people who made the original decision. But, Mr. Speaker, we lost that argument when the bill originally went through and merely holding up section 1 of the bill before us is not going to achieve anything.

But I draw it very pertinently to the minister's attention that I think the principle in the bill is wrong. While there should be these trials of necessity as we discussed at some length when the bill went through, it makes no sense at all that the trial of necessity is from the same body to the same body.

The only other point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, is in relation to section 8, which prescribes the tariff of costs and that will be done by regulation. I would hope that either the minister or some of his advisers have a draft tariff in the file before the minister or in the office somewhere, that will be available to be embodied in a regulation immediately after His Honour has given royal assent to this bill.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too much the fact that there is a group of citizens whose rights have been very seriously infringed upon by reason of the fact that they have run up against a legal roadblock which was no creation of theirs. This bill will do much to clear up their problems, albeit that it is somewhat late, but the tariff of costs should be prepared if it is not already prepared and proclaimed in regulation just as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points I would like to make about the bill.

I am not happy about the provision for the question of cost to be referred to the taxing officer as an alternative method of procedure. In the legislation when it was before the House in the initial instance we set up, and quite properly, a very elaborate Land Compensation Board for the determination of all matters which came before it under The Expropriations Act.

We endeavoured to do that in order to prevent references outside, for all purposes, to different bodies for different purposes. In fact the financial provision made for that board is very ample. I think it is fair to say that the members of that board are well remunerated for the services which they perform. The staff has been established for that board.

It seems to me that both on the principle of a distinction between administrative law and proceedings in the Supreme Court of Ontario —and I think that is a very valid distinction which can be made between the two methods of procedure—and on the question of the expertise which we expected and anicipated this Land Compensation Board would develop, there seems to us no reason whatsoever for involving the taxing officer of the Supreme Court in the question of fixing costs. I think it is just an unwise transference of powers out of the board.

It seems to me that having gone to the trouble—because of the difficulties in expropriation matters—to set up an independent board amply staffed, with the time it took to establish itself to take on the responsibilities given to it by this Legislature, that board should finally determine the whole question of what the costs are which are to be awarded in any circumstances.

I think that we are going to vote against the bill. I do not mean by that that we are going to ring the bells on it for the sake of ringing the bells. But I think that if any member of the House were to give consideration to what the minister is asking us to do, he would see the merit in the position which we are taking and we believe that the land compensation board and its staff, with its special expertise, should make the decisions with respect to cost.

I think every lawyer in the House, Mr. Speaker is well aware that the tariff of costs and the fine and subtle distinctions made by the taxing officer about the question of costs, the elaborate detail which has been developed over a period of years, is, for practical purposes, gobbledygook to a layman.

I would think that a land compensation board does not necessarily connote a board before which a lawyer must be the person who appears. I think there must still remain the opportunity for a person, a layman, a skilled layman or a knowledgeable layman, to take his own case.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question? Is he aware that the section provides alternatives that either the board can on its own fix a lump sum and/or refer it for taxation?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, I think in my initial remarks I made the point that what the amendment does is to provide an alternative procedure for the board. But it is that very alternative procedure which I think departs from the principle of what we were trying to establish in the House; that a land compensation board should accept full responsibility for all aspects of this question.

It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that only the board itself, or an official of the board constantly available in attendance, can make the kind of proper assessment which will ensure that the costs are fair and reasonable when they are awarded, either for or against the person who appears for them. That point, I think, is one that we feel sufficiently strongly about to vote against the bill on second reading.

I also think that it is unwise in a bill such as this to perpetuate this distinction between party and party costs and solicitor and client costs. As I understand it, the alternative provides that if the person comes before the board and ends up with less than 85 per cent of what the board has awarded, then they are limited to and restricted to the party—

Mr. Singer: No; less than 85 per cent of what the authority had offered.

Mr. J. Renwick: Had offered? Then if their determination by the board—and I accept the correction—is less than 85 per cent of what the authority had offered, the persons appearing before the board are limited to costs on a party-to-party basis. Just to say party-to-party basis is enough to indicate to most members of the House who are not lawyers that it becomes a very technical matter because very few people, including myself, understand what the party-to-party basis is.

If, however, the person gets 85 per cent or more of what was originally offered to him, he is entitled not to solicitor and client costs at all. But it is still left open to this taxing officer to award him only compensation or costs on a party-to-party basis. He is not given the benefit of the higher tariff; he is only punished by having to accept the lower tariff.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It is hardly punishment.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would say so. I think it is quite true that costs in many cases—and I think the term is—I have never been able to pronounce it, mulct in costs. It is the method which is used by the court to punish litigants, for one reason or another, who come before the court. It is a very important consideration in determining whether or not persons in fact make use of such a board for the purpose of determining their rights.

It would seem to me when one takes those factors into consideration, one is driven back inexorably to what we were trying to accomplish when we set up The Expropriations Act. That was to provide a board adequately staffed whose membership was capable of dealing with this kind of a problem and to do it in such a way that when the individual citizen, as is most often the case, is faced by a decision of an expropriating authority, which from his point of view must always be somewhat unjust—that his land is going to be taken from him—it was our intention to set up such a form of adequate board that the person could come before the board and that the costs that he would suffer if he lost would be minimal. I am not suggesting for one single moment that we can rely upon some kind of a tariff, devised more or less in accordance with the kind of experience and background which the taxing master of the Supreme Court may have, that that is a method of ensuring the lowest possible cost by which a person faced with an expropriation can achieve what he considers to be just compensation for the land which has been taken.

Of course—

Mr. Singer: The discretion is still left to the board, though.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Downsview has again interjected that it is at the discretion of the board. I am saying simply that we did not intend to provide the board with the discretion to shift the obligation to fix costs to somebody else.

Mr. Singer: It may not have been the member's intention.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am simply saying that the bill is—

Mr. Singer: The member is not giving much of a reason.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am simply saying, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the member for Downsview, that that is what the bill did, in fact, say that they accepted the responsibility. This bill is to permit them to take alternate courses. We do not think that the alternate course is a wise course. I think if consideration is given to the points which I have made, that the minister might very well consider that it is an inappropriate way for such a board as the Land Compensation Board to determine what portion of the costs that a person before that board is to obtain by way of compensation for the expense to which he has been put.

I think a person coming before that board is entitled in some way to the benefit of the doubt; that he came as part of the third-stage procedure which will have already been gone through; that he comes before the board in the utmost good faith and that he should not have some predetermined fixation as to what the cost will be by itemizing a series of costs and having them toted up by a taxing master.

I think the whole nature of administrative law leads one to conclude that the question of that kind of just result can be achieved only by an administrative tribunal exercising its overall judgement on what is fair and

reasonable in the circumstances of the individual case. It was entirely for the purpose of getting away from the strictures of the rules of procedure of courts and the taxing costs of courts that administrative tribunals were established. While the limitations may be quite correct and quite proper in the historical development of the court system, they are quite inappropriate in the case of a board such as the Land Compensation Board.

With respect to clause 4 of the bill, I may simply say in finishing off that remark, of course, that one of the sections of the bill provides for prescribing these tariffs of costs and rules to be applied by taxing officers. I would assume that the very people who are going to be given the opportunity of transferring this obligation of making the tariff work are the members of the Land Compensation Board. Developing an adequate tariff is the duty of the Land Compensation Board and, in turn, the taxing officer is the one who is going to be bound by those rules.

I reiterate what the member for Downsview has said. I would hope in the minister's remarks, either now or in committee, that he will, in fact, have in his hand the table of what the tariff costs will be and what the rules are to be if he persists in following this course.

With respect to the other portion of the amendment in the bill, it appears to us, for whatever the reasons, which I agree are the ones which the member for Downsview has given, that it is a clarification of the transitional provisions of the bill, and we are, basically, in favour of it. Again, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, in the case of those instances where evidence has been adduced before an existing board because of expropriation procedures, they can continue before that board if no evidence has been adduced before they come before the Land Compensation Board. To that part of the bill we have no objection. But on the first part of the bill, which in a sense has an element of principle to it in the position which we take, we will oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I just want to comment, if I might, on the initial proposition put forward by the member for Riverdale. I do not subscribe to it at all. I can see no validity in it. He went on at great length to try to convince us, in effect, that we should not afford this board the discretion to send on to the taxing officer at Osgoode Hall the right and ability to tax costs.

The fact of the matter is this. This Land Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, is going to be presented with expropriation matters both simple in the extreme and sophisticated in the extreme. I would think that is the intention of the Legislature here.

I think the intention, in effect, is to give them the right in simple matters, probably involving non-significant funds, to set the costs. But it does not go beyond the imagination that this particular board could have before it matters of extreme technical expertise and difficulty and refinement involving millions and millions of dollars.

I think that is good legislation. I support it without reservation. To give that board the ability to say, in circumstances such as that, "We feel that there is another avenue of approach toward the settlement of equitable costs in the circumstances," and then to arbitrarily deprive them of that right, I do not see that there is any benefit in law.

But basically too, I invite this consideration of you, Mr. Speaker. If we do this we not also know, as is known by the Minister of Justice and is known by yourself, probably, Mr. Speaker, that the taxation of costs is automatically subject to appeal?

If we follow the validity of the logic of the member for Riverdale, what he is saying is, in effect, that the Land Compensation Board should be vested with the sole and unalterable right to assess the costs in connection with any matter that comes to court. I do not subscribe to that.

I think that frankly there should always be a right of appeal, because the fact of the matter is that the costs, as assessed, might not be appropriate. I invite the member for Riverdale to consider, for example, that there might be a member of the board establishing a set of costs that are entirely unwarranted in the circumstances.

On the other hand—

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps, on a point or order, my friend would allow me to interfere. The Act, in fact, does provide that an appeal lies to the court of appeal from any determination or order of the board. I would think, to the point that he has just made, it would permit an appeal to the court of appeal from an order with respect to costs.

Mr. Bullbrook: So then that section puts the lie to the very argument that the member wanted to put forward, and that the basis of his argument, in effect, was—

Mr. J. Renwick: The member cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Singer: Sure he can. He is facile!

Mr. Bullbrook: The member, in effect, said that the board should be the sole tribunal to decide as to the equitability and the adequacy of the costs. The fact of the matter is that the statute, out of his own mouth, says that they have a right of appeal from that board. I suggest to the House frankly that really the comments that the member made, and upon which his party is going to vote against this bill, have little or no substance whatsoever.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The arguments, Mr. Speaker, that I was prepared to make have already been made for me, for which I am indebted to the hon member.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Is the minister prepared to take the vote?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I do draw to the attention of the hon. member for Riverdale, though, that this is no administrative tribunal in the ordinary sense.

Mr. Lawlor: The Liberals over there are pretending to be the government.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is a tribunal, really, which can decide rights very dear to the future and the hearts of our citizens. Rights and matters and interests which can be certainly as important to the citizens as almost any matter, perhaps with the possible exception of his own future on this earth, that any court can decide. The decision therefore was made. Obviously, in presenting it to the House I think it is the right decision that we do have a specialized tribunal of another type set up already to decide just exactly what we are asking to be decided in this case—namely, the taxing officer and the taxation of those costs.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be directed for third reading?

Agreed to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That was not very loud.

Mr. J. Renwick: He does not have to be loud to be effective.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, while we are on second readings, I would ask you to call item 5.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 24, An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments with respect to this bill. The amalgamation of The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport to form a new department which will now be called The Department of Transportation and Communications is welcome on this side of the House, at least, insofar as this party is concerned. We think it is a good move to merge The Departments of Transport and Highways.

One of the very first speeches I think that I made, at least it was one of the first speeches insofar as the estimates were concerned in this House, was a speech having to do with this very matter. I was called upon at that time and on that occasion to lead off for my party with respect to the estimates for The Department of Transport. At that time, I think that was back in 1964, I made that point and many members in my party had been making that point previous to that, and certainly since that time.

The Department of Transport basically was a department which was set up to licence and collect fees. That was really its primary function. There were responsibilities insofar as air travel was concerned, but primarily it was a licensing department.

The Department of Highways, on the other hand, was a department that had the responsibility of building highways, of really establishing the transportation policy and encouraging growth in certain parts of the province through the network of the highway systems it developed and built. The Department of Highways really, insofar as a transportation policy was concerned, had in my view the

primary responsibility to develop such a policy.

Now it seems to me that given those two departments, we feel that the function of transportation per se should not be fragmented. I think that it was under the old system, when we had The Department of Transport on the one hand with certain responsibilities and The Department of Highways on the other hand with other responsibilities. To that extent I think the whole transportation field was fragmented, at least to a certain extent—I say that from the point of view of coming up and designing a master transportation policy. In my view I think this is absolutely necessary for the province. I think it is much more difficult to do when there are overlapping responsibilities between two departments; not only overlapping responsibilities, but segmented responsibilities as well.

In my view the master transportation policy for the province is a vital necessity. I think it has to be arrived at in conjunction with a number of other departments, of course. We have to involve The Department of Trade and Development; Municipal Affairs is another one, Treasury and perhaps there are several more. The urgency of such a master transportation plan is quite obvious.

There were some members in this party and some members in the NDP who were confronted with the situation when we had to appear before the Canadian Transportation Commission with respect to the applications for discontinuance of train service in our part of western Ontario. The Minister of Transport in response to my questions in the House said, "Well, we really do not take these applications too seriously. We just think the stance of the railways is that they do not really want to discontinue. They just want to make sure that they get the 80 per cent subsidy."

I think he took that position really because the government did not have any transportation policy. It was the only real tenable position which he could maintain. I think that was unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is straying from the principle of this bill, which is to amalmagate the two departments.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I do not think I am. I am talking about amalgamating the functions of The Department of Transport and The Department of Highways, and how this particular merger should have been effected several years ago. If it had been effected, perhaps we could have had a transportation policy which could have been used as a good defence to argue against the discontinuance of rail service in our part of the province. That is the point I was making.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is dwelling upon aspects which perhaps are related to the departments, but I do not think he is dealing specifically with the amalgamation of the two departments. He should confine his remarks to the principle of amalgamation.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I am.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If Mr. Speaker is going to limit the debate in that way I would point out that this bill, while it is intituled An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport, does not end up under the name Department of Highways and Transport. If it were a simple amalgamation bill I would agree 100 per cent with what Mr. Speaker has said, but it ends up with, not simply an amalgamation, but vastly extended area of operation as connoted in the new title, Minister of Transportation and Communications. I only refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the Throne debate where we were speaking about the Telesat, if I remember correctly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has risen on a point of order. It seems to me that the new bill creating the new department, of course, will stipulate and set forth the functions of that particular department and that that would be a more appropriate time to discuss the functions of the amalgamated department.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, unless I am misunderstanding—and I am speaking again to the point of order—this bill does that, and perhaps the minister could speak on the point of order as to whether or not this is the bill which creates the new department, that it does not simply put together two existing departments.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That would be correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it did seem to me that the hon. member was straying somewhat from the bill. If, however, it is felt by the House that he is not and it is vital to the discussion of the principle of whether or not this amalgamation takes place, he may continue.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, thank you.

I think the assistance which the hon. member for Riverdale has given is very helpful and quite accurate. The new title of the department is The Department of Transportation and Communications, and that is precisely what I am talking about—the whole gamut of transportation. This will be the function of the new department.

If it were simply a matter of merging The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport, then your point may very well be accurate, but it is not. A new portfolio is being created and it has new and additional responsibilities.

The point that I was making, Mr. Speaker, was that it is impossible to actually consent or defend adequately the withdrawal of any services involving one mode of transportation to a particular area without first knowing the potential industrial and tourist development of the area in question. That can only be arrived at when we have some sort of overall plan, and it seems to me that had that been arrived at prior to the applications of the railways to discontinue service in our part of the country, then I think the application could have been defended.

In other words, I think the railways would have lost in their applications to discontinue, had we been able to say—and that the department lawyer been able to say—"This is what we envisage for the Province of Ontario. We anticipate that there will be so much growth in this part of the province. We anticipate that the transportation needs of that part of the province in response to that growth will be such and so. Therefore, we contend that rail service, or other modes of service in addition to car and transport transportation, will be needed, whether it be rail, air or what have you. I feel that had that been the case at that time, we could have put up a very good case and indeed rejected the applications of the railway companies to discontinue at that time.

However, we did not have the policy. All we could do was sit back, and the minister said, "Well, you know, I do not think the railways are really serious about discontinuing. It is just a case of trying to get the subsidy." The transportation policy as it evolves—and the Minister of Transport has indicated that the study under way at present is going to take approximately one year. I hope it can be completed in one year, because I think it involves the directing of development—this is part of the Toronto-centred region, I presume; it has got to dovetail with it. It involves picking growth centres and so on and many other things. The point I am making is that we have to come up with some type of master plan to set out the transportation needs of the province.

I was interested to note that last year in The Department of Highways estimates, the minister asked for $7,608,000 to expand the experimental projects and studies in the field of mass transit in order to bring about a so-called balanced transportation system. In my view, I think this is only a start and that it is going to have to have substantially more funding than that, if we are going to arrive at any meaningful transportation plan for the entire province.

In addition, I think the master transportation plan involves deciding how the transportation needs of the province can best be met within any given area. Is it by extension of GO, is it by monorail, is it by rail service or highway? I think these are things that are part of that determination in formulating a master plan.

It is a case of where the public money can be used to the best advantage to meet the needs of the travelling and commuting public, having regard to all of the factors of pollution, land use and the ultimate effect on any given community.

In my view, the province has been lax in this regard, and my guess is that we are still several years away from a master transportation policy for the province. In the meantime, many of these decisions—and I can think of the decision involving the Spadina Expressway—are going to be made and they are going to be irreversible. We cannot do anything about them.

I urge the minister to speed up his efforts in trying to determine what the needs will be, what modes of transportation will have to be emphasized in any given area across the province, and I end by saying that in our view, the merger of the two departments hopefully will assist this formulation of some type of rational approach to the transportation needs across the province, whether it be air, highway or rail.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the minister on bringing in this piece of legislation. I first advocated the amalgamation of The Department of Transport and The

Department of Highways two years or three years ago.

One thing still bothers me about the bill, and I want to go back to something I said about a year and a half ago when I said:

> I am disturbed, Mr. Minister when the deputy minister talks about the diversification and overall policy of transportation. And then you see the Ontario Northland Railway turned over to the ombudsman for the north.

I have just finished checking the estimates for 1971-1972, both for The Department of Highways and The Department of Mines. I do not know where that estimate comes in and I fail to understand how we can talk about a comprehensive transportation policy if we do not include the Ontario Northland Railway somewhere in this department that is now being created. I could be wrong; I just simply cannot find where it has gone to.

I suggest first and foremost with respect to this bill that the Ontario Northland Railway must end up with the Minister of Highways under the new bill, The Department of Highways and Transportation, or Transportation and Communications. I do not think we can leave such a vital link out. I say this, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: In view of what occurred just this past winter in northern Ontario with the discontinuance by the CNR of trains 7 and 8, and 107 and 108, at that time I desperately tried to get the Minister of Mines and Northern Development, or the then Minister of Mines, to act on behalf of the residents of northern Ontario to prevent this train from being discontinued.

The minister was engaged in other fields of endeavour at the time and after four or five phone calls which he did not choose to reply to, I subsequently followed it up with a letter. What, in effect, has happened, of course, is the CNR has now put on a token service which will run for six months, running from Capreol to Hornepayne or Armstrong. At the end of six months there will not be a paying passenger on that train.

They will go back to the Board of Transport Commissioners and say: "Look, we did not have a paying customer. We will have to take this train off," because they are starting in an area where all the passengers who use this service are on passes. I just use this to emphasize the point, because the minister then went on in January in North Bay and announced that we must improve the rail service for northern Ontario. We had an opportunity to do something about it. We could not even get him to acknowledge a phone call.

You know, you are not going to reach many areas of northern Ontario without an adequate rail service. In other words, we are not going to be able to put in highways in too many of isolated communities. And I am suggesting rather strongly that if the government at that occasion had taken a positive position, and I might say I wrote three different ministers—the Minister of Tourism, because the tourists are going to be affected by this move by the CNR; I contacted the Minister of Transport at the time and I finally contacted the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs—but really none of them did anything.

We now have a situation where we will eventually have one train service which is the Super-Continental which will become a milk run eventually and is not going to provide the services for residents of northern Ontario.

The member who spoke before me has a similar problem in his own area, but you had an opportunity last winter to assist and after the fait accompli, the white knight gets up in North Bay and says we have to improve train services in northern Ontario. And I suggest, where was the government when you had an opportunity to prevent this? Hopefully, this new department, which is going to have a comprehensive view and using this department to develop northern Ontario and other parts of Ontario as well, will have a policy where they can make strong representation to discontinue the erosion of services in northern Ontario.

I would like to say I was also delighted, as my colleague from Riverdale has just stated on his point of order, to see that we are going to utilize the new department, as was outlined in the Throne Speech, to develop the province. I made the following quote two years ago:

> The most basic tasks of the provincial government are to stimulate and guide the economic growth of the province and to consider and influence the distribution of income of the province among socio-economic groups and regions. To conduct these tasks effectively, it is essential that all of the policy measures available to the government be co-ordinated toward a consistent and a comprehensive set of goals. Transportation is one of the most important policy variables in the determination of regional growth patterns.

And I had presumed that the government had used my quote of two years ago in the Throne Speech and was delighted to see it show up there. I hope I reached the government by some small measure at least, because if we are ever going to develop Ontario in a comprehensive fashion, tapping the resources and developing a secondary industry, as I

stated to the minister's predecessor, the answers for most of this must come from a new role for the department—at that time I said The Department of Highways but now The Department of Transportation and Communications.

I have always had the feeling that those people played follow the leader in The Department of Highways and were never really where they should have been—that is, in the vanguard of developing the province—because I do not see how you can get any type of development and leave The Departemnt of Transport the role it had previously. It must take on a new significance. It must, I think, play a major decision-making role in economic development and, without them sitting down with the minister to discuss that, I think it is just a pipedream to have an economic development in a co-ordinated fashion.

However, one thing that disappointed me in the bill is that if the minister is going to establish ths new role, I believe that it is going to be incumbent that maybe a new division be created within the department to do the very first thing before we can even start to develop the province in a co-ordinated fashion. I think we have to know exactly what the resources are, not only natural but human, as related to education, the sociological effect, the whole bit—everything pertaining to highways.

I do not see anywhere, nor have I seen in the last three years in discussing this set of estimates, where we have really increased that capacity in The Department of Highways to assess all of these things.

I think we are going to need computers; we are going to need data-processing centres—the whole bit—to put all of that together in order to develop the province in a co-ordinated fashion. And I do not think there is any place in this department yet where this is possible, because to be building a road after a mine is opened or after we have decided to tap an area is ridiculous. We have got to know ahead of time.

We have got to decide what our goal is for a particular area. I think particularly with respect to northern Ontario, because of its size, that we have to use avenues of transportation from one growth point to tap the resources in possibly five or six different areas —even if it means building roads 60 or 70 miles long just to move people back and forth to work—so that when one industry closes down, the town does not die. We have to do the preliminary work of amassing an inventory of every type of resource that exists so that we can do this sort of thing.

I am sure the government is aware that we can no longer have one-industry towns which die after 20 or 25 years, because people lose their whole life's equity. Again this is where The Department of Transportation and Communications can play the major role, in knowing what is there and how we will develop it, based on one central community. In the long run it might mean a little more for highways, or co-ordinating it with railways or existing railways, but in the final analysis it is going to be a lot cheaper because people are not going to be losing equities. We are not going to be building schools for 25 years and then see them close down. We are not going to be building hospitals—the whole bit. I suggest that the minister has a very important role and a very new role and a very dynamic role to help develop the potential through this department.

There are several other things in the bill, however, that disturb me. We call this The Department of Transportation and Communications and I know he is not happy at getting a little more thrown at him in the way of a bureaucracy. But I think if we are going to talk about communications, it is a tremendous field with the announcements that the Prime Minister made last weekend; with The Department of Northern Affairs still retaining the communication link between northern and southern Ontario with the Northern Affairs offices.

There is a whole field there and I just do not know at this stage in the game what that tag-end of communication really means. It seems to me that if we are talking about an all-embracing communications system involving satellite television or satellites for television for northern Ontario—because there are many communities which do not have anything except news and reruns and he whole bit—whether it involves the field of television or whether it talks about the Northern Affairs offices, how their role fits in with the new idea of transportation and communications, I would hope that the minister would clarify the reason for putting communications as a tag-end on this name.

Is it a long-term goal that eventually will bring all of this together—transportation and communications—and all of the communications within one department? I do not know, and the bill really does not clarify it, so I am left a little at a loss as to why the minister would even put communications in.

The other point is on the first page of the bill, article 4, the designation of power, or the designation to someone in the department. It is not really clear, and I would hope that the minister would have an opportunity to clear up what he means by "passing on powers"? If it is as it exists at the present time, fine, but I would like a little clarification with respect to that because there is a degree of vagueness there.

I guess, in summation, I am delighted to see this happening. I hope that the minister will take on the role of being the man responsible for bringing about some real planned or co-ordinated economic development. I have been stating for two or three years that it is certainly the government's and particularly this department's responsibility. I am glad to see it and I hope that this department will take that line.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the introducion of a bill to form The Department of Transportation and Communications. I am disappointed that the bill does not outline a purpose, an objective, that is clearly a new thrust for this province.

Recently I noted advertisements describing the new Minister of Transport and his qualifications for the job of Minister of Transport; it does not describe much more than that. I guess we now have a rival to the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) in spending money to promote a minister.

I am sorry that the minister has not, in this department, taken a new line in this bill and given evidence that we are now going to see a total approach to transportation and communications. We appear to be merging two departments with their separated interests that they have had in the past, but not showing what is really needed now in Ontario—not a big contracting organization that is building swaths of concrete; not a big department working out all types of regulations for drivers and vehicles, but the prime purpose of which is to really give an overall integrated programme for transportation in this province. The other aspects, that of construction, that of regulation, are in a secondary position.

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: That is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Deacon: The purpose, I understood, of bringing these two departments together was so we could have a co-ordinated integrated approach to transportation and communications in a new department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let us get this bill through first.

Mr. Deacon: I am interested in the side comments of the minister that we are going to see a change and a new bill later on which is going to involve an integrated approach to transportation and communication.

We are going to see direction being given, not by those who are the contractors or the makers of regulations, but by those who are telling us what is needed by the people to serve their transportation needs.

For example, the research would show that the needs of northern Ontario, for example, could be greatly met—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would have to suggest that the hon. member is really out of order. That is not the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Sopha: And what would be the purpose?

Mr. Deacon: I am at a loss to understand when I hear—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Again, Mr. Speaker, if I may, are statutes required to spell out the policies that may well be implemented when the authority that this bill will confirm is established?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Yes, The Department of Trade and Development is one that does.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I differ with the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that I am having difficulty in detecting the difference in the type of remarks being made by the hon. member for York Centre as opposed to the remarks that have been made by the numerous speakers up to this point. They are all ranging out of transportation and the development of transportation systems in connection with the amalgamation of the two departments. I would have difficulty in separating the remarks of the hon. member for York Centre from the others.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You wrestle with your difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and the minister will subside.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Fair enough.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps then, Mr. Speaker, I will continue in pointing out what I was hoping I would see in this bill and what I would feel was a start. It does not really give us an idea of plans—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not intended to.

Mr. Deacon: I hope that sometime the minister intends to outline to us the solution to the problems of transportation and communication in this province. It is high time this man, who has been in the business—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member will not find that written into the statute.

Mr. Deacon: —who professes to be in the business, who has had the responsibility for years past of highways and transport in this province, has not brought forward something that does give us assurance of a solution to the problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How do you write that into an Act?

Mr. Nixon: More of the same.

Mr. Deacon: Insofar as the minister's provisions are concerned here, we have a bill that is more of a patchwork. It is not one that shows an appreciation of the overall problems we have in the province. We are still going to continue—according to what is in this bill—having made no change from the past, the engineering of highways and the construction of highways overriding all other considerations, instead of having research showing us the true economics of meeting transportation requirements. Such is the fact in northern Ontario. A new trans-Canada route to the north of Lake Nipigon could shorten transportation, not only in the mileage but also cut off two hours or so off the travel time between Winnipeg and Toronto and open up the country and cause a great boom to the economy.

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: The member had better talk to somebody else about that.

Mr. Nixon: That is something else the minister can add to his list.

Mr. Deacon: It would cause a great boom to the economy and make it possible for people in that area to have much greater and better access than they now have to other parts of the province. The fact that it may have been described as the northern Trans-Canada Highway does not reduce by one iota the responsibility of this minister for providing transportation. Any assistance they get from Ottawa is actually a plus. There is no reason for not proceeding with something that would be of great help to the economy of that area.

We have no evidence here of a thrust by the minister to look at the role of the province in providing public transportation in a much more meaningful way. We are looking forward to hearing of a change in the past support that has been so inadequate in the way of grants for public transportation.

But in order for the people who are in a position to spend these grants—the municipalities—really to know what they are doing, this department should be providing them with the facts and figures that would help them arrive at the most economical and most efficient transportation plans.

Another point I want to make is that we have had no evidence in the past—and I hope we will have evidence in the future—of work by this minister or this department to assume a much more meaningful role and to obtain from Ottawa a means by which they could have a much more meaningful role in the operation of our railways. Ottawa has been very lethargic and disappointingly inactive in providing us with an imaginative solution to our transportation needs, but they have had no support, no urging, no push, from the province in solving the problem. The only way we will solve our transportation problem is when the province maps out for itself a definite role in which it can have a responsibility for co-ordinating public and private transportation. This bill does not show nearly the imagination or the leadership I had hoped it would have.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, I do not mind the hon. member rambling away, but this bill was not intended to do this. This bill is to give us the authority to create one department out of two.

The operative legislation that concerns both departments could be said to be The Highway Improvement Act, The Highway Act and a full level of related Acts. These are the operative Acts under which some of the things the hon. member is stating just might be related. But what I am trying to say is that they are not related to this bill. In other words, we cannot write into this Act the things the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Deans: We are trying to decide whether the minister should have the authority or not.

Mr. Deacon: I am surprised the minister keeps on giving us reasons why this Act does not apply.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member now speaking to the point of order?

Mr. Deacon: Was that a point of order that the minister raised?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the minister rose on a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: I want to speak on the point of order, if you will forgive me. A deficiency in the terms of a statute, I submit to you, goes to principle, and it is open to any member to allege deficiencies which, in his opinion, emasculate the provisions of the bill. That is perfectly proper, I submit to you, with the greatest respect in deference to your own opinion, on second reading of a bill.

It may be, as the minister says, there are other operative Acts. That is fine. But if my friend, the member for York Centre, wants to say they ought to be in this Act, then it is his free right to do it, and this is the place to say it.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that I cannot agree to any great degree with the hon. member for Sudbury. It seems to me that when a bill comes before this House, that bill is before the House for debate of the content of the bill, not anything that is not in the bill. So I cannot accept that argument.

By the same token, I do believe that the hon. member for York Centre, for the last few minutes now, has been definitely straying from what we have been permitting the other hon. members to talk about, and I must say that I agree to a great degree with the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport in this connection. It seems to me that right from the beginning there was a great deal of discussion that was not on the principle of this bill, which was to amalgamate the two departments. I have permitted some degree of discussion on all aspects of the two departments as they have been. But it does seem to me that we are now straying somewhat from the bill, so let us try and keep to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by saying in my mind there is no better place and no more logical place for the purpose of a new department to be clearly set out and defined in terms that are clearly understood than when a new department is being formed. Regardless of what the minister says about all the other Acts in which they can be included, this is where we should clearly be told what this whole department is going to be for.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I could not think of a more appropriate place to protest to you than on second reading of this bill; there is not a more apt opportunity to say that it is my firm belief that there ought to be a ringing declaration on the part of the government to be the initiator of the bill, that it is a fundamental principle of living in Ontario that a person wheresoever he may live has the right, has the absolute right, not to be discriminated against in terms of transportation; that he has that right.

This bill, from my point of view, is gravely deficient in that it says nothing about the discrimination in transportation that does affect three-quarters of a million people who live north and west of the French River. Those people who have to pay retail sales tax to this government on the additional transportation costs. That is a shocking matter of discrimination.

Mr. MacDonald: The member will say it where he pleases.

Mr. Sopha: Would I say that under The Highway Improvement Act? Would I say it under The Highway Act? Where else is the more proper place—

An hon. member: This is the appropriate place.

Mr. Sopha: —to point to that and to draw attention to the fact that one of the instruments that will be under the jurisdiction of this minister will be a government owned and operated railway, in which steps have not been taken for three decades to remove that grave discrimination that afflicts people who live north of North Bay?

Beer, that is an important one. It is important in Sudbury, a heavy beer drinking society. But they work hard, those people moil in the ground, that is significant, but it is nothing compared to the cost of fresh vegetables and the cost of manufactured goods—

An hon. member: Gasoline.

Mr. Sopha: –gasoline, basic commodities for which they have to pay those discriminatory prices. That is one aspect. But I do protest that the bill is deficient in that it does not have a section in there that says there shall be equal rights to transportation every place in Ontario. Now that is one side.

The other side is the policy with respect to the building of roads and transportation generally. Two sentences in the Speech from the Throne, one little wee paragraph, was the only recognition we got that northern Ontario –the area that produces the wealth that supports this province–exists.

We have never had a policy–that is the thing that can be brought home to the door–they have never had a comprehensive, well-thought-out policy in transportation. Let me illustrate to you, because I do not stand in this House and speak in terms of generalities. I heard the Attorney General when he was Minister of Mines say one day here that if they would build roads, he did not care where they built them any place in northern Ontario.

That statement would not go down very well with the Quetico people who are harrying the government's heels and other legions that are becoming very desperately anxious about the ecological integrity of our large wilderness areas. We deserve something more than a loose, irresponsible statement that he does not care where they build roads. We do not have to worry too much because they never built very many. Sudbury always had to suffer from the grave, economic disability that it was more closely and intimately connected with the southern part of the province than it was with the north. Sudbury, the capital of the north, ought to have a large measure of economic dominance in north-eastern Ontario, but until September of last year it did not even have an artery into the north.

Mr. Stokes: Does the member know where the centre of Ontario is?

Mr. Sopha: I know where it is.

Mr. Stokes: The geographic centre?

Mr. Sopha: I know where Sudbury is too, and I know Sudbury is important.

Mr. Stokes: It is not Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Sudbury is one of the most important economic areas of this whole country. Its contribution to this country is immense and that has been a constant source of complaint from me over the years. The centre of Ontario is somewhere around Kapuskasing.

Mr. Speaker: Can we get back to the bill, please?

Mr. Sopha: Moonbeam, yes, Moonbeam.

Mr. Nixon: Moonbeam has good roads. Moonbeam is one place where you find good roads.

Mr. Sopha: Have you ever seen that road into Moonbeam? Have you ever seen it? It leaves the highway paved.

Mr. Stokes: I think it is about 50 miles northeast of Kapuskasing.

Mr. Sopha: Right up. There is not another paved secondary road in the whole district of Cochrane but that one in Moonbeam.

Mr. Nixon: I hear they are going to four-lane that one.

Mr. Martel: It is okay now.

Mr. Nixon: It gives access to all those planes parked at the end of it.

Mr. Sopha: I am curious as to how the former Treasurer, the seed dealer from Exeter, landed in this portfolio. I really am curious, but I thought after the titanic struggle at Maple Leaf Gardens that he was pretty high on the list of the hierarchy.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Oh, yes.

Mr. Nixon: He has been moved away though.

Mr. Sopha: So I put the best construction on the move and I though that putting an energetic man like the member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton) in this portfolio, we were going to see something really dramatic, that some revolutionary concepts in the transportation policies of this government were going to occur. And, perforce, I am tremendously disappointed.

Mr. Nixon: He is just serving time.

Mr. Sopha: Somebody aptly pointed out that other statutes that create departments have declarations of their purposes. This one was singularly appropriate because of the immense land mass of this province. Perhaps our most compelling characteristic is the size of this province. When thinking of that

size, you have to remember that four-fifths of the area—just a little under a percentage point or two under four-fifths of the area is north and west of the French River, with one-fifth down here in the industrial heartland. Bearing that in mind that posits a tremendous challenge to the legislators here to adopt—

Mr. Stokes: Where is the University of Western Ontario?

Mr. Sopha: Where is it? It is in London.

Mr. Stokes: Western Ontario?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, London. London in the bush, not London on the Thames. London in the bush, as the English immigrant called it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Also on the Thames.

Mr. Sopha: All right. The failure, to lay out something of a philosophy of transportation indicates that, as in many other areas—I end on this note—this government has become totally vacuous in policy and that, of course, heralds the reason that whenever the contest is called it must, perforce, and will, go down to defeat.

Mr. Nixon: Right you are.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is the third time this week the member has told us that.

Mr. Nixon: Here is another northern speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may this integration of highways into this new department see the end, or perhaps give pause to those asphalt superstars at Downsview, and give them time to pause and reflect upon the ultimate goal of the transportation programmes of the province, because, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: He is rebelling again. Back to the woodshed.

Mr. Gisborn: The member will have to make note of these departments that are cancelled and are no longer. They are gone.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Just hold on. Mr. Speaker, one of the real problems facing our society, not only in this jurisdiction but all over North America, of course, is the matter of urban rapid transit. I sincerely hope that this new department will give a real thrust and innovation to the pioneering of rapid transit in our large urban centres to make transportation more viable and appealing to the public. I think perhaps we need some new creative ideas in rapid transit.

Perhaps this new department can supply the technological assistance to the various public transit commissions across Ontario, so that these bodies may come up with some new ideas. This new department might be able to fund them because we have in Ontario at present these various transit commissions going off in their own direction, receiving very little in the way of provincial assistance or assistance technologically or financially. If we are going to ever be able to sell to the public the value of public transport, we have to have better service and have it at a very competitive price.

This might involve tax concessions in the abolition of gasoline tax, purchase tax, licence plate tax, and so on, to the public transportation vehicles and the introduction of small jitney services to service the urban neighbourhoods, and so on, into a feeder system. There are many ways this can be tackled.

I think, Mr. Speaker, beside the financial aspect of the whole problem, with these new departments we have a major challenge in creating public opinion that it is not degrading to ride public transit. Using public transit is one of the things on which we have a real hangup in our large metropolitan centres.

Perhaps Madame Trudeau is going to set a new trend with her two-wheeler in our capital city, but it is certainly not convenient for all of us to ride a two-wheeled bicycle to our places of employment.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): What about a two-wheeled baby carriage?

Mr. J. R. Smith: I think she would require a four-wheeler. I do not know if that is on its way or not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Surely once we can devise better means of public transportation? The department is going to have to try and show that it is the in thing to use public transport and not to stick with our present values and standards that everyone should set off in their own vehicle to their place of employment.

Not only are highways congested, we have reached the saturation point, Mr. Speaker, only last weekend I had the opportunity to use Highway 27 up to 401. Really, those facilities just cannot expand any further. We have

had enough of expressways and all these various road widenings. We are going to have to come to the point where we have to reassess our values. People are going to have to realize that public transport for them can provide faster transportation, ease the overcrowding in our cities and make a better way of life for all of us.

Mr. Peacock: No applause?

Mr. Gisborn: He should have been here 25 years to get an applause.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this change—the amalgamation of The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport, which is going to be called The Department of Transportation and Communications. I do hope, when the minister gets down to establishing some guidelines for the operation of this newly formed department, that he will take into consideration the remarks made by the member for Sudbury East and the member for Sudbury in coming up with a meaningful and comprehensive and a realistic overall programme of transportation and communications, particularly in areas which are under-serviced or where there is no service at all.

I do look forward to the minister getting up and saying that he is going to take over responsibility for the so-called development road in the Province of Ontario, the Ontario Northland Railway.

I do hope too, that at the appropriate time that he will mention that the highway-in-the-sky programme that he has seconded on to himself as the result of taking over the operation of the former Department of Transport will, indeed, get off the ground.

I do hope that he will give some assurance at the appropriate time that, since Air Canada is phasing out of the regional air carrier services, he or his department will provide an adequate regional air carrier service all throughout the Province of Ontario, and not just in the more heavily populated sections of the province.

I am even suggesting that maybe he might even take over Rene's air force and, in that way, it will be the arm of the—

Mr. B. Newman: Never!

Mr. Stokes: —transportation system in the Province of Ontario where it will come under one wing—the left hand will know what the right hand is doing—and that we will, indeed, have an adequate transportation system.

Mr. MacDonald: Let the left wing know what the right wing is doing.

Mr. Stokes: I am also hoping that he will take into consideration remarks made by the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) when he suggested that: "If taking over the unused portions of the transcontinental railways of both Canadian Pacific and Canadian National will foster the kind of development that is so badly needed along the north line of the CNR and the unused portion of the Pagwa line, if this means economic development in that section of the province"—well, he said he was prepared to do that too.

I am a little bit chagrined that nobody has mentioned—even the minister has not indicated—that the roads-to-resources programme, particularly in northern Ontario, with a budget of about $5 million, will not come under the supervision of this department and this minister. The chairman of that committee will still be the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier).

So I think that if we are going to have the kind of transportation policy that will provide adequate transportation at a price that people can afford, and the transportation of goods at realistic rates, the minister is going to have all of these tools at his disposal in order to complement those transportation systems that are completely inadequate at the present time.

I also hope that the communications wing or branch of his department will take into consideration the complete inadequacy of telephone, radio and television service in the north. I do not think that too many of the members in this House have had occasion to drive in the northern parts of Thunder Bay riding, in the northern parts of Kenora riding, or indeed all of northwestern Ontario, outside of viewing range of Thunder Bay. Everything they get there by way of radio or television is oriented from either stations in the United States or Winnipeg. It is kind of ironic that one travels into places like Savant Lake, Pickle Lake, Central Patricia or Osnaburgh and there is nothing that you can get except a paper that is one week late. There is nothing that would indicate to these people that they are, indeed, residents of the Province of Ontario and that somebody cares about them and is interested in keeping them informed about what is going on.

At the northern conference I think it was brought home to the minister and his colleagues. Those northern conferences that

were held in Thunder Bay, Timmins and Sudbury, I think, highlighted very clearly that these people felt that they were entitled to something better by way of communications than they were getting at the present time. Indeed, I think that the present Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs sponsored a private member's bill in this chamber a little over a year ago indicating that this government should either do something themselves or prevail upon the federal authorities to provide adequate communications by way of decent telephone system, decent radio and television communications.

I do hope that the minister will indicate that this is the kind of thing he is going to concern himself with in the reorganization of these two departments. I want to say on behalf of the people of the north that if it will do those things, we welcome this and will assist in any way possible to bring it about.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this. As one who has been a critic of The Department of Highways in years gone by and likewise a critic of The Department of Transport during all of those years, we on this side of the House, recommended the assimilation of The Department of Transport into The Department of Highways.

Apparently, according to the legislation before us today, this is just what is going to happen. We welcome it. All we can say is that it is years too late. Had the government taken the suggestion from this side of the House, we probably could have been working on some of the problems that have been mentioned by the various members who have preceded me with their comments.

Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems with the assimilation of the two departments would be the development of an overall transportation policy, something that has been sorely needed in the years gone by; the need for the co-ordination between rail transit, the highway transit, water transit and maybe even transportation—not in the air, not on water, not on land, but just slightly above the land. That is, with the use of the various new types of vehicles, such as all-terrain vehicles, go-anywhere vehicles, hovercraft that could be taken into consideration in the development of the all-Ontario plan for transportation.

One of the things that does disturb me in the combination of two departments is what will happen to the civil servants as a result of the combining of the two departments. I hope the minister can clarify that in his remarks later on, so that no civil servant today finds himself in a position of being dismissed or being adversely affected financially as a result of the combination of the two departments.

Mr. Speaker, another reason for my wishing to speak on this is that the development of our urban areas now is leading to the greater and greater demand for a rapid transit around the area itself, or from one side of the community to the other, and that has led to the development of the ring road. Had the department been combined years before, it is possible that studies could have been undertaken as to whether the ring road was the proper method of facilitating transportation of goods and individuals in the community. Maybe other methods of transportation would have been far better than the land method of transport—the use of the ring road—possibly the use of rail or some other method, and I was thinking essentially in this instance of monorail or an air-cushion type of vehicle.

Municipalities are hard-pressed for funds as it is to take care of normal needs for services, and the development of ring roads would make it just that much harder and more difficult for a municipality to provide other types of services to the residents.

I hope that when the minister does take the department in hand and has the one department—The Department of Transportation and Communications, as the new appellation will be—he will seriously consider the position of ports of entry into the Province of Ontario. I refer to my own community as a port that has a lot of traffic generated in it as a result of Americans coming into Ontario, and not necessarily coming only into the city of Windsor but into all parts of Ontario; likewise, Sarnia, Niagara Falls and Fort Erie, to name those that are in the southern and western regions of the province.

Some kind of additional consideration has to be given to those municipalities as a result of the inflow of individuals and vehicles from another jurisdiction. That consideration could either be shown monetarily or in some other fashion.

I would likewise like the minister, in the assumption of his new duties, to look into assistance to municipal transportation systems. That could be by means of abatement of diesel fuel tax or even the gasoline fuel

tax to assist the municipalities themselves to develop better mass transportation systems within their communities.

There is another new feature—maybe we are a little too late actually in even discussing it—and that is the rapid rise of shopping plazas and the effects they have on the overall transportation picture in a given community. I hope the studies undertaken in this department could be accelerated so that there could be some type of control regulations or some type of direction as to locations of shopping plazas so that the developer of a shopping plaza would not create more problems in a given community than benefits that are derived by the shopping plaza. Naturally, the shopping plaza may not go in the community. It may go beyond the bounds of the given community and, as a result, create problems to the larger and the core community.

Mr. Speaker, this generally completes the remarks I wanted to make on the topic. I hope that the minister will reply to my remarks concerning the civil service, and its effect as a result of the assimilation of the two departments, and the possible assist to municipal transportation systems.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this bill engenders in me a certain sense of nostalgia and hope.

I recall the occasion some years ago when we debated the bill which separated out of a certain proportion of The Department of Highways into The Department of Transport, and we on this side of the House all expressed some misgivings as to whether or not this was not Parkinson's law running a bit and in terms of the proliferation of cabinet posts.

We were willing—at least I personally was willing—to go along with the government in its new approach if they were to develop within The Department of Transport a department of research that would be worthy of the name, but it never happened. It just never happened. It was obvious that the government did not have sufficient confidence in the ministers, and particularly the last minister who held that portfolio, with the result that any research that the government did engage in was usually handled by somebody else, including the new Minister of Transportation and Communications, such as for example, the whole MTARTS study into the Metro area. It always puzzled me as to exactly where things got out of kilter, that if you set up a department—and theoretically it was the appropriate one for research—why you did not do what was necessary to develop the research within that department.

Well, it did not happen, and I can only express the hope that now it is going to, not only in terms of research on new kinds of transport, not only in terms of research on municipal transportation systems and the problems that they are facing but, I submit, at least within the terms of the province of Ontario, on the fundamental need for research in this country, and that is the rationalization of all of the various modes of transportation which now, to a great extent, come within this department and some reassessment of public moneys that are being pumped directly or indirectly into each of those modes of transport.

Now, I would concede, Mr. Speaker, that clearly this is primarily the responsibility of the federal body; but we have got our traditional modes of transport: highways, water and rail. Since the development of air transport there has been a syphoning off of a growing proportion of the passenger or the freight traffic from these others. There has been intense competition among them, and as a result of the economic difficulties that each one of those systems tended to get into, we found the government reacted in a piecemeal fashion to pumping money in to assist rail transport and, of course, there has been a traditional subsidization of air transport through the provision of airports and things of that nature.

At some time, in this country, or at some time in this province, I hope we are going to have a government that will have the courage to tackle some rationalization of this, because the net effect of it is that the public purse is competing with itself through subsidization in competing areas of transportation. It may well require what appears at this stage to be relatively arbitrary decisions. We may have to intervene in the free choice of what kind of transportation is going to be used, because in providing such a proliferation of transportation opportunities we, the public through the public purse, have to pay for a good proportion of the bill.

That, to my mind, is the fundamental area of research. And I would hope, this is my area of hope—I have passed the nostalgia now—that the minister, since he has been involved in whatever research this government has tended to do, will with what personnel he has got or what he needs, tackle this problem.

The second area that I want to touch on just briefly is raising some of the problems in relation to the new aspect of this department, namely the communications.

Presumably they have telescoped highways and transport into transportation, and highways to the sky and the ONR and a lot of others are going to be brought in as well. But this communication one is a bit mind-boggling. In fact, I think it is so mind-boggling that rumour has it that the minister is resisting a tendency to dump a lot of things into this department which he, either personally, or his concept of the department does not envisage them as legitimately being there.

Yesterday, when we got into what amounted to a mini debate on the cable TV situation in the question period, the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), en passant, said: "Well, may I remind the hon. members of the House we now have a Department of Transportation and Communications," and suggested that cable TV—in that new technologically advanced sense of the word communication—was going to come within the purview of this new department.

One pauses for a moment. One can envisage this department as becoming responsible for being the official voice for the Province of Ontario and I trust that it is going to become an active voice rather than a passive one—as so often was the case in the past—before the CRTC or on, conceivably, a more permanent and satisfactory solution of the educational TV problem that the Prime Minister referred to, certainly the new cable TV. This department can become the official voice of the Province of Ontario before the Canadian Transportation Commission, not only on rail issues in the earlier comments of some of our people in relation to the ONR and the fact that it tends to sort of tag along with what the other railways do, but on everything from negotiations with their workers to freight rates and so on.

This government, I trust, is going to become active rather than passive in its representation, and conceivably within this department, with regard to the inevitable periodic application by Bell for increase in rates. And finally, of course, this government through this department may become the official voice for the Province of Ontario before the Air Transport Board. If you are really going to get into highways to the sky, then get them off the ground. We have fought one election and we have played around with this concept. I am told by my friends from the north—what is it—you have one highway to the sky? One airport?

Mr. Stokes: One that is really operational.

Mr. MacDonald: One that is really operational in three or four years. Now there is "in the fullness of time."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are more than that. There are four highways in the sky, you know—

Mr. Stokes: That has been in operation since before the government even announced the highways-in-the-sky programme.

Mr. MacDonald: It is like the community colleges. The government took existing institutions and put a new label on them, and they were community colleges. Apparently they have a few highways to the sky that have been incorporated in this programme to give it some more substance than the actions of this government would justify.

All I am saying is that I hope that when the minister concludes this debate he will give us at least his concepts of what the communications aspect of his new department is, because we have now moved into a technological age—as the Prime Minister reminded us yesterday, with cable TV and its whole impact in the community, and satellite transmissions—where that department can become one of the major departments of the future.

Indeed it can become a real trouble spot for ministers, as the last Minister of Communications in Ottawa found himself in on some occasions. I do not want to in any sense of hope express that for this minister, but at least it will be interesting to have his clarification as to what he conceives to be the communication aspect of his new department.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the joining of these two departments under one department has infinite possibilities in terms of developing an overall structure for transportation in the province. And in terms of economic development of areas like northeastern Ontario, this department can be one of the key departments in opening up new areas. When we opened Highway 144 last fall, the minister was up there along with several other cabinet ministers and I suggested at that time that we should develop some more

roads in northeastern Ontario—I mentioned one between Timmins and Smooth Rock Falls—and suggested that we should go on up to Moosonee joining Highway 11. The response of the Prime Minister at that time was that while we may not be developing these particular roads that I mentioned, it was clearly the government's intention to come up with an overall policy for transportation in that area and that new roads would be built.

I think the location of the roads will have a significant bearing on the actual development of northeastern Ontario. As it is now, the communities in the northeast are largely tied to Highway 11 as it goes up and Highway 101 as it comes in. If new roads are built then I can see more communities being developed and other resources being utilized for the benefit of the people of the northeast as well as all the province.

I think it is important that the Ontario Northland Railway has been also given to this department. I do not see it mentioned in the bill here, but I understand it is to be delegated to the jurisdiction of this particular minister. I think that if the ONR is extended in certain areas it can become more of a development road for our particular section of the province. I have mentioned before, and others have, that extension of the ONR between Timmins and Foleyet would join Timmins with the main CNR trans-Continental line and should Timmins become a centre for refining zinc concentrates in the country, these could come from the northwest and other parts of the country into Timmins through this line and it could mean quite a strengthening of the economy of that particular area.

I understand plans are afoot to extend the ONR to Parry Sound, so that there will be a link with a Great Lakes port and it could very well be considered the expansion of some of the area around there as to greater docking facilities and so on, so that more cheap transportation could be provided to us in the northeast.

In the Speech from the Throne we were given the assurance once again that the government is considering a study of the prices of rates in northern Ontario and the way they affect the economy of the north. Because of the freight rates the pulp and paper mills of northeastern Ontario are undergoing some difficulty in shipping the paper to markets in the south and to the United States. These industries met with the federal Minister of Transport and the Minister of Lands and Forests in Kapuskasing last fall and presented a brief and discussed this.

I think if this particular study is finally going to get off the ground and we are going to get something from it that it can be of tremendous importance to us in terms of economic development. I hope that the minister who will now have this under his jurisdiction will see to it that this study is not delayed and delayed, but that it is brought in and that action is taken on it so that some of the reasons for disparity that exists in the north can be bridged and that we can begin to develop our own secondary industry much more effectively and that prices of commodities into the north can also be lowered to some degree.

I think a very good case can also be made for either negotiations or some kind of provision for extending the ONR from North Bay to Toronto. At present, even if a good rate can be granted on the ONR, that rate can only pertain as far as North Bay then you would have to go into the freight structures of the CNR and the CPR from there on. Any advantage that the ONR is able to give is nullified by the fact that we have no further rail link with the south. I hope that this particular idea will be pursued.

I think that this department can also be very effective in terms of some kind of movement perhaps into a monorail system to link the north with the south. This may be some years in the future, but I think it is an area for research and study where some of these very high-speed trains could be used to transport passengers from the north to the south. In fact, if there was such a system it would even mean that perhaps the dependence on air travel may not be as great as it is at the present time.

I have followed with interest the discussions that have gone on in this House in terms of the regional air carriers, and the minister has suggested that perhaps Air Canada might be getting out of certain lines. We have been assured in Timmins that Air Canada is supposed to continue the Timmins-Sudbury-Toronto route. If the minister has any information to the contrary about that particular route, I would appreciate it if he would let me know about it. I would hate to think that we are being led down the garden path by Air Canada by the statements that they have given to us.

There has been a committee set up by the Chamber of Commerce and other interested people in our area and they have

made representations to Ottawa and to Air Canada. Perhaps they should have made representation to this government here. They were assured that Air Canada was going to stay in there. They would be very unhappy if they are not.

Perhaps the minister could take a look at that. I think that in terms of joining the northeast with the northwest, a government-operated airline, a GO Ontario Air or a GO Air, might make a lot of sense. It might bring a greater sense of community between the northeast and the northwest whereas at the present time I do not think there is sufficient contact between the peoples of these two areas. It is difficult, in terms of public transportation, getting from the northeast to the northwest.

I would hope that a further look might be taken at the kind of highways that are built in northern Ontario. I was rather concerned the other night to find that a road built from Timmins to the airport which was just completed last year has now got great large cracks in it in certain areas. One realizes that the winter imposes pretty severe conditions on roads in the north, but surely one would think that a new road should be able to last more than six months.

I would hope that this department would do the kind of research necessary to make sure that we are not spending money on roads and then they break up prematurely under us. I think that greater research has got to be done on rebuilding roads already in existence. There is a road in my own particular area—Highway 101—that has been deteriorating for years and years and I have been in contact with the minister about it. He says that it will depend on the allocation of funds. I think that when roads get broken down, after a number of years, there should be almost an on-going programme to reconstruct these particular roads. I would hope that he would take a good look at this whole aspect of it and particularly that Highway 101.

Mention was made by my colleague from Thunder Bay about the roads-to-resources programme, that it is being left in The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs rather than being centralized in this department. I think there might be something to be said that it be considered in The Department of Highways. There is a road in my own riding that joins a new mine called the Texmont Mine that is going into production. It is in a very dilapidated state.

The mine is spending $3 million to develop and go into operation, supposedly on July 1, and yet these two departments, Lands and Forests and Mines and Northern Affairs, have done very little about it. They have commissioned a study by The Department of Highways to find out what necessarily has to be done to bring that road up to some kind of standard so that people can go back and forth.

At present, there is no ploughing of these kinds of roads in the wintertime. It is the responsibility of the mine developer or the forest products man to keep a road like that open. In this particular case, a number of accidents have taken place and—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is still on Bill 24, is he?

Mr. Ferrier: I am on Bill 24. I am suggesting that—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I was not sure.

Mr. Ferrier: I am suggesting that the roads to resources programme might very well be—

Mr. Nixon: He is on Highways estimates.

Mr. Pilkey: Right on.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Highways in the sky.

Mr. Ferrier: —included in this particular bill. I think that The Department of Highways has the personnel and the techniques to see that these kinds of roads are built properly and that they service the area they have. I think that with these remarks I will draw my remarks to a close, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Vote 101 is in order. Spadina Expressway is in order.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to enter the debate? If not, the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am going to find it rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the barrage of advice that I have had over the last hour and a half.

Mr. Nixon: The minister needs all the help he can get.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the minister mean he does not need any?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I think I need a great deal. I do not know if I need it in as repetitive terms or in such volume all at once.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Give us something to work with for the next few months.

Mr. Martel: The minister has got the message.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As the hon. member for Peterborough—

Mr. Speaker: I will help the hon. member for Peterborough. I will not rule him out of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As the hon. member for Peterborough confided a few moments ago, he thought it would likely take me a few days to get this all worked out. I agree with that.

I do not know whether to start at the beginning here or not. I thought the hon. member for Huron-Bruce made some very sensible comments, but then of course he comes from Huron and what else do you expect?

Mr. Gaunt: Hear, hear. Thank you.

Mr. Nixon: We do not consider that his main claim to fame.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would certainly consider it a help to that claim to fame—indeed I do.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The group is operating today all right.

Mr. MacDonald: If we can get over this parochialism, let us get into this mind-expanding department.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A highway in the north.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well. I shall pursue that and I think I understand what concerns the hon. member for Huron-Bruce with respect of rail line abandonments. I suppose I could see, in that context, that the rail lines that have lent themselves to abandonment might have concerned some of the patrons of those rail lines a little earlier than it did, in a good many circumstances, because I would challenge anybody to find anybody riding on them on a day-to-day basis, which must have had some bearing on the decisions that were made.

Mr. Pitman: That is not true about the Peterborough road.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am talking about some other ones with which I am more familiar.

On the other hand, that does not mean that we cannot continue to represent the province in its various areas in that field—

Mr. MacDonald: Let us get out of Huron.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —and I can assure you we will. I made a few observations in the explanatory statement when I introduced this bill that appear to have been overlooked by some. Reference has been made to the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, in what appeared to be at least a dozen times, and I did indicate—it is on page 740, that I said:

> As previously indicated, the new department will be given responsibility for the operation of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission whose services will be incorporated into our comprehensive planning.

It seemed to me that, in general terms, that might have mitigated the various comments and pieces of advice that have been tendered during the last hour and a half or two hours. However, let me speak about the Ontario Northland if I may, for a moment.

Mr. Stokes: Do not talk down to us.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not talking down to the hon. member. I am trying to read my Hansard and I am having a little difficulty.

Mr. Stokes: The minister's remarks are so condescending.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am trying to read my Hansard here. With respect to the Ontario Northland, I just simply say in terms of comment with the members of the House, it does not require any statutory amendments of any kind. It only requires an order-in-council to transfer the Ontario Northland to any department of government. Once this bill is given royal assent the order-in-council will be brought forward and the commission will be transferred to The Department of Transportation and Communications. As a matter of fact, we are working very closely with the chairman of the commission now in anticipation of the day when it will be under the jurisdiction of this department.

We see many things that can be done with the Ontario Northland Railway and we see it as a very effective instrument for communication and development. I agree with those who referred to it as a development railroad. That is exactly what it is, and I think it has performed a useful function up there, but I am not one who believes that that function cannot

be expanded. I see no point, Mr. Speaker in me attempting—

An hon. member: The Minister of Justice does.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —to outline to the House how many of these things can be done, because of course the bill—the bill I am asking approval for in principle here today—has not become law.

An hon. member: Does that disappoint the minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are moving in some of these fields, as I pointed out, and once we are given the approval of this House for the bill that I am presenting to you in principle today, then I hope to provide action along the various lines that have been referred to.

Let me see if I can cover a few other matters. I thought the hon. member for York South, made a good point when he made reference to these things.

Mr. Stokes: He usually does.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He frequently does. He does not alway do this.

Mr. MacDonald: We all have our poor days.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we all have. Some of us have better days than others. I agree.

I am looking down again at the Hansard, if that is all right with the hon. member for Thunder Bay. I am not looking down at anybody. I am looking down so that I can read.

The comment here, and it may not go quite as far as the hon. member for York South had in mind, is a comment, again in my introductory remarks, that the planning and research functions of both departments will be brought together to co-ordinate all our efforts toward improvement in transportation; in the field of traffic safety, for example, we can co-ordinate considerations toward the reduction of road vehicles, driver and passenger hazards. Similarly, in pursuing improvement of air services across the province, the amalgamation will enable close co-ordination of ground transportation requirements which are essential to convenience and efficiency of their services.

I think this is an example of what we mean in terms of research; the research functions as they exist in both departments will be brought together. Hopefully they will become much more sophisticated and hopefully they will be staffed to the extent that the job can be done that is required.

The hon. member for Sudbury East made some observations about discontinuance of trans-Canada train No. 7 and 107, I believe. Well, I must say I could not agree with him more. It is becoming increasingly evident that every move, every manoeuvre that can be made to justify the abandonment of passenger service in Canada is being undertaken by the railroads at this point in time. I can assure you we shall have something to say about these matters; how effective they will be remains to be seen, but we propose to engage ourselves very vigorously in these matters.

The matter of communications, of course, becomes highly important, highly complicated. I would be able to talk about it better in this House this afternoon if a meeting had been held that was scheduled for May 7 with the hon. Mr. Kierans of late and lamentable memory, because we had arranged to discuss the very guts of this particular situation. Certainly those at the federal level were going to indicate to us what their ideas, thoughts and probably intentions were, and we were concerned about some of them. Here again we get back to the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, and in this particular institution we have the facilities for communication, of course, that are second to none in this province. That is one of its great strengths, part and parcel of its ability to carry people and goods. But that has been developed to the point where I would say that the Bell system and other communication systems all have to utilize the facilities of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, and particularly in that area of the province.

I suppose it is worthwhile to remind the hon. members that we still have control under the Ontario telephone authority, or whatever it is now called, and this involves something over, I think, in the order of 150 privately owned, municipally owned telephone systems. These also play a part in the interconnection of telephone services and the transmission of other types of communication. I believe that an order-in-council will follow in due course to transfer that authority to The Department of Transportation and Communications.

Now to get into the very philosophy of communication I have to apologize Mr. Speaker, because at this point in time I admit I am not capable of doing it. It is very complex. We had two or three staff meetings on it to brief me for the meeting that did not take place, but I find that it is complex to the

point where it involves levels of communication much broader than what we have touched upon here. The wire services are one thing, but we have the microwave system, we have coaxial cable systems, and the multiple use of all these things that I think jointly affect both the federal and provincial jurisdictions. But it is my opinion on the basis of a short review that the federal government is much interested in, shall we say, taking over most of the authority for this type of communication. And I say that as a matter of what is apparent fact. I am not saying it critically because we have not reviewed it as yet. But many elements of it on the basis of what we read and what we are told would indicate that they would very much like to assume most of the control over these means of communication.

This is something as was suggested; we propose to watch with much interest and deal with vigorously in those areas that at least have an effect on the province and we think we should reserve to ourselves those areas of the communication field that have a meaning to the province as such. So I will have to ask for your consideration at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, as I hope to become more familiar with this broad complex subject before we get into these matters again.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville asked me about the fate of civil servants. I cannot speak for all of them. I see little or no erosion of their position. I cannot see anyone having a lesser position. As a matter of fact I can see many opportunities in the joint responsibility that will develop that will add preferment to the positions now held by some of the middle-management and senior people.

The responsibilities are going to be very greatly broadened. The departmental structure and the organizational chart is now largely developed for approval by the Treasury Board. Some people will move into areas of higher responsibility, higher remuneration—these are middle-management people at the moment. I cannot see, really, how it is going to affect anybody up and down the line materially whatsoever.

I am going to have some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in touching all the matters that were referred to me. I think I will simply leave it at this. I have explained the matter of the regional air carrier services to the hon. member for Thunder Bay and to the House before as I see them. We are already very actively into the pursuit of appropriate studies and operational studies in that field, as I think I explained to the hon. member some few days ago.

With respect to Timmins and Sudbury service communities, I cannot be positive about that but I think I would suggest to the hon. member for Cochrane South that he not bet on the fact that those communities will lose their services at a point in time. Certainly many others will—at least they will not lose the service, but Air Canada will pull out and it will become necessary for someone else to service them. Then of course, there are the third-level services that I discussed with the hon. member for Thunder Bay just a few days ago. We are active in this field in terms of a demonstration project that will lead us to certain conclusions as how to best serve the smaller communities, not only in the north but in the southwestern and southeastern parts of the province. That demonstration project that I mentioned the other day will start in September, we hope.

Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up the substance of this bill and I repeat now, as I did before, although it presumably was in order to range over certain matters related to the bill, actually this bill in precise terms just grants the authority to merge the two departments and the operating Acts will come under the operating umbrella of one bill rather than two. I am talking about, as I mentioned before, The Highway Improvement Act, The Highway Transport Act—there are many others—The Local Roads Boards Act, if you will—you will be familiar with those, if you come from the north. The Statute Labour Act, and quite a range of parts of other Acts will come under the umbrella of this one bill and the department that is formed.

Mr. Stokes: What about transportation studies?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Transportation studies will all be under this one umbrella now. We will combine the research and study forces of both departments in this field. I cannot say where that stands at the moment but I can only tell the hon. member that before even we have the legislative authority to create this new department much of the work is being vigorously done in any case.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the hon. minister wishes to introduce an amendment the bill will then stand referred to Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I ask that you call item 11 for third reading.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 36, An Act to amend The Expropriations Act, 1968-1969.

Clerk of the House: The third order, Committee of the Whole House; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT, 1968

Mr. Chairman: House in committee on Bill 2, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Act.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill, and if so, which one first?

The member for Lakeshore, on which section?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The first section, Mr. Chairman.

On section 1:

Mr. Lawlor: The business about striking out the word "indictable" and allowing "summary conviction offences, allowing accused persons, or person accused of such an offence to be brought back into Ontario."

I said in principle, and return at the moment that it ought to be used not grudgingly but gingerly, because of the public expense involved over offences which have not got the weight or the substance named, generally speaking, of other offences. And I thought I heard the minister disagree with me rather savaging—not savagely, but savaging—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): No, no.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister did. He took umbrage and he furrowed his brow and he did a little dance over there and then he said: "Oh, no. We certainly intend to make extensive use of that particular section.

Well, I return to it, and I think the minister ought not to—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I said it was of great importance.

Mr. Lawlor: That is my recollection, during second reading, as to what your reaction to those remarks were. I could be wrong. Maybe the minister was hustled that day and a little perturbed about things happening in other parts of the world, or something like that. But certainly what I have to say on the matter—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Was that the day after the dinner at the Albany Club?

Mr. Lawlor: That was probably some—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I think it was the day before.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, because that would explain it.

Mr. Lawlor: The only question I really have is, just what does the minister mean? How extensively does he contemplate that this section will be used in bringing people back, say, from British Columbia or from other parts of the world? I suppose most of the offences that would follow would not be extradictable to begin with, and I think the minister's compass with which he is operating would largely be within this country. In other words, I think the public is entitled to a greater definition as to precisely what the minister proposes to do under this section.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, as I think I indicated on second reading, we feel it is of rather great importance in a number of types of cases relating to provincial statutes, but obviously only where there would be some great injustice occasionally if the witnesses, or the people concerned, were not brought back; and coupled with that, of course, in cases where it is pretty obvious that they would not come back of their own free will simply because of the financial considerations involved.

I can imagine the number of types of cases, as I thought I indicated, arising in respect of motor accidents, in cases of offences under The Juvenile Delinquents Act, for instance.

Mr. Lawlor: Would the minister bring somebody back for careless driving?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, they would have to be pretty serious.

An hon. member: What is the principle of the Act then?

Mr. Lawlor: It is a most serious offence, is it not, under The Highway Traffic Act?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, no. There can be—

Mr. Lawlor: Leaving the scene of an accident?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, no, manslaughter, some of those things. Those connected with deserted wives, The Children's Maintenance Act and other provincial legislation. I do not think we are going to start writing blank cheques, of course. If nothing else, I do not think the Treasurer would permit it. But apart from that it is not our intention to use this in any extensive way, but we do feel that it is important that the discretion be there and at the moment it is not. There have been cases of injustice. Some of them, I am sure, are known to my friend, where the wheels of justice were not ground out in the proper way simply because discretion was not there.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I am always willing and anxious to learn, even on matters which seem to be only grammatical. Would the minister give me a little pedagogy in terms of statutory construction or the problems of drafting as to why he feels it is necessary to shove in the words, "under any Act," when, for my cursory or even profound reading of the existing section, it is quite adequate. I do not see anything wrong with it at all. That particular piece of gymnastics the minister is performing here may, like a magician, make the rabbits disappear or reappear, but is that what the purpose of legislation is?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am not going to get stuck on the end of any spear in relation to the draftsmanship of it. That is a pretty specialized branch of the law. I am having enough trouble mastering other aspects, without that. The principle of the bill is the one that I think I should worry about. If my friend has any great difficulty with the actual wording, well, of course, we will take that up. But the principle here is simply that we want—we are dealing now with section 2—to permit the fees payable in the whole of the administration of justice under one statute. That is all. Presumably those words, "under any Act for the administration of justice and prescribing the amounts thereof or authorized under any Act to be done by any person," mean exactly that. What other explanation is there? Am I grasping the point the member is making, or not?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): The hon. member for Lakeshore should throw in a little Shakespeare.

Mr. Lawlor: "What is a man, if his chief good and market of his time be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more."

That is kind of off the subject, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: I will not labour the matter unduly. I just thought the minister might take me up to present some kind of rational argument as to why he goes to the trouble of changing statutes and bringing the stuff before the House. He has added wording to the existing statute, which I think is pleonastic, redundant, and many other words you can think of in this context. Then he stands up and says he is not an expert draftsman, he just does what he is told. But he does not come here with any kind of *apologia pro vita sua*. His life is an open book. There is nothing about his legislation that calls any question. It is such a small point that I hate to make such a long speech, but if he would answer it, we would get it over with.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, the member does not. He loves it and he knows it.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 2 reported.

JURORS ACT

House in committee on Bill 5, The Jurors Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 5, An Act to amend The Jurors Act. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill?

I believe the hon. minister has an amendment to section 1.

On section 1:

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have an amendment to section 1. I move that section 1 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Paragraph 14 of subsection 1 of section 3 of The Jurors Act is amended by inserting after "chemist" in the second line, "drugless practitioner optometrist," so that the paragraph shall read as follows:

14. Every physician, surgeon, dental surgeon, pharmaceutical chemist, drugless practitioner, optometrist and veterinary surgeon actually practising.

In effect, my amendment here and the purpose of section 1 will be not only to insert the words "drugless practitioner," but also the word "optometrist."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Drugless practitioner, comma, optometrist?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Hon A. F. Lawrence moves that section 1 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Section 1, paragraph 14 of subsection 1 of section 3 of The Jurors Act is amended by inserting after "chemist" in the second line, "drugless practitioner, optometrist," so that the paragraph shall read as follows:

Every physician, surgeon, dental surgeon, pharmaceutical chemist, drugless practitioner, optometrist and veterinary surgeon actually practising.

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I really do take severe exception to this particular kind of thing, Mr. Chairman. If you are going to remove optometrists from being jurors in cases before the bars of Ontario, just who is going to look into these matters?

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions, or amendments to any other section of this bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2, Mr. Chairman.

On section 2:

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, this is a real piece of legerdemain. The prestidigitator, that is what I called the minister over there. Blackbeard, the magician, has pulled it off again. It almost pains me this afternoon to have to come here. That section the minister is repealing, you know, says that the justice of the peace used to get, before he repealed it, $5 for the release of each juror summoned before a hearing. That is a marvellous piece of work that the minister performed. Then in the next two sections he has done pretty much the same thing.

We have said in second reading that the justice of the peace ought not to be paid in this way at all, by McRuer's mandate ad nostrum, nor should it be be the minister's. But he picks up $5 for every person released. So the minister repeals it, and says that he agrees with Lawlor and he agrees with McRuer and he agrees with all great figures in contemporary western civilization, Toynbee or whoever. But what does he do?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: What on earth does the minister do but he restores it in the next following paragraph. He takes it out and he puts it back in again. That is what I call real legislative draftsmanship.

Mr. Randall: How did nostrum get in there?

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill? If not shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

On Section 3:

Mr. Lawlor: Well, how about 3? I am sorry, just one more remark on 3, Mr. Chairman. I must have missed you. You go with such lightning-like rapidity.

The second one says the justice of the peace got $5 for ever juror drafted. We are into the draft now. He strikes that one out and, again, he immediately turns around and puts it back in again.

Section 3 agreed to.

Bill 5, as amended, reported.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to sections 1 to 3 of the bill?

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated on second reading, I move section 4

of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) This Act except section 1 comes into force on the day it receives royal assent.

(2) Section 1 comes into force on the first day of October, 1971.

As I indicated on second reading, sir, this is required, I am now informed, so that the uniform ticket amendments can come into force on a specified date, namely October 1, which will permit time for printing and distribution of the tickets reflecting those amendments.

Mr. Chairman Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves that section 4 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor.

(1) This Act except section 1 comes into force on the day it receives royal assent.

(2) Section 1 comes into force on the first day of October, 1971.

Shall the amendment carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments to this bill? If not, shall the bill as amended be reported?

Bill 7, amended, reported.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves that the committee rise and report one bill without amendment and two bills with amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports one bill without amendment and two bills with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Act, 1968.

Bill 5, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Five per cent civil service salary increase guideline, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1424

Government policy re layoffs of teachers in community colleges, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1424

Government policy re layoffs of teachers in community colleges, statement by Mr. Welch 1424

Government policy re layoffs of teachers in community colleges, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Deans 1426

Preparations for federal-provincial conference in Victoria, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1428

Cleaning up mercury pollution in Lake St. Clair area, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Singer 1428

Instructions to prisoners how to apply for bail, questions to Mr. Apps, Mr. J. Renwick 1430

Policy re high school teachers taking over jobs as junior forest rangers, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Jackson 1431

Administration of justice facilities in Sudbury, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha 1431

Resolution requesting voting age in municipal elections be lowered to 18, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Knight 1431

Danger of certain types of firecrackers bought by children, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Young 1432

Amendments to Criminal Code re off-track betting, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Bullbrook 1432

Code of minimum standards for police vehicles, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. B. Newman 1432

Request of Retail Gas Association for arbitrator, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. MacDonald 1433

Pension of Metro Police force tied to 4 per cent interest-bearing rate, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Good 1433

Meeting with labour council re hospital bed shortages in Sudbury, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Martel 1433

Condition of Port Dover lift bridge, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt 1434

Tabling salaries paid to top officials in certain commissions, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Deans 1434

Pursuit and slaughter of wild animals from vehicles, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Burr 1434

Adjustment to social and family allowances, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Gisborn 1434

Waterloo townships whose education costs rose by further 20 per cent, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Good 1435

Employing university students as bar assistants in hotels, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Innes 1435

Administrative costs for OHSIP as administered by government and by agents, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier 1435

Investigation re substitute for tire studs, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Good, Mr. MacDonald 1435

Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading 1436

Expropriations Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading 1442

Department of Highways and Department of Transport, bill to amalgamate, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 1446

Third readings 1465

Administration of Justice Act, 1968, bill to amend, reported 1465

Jurors Act, bill to amend, reported 1466

Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, reported 1467

Third readings 1468

Recess, 6 o'clock 1468

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 35

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in Committee of Supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(continued)

On vote 1102:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose last, we were starting item 5 on 1102.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned yesterday on this topic, several of us had something more to say about the land branch.

First of all, I want to suggest to the minister (Mr. Brunelle), Mr. Chairman, that in connection with his recent announcement with respect to the termination of sales of Crown property, and the institution of a new policy on leasing—well, we got the termination of sales which is a nod in the direction of the problem of American ownership of our Crown lands, but unfortunately we did not get a leasing policy.

We now, as I see it, have a vacuum. We are refusing sales, but we are not generating leases. The first question I want to ask the minister is how long will it be before we get a formal arrangement with respect to the leasing of cottage properties?

The minister may say that he has a policy, but in the area that I am familiar with there certainly is a vacuum. There are several situations where commitments were entered into on behalf of potential purchasers, even to the point of having a date for a public auction. Of course, that is out for the time being, so what takes its place? Nothing, so the people who are in a position to buy cottage properties now do not know where they are at.

I would like to invite the minister's comments with respect to the length of time that he expects to lapse before these people can at least be given some idea as to whether, for instance, they get any pref rence with respect to leasing. And in situations where there was a price more or less laid down and commitments entered into, how soon will they know whether in fact they get the property at all under any arrangement?

This is a very disturbing thing because, you know, I know of several—in fact 20—different parties who have put the money together and entered into a road-building arrangement and had something of a commitment from the department in respect to the possibility of purchasing. Now, of course, they are nowhere until they get a leasing policy.

I would like the minister to expand on what, if any, policy is proposed, and how soon there will be a policy with respect to leasing arrangements, as opposed to purchasing arrangements.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, I think maybe the member for Algoma-Manitoulin was out of the House when I replied to a similar question. I said that in the very near future we would announce the new regulations about the leasing of cottage lands.

The regulations in The Public Lands Act will have to be amended. We are in the process of doing this and I would hope, that some time before the end of this month the details of the new regulations will be made known—the length of the lease, the terms, and all other conditions that people would be interested in.

Mr. Farquhar: There is just one thing that I will add to that, Mr. Chairman. Does the minister realize that this is the spring of 1971? People who have had certain commitments made to them by the department, and negotiations entered into, and certain dates laid down, are now in a situation where they do not know whether in 1971, for instance, there is any possibility that they will be able to get to work on these properties or not.

Is the minister saying that during the next few weeks—a very few weeks—that this is possible? That the people will be able to do business with the department on a leasing

basis? Or is this another one of those, you know, 12 months or a-year-from-now deals?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member that the terms and all the conditions have been decided upon and the mechanics are in process to amend the regulations of The Public Lands Act. Again, I would like to repeat, I hope, before the end of this month that this will be made public.

Mr. Farquhar: I realize that the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) dealt wth it and that I missed part of that debate, but it becomes very important. One wonders, I must say, that when a decision is made and a public announcement is made with respect to the termination of arrangements for sale of property, why, at that particular point in time, there would not have been an alternative arrangement laid down with respect to leasing. I see no reason why there should have been this vacuum. However, I will accept what the minister has to say about that.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, with regard to that—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: If the minister indicates that the terms and conditions have been laid down and that they will be made under regulations so that we will not have any opportunity to comment on this, perhaps he could make the terms and conditions known now during the estimates of the department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I can give the member the broad terms as announced in the Speech from the Throne. Canadians will be given preference. It will be a long-term lease. We have had a lot of experience in the past. We have been selling cottage lots for 20 or 30 years, so the building requirements will be quite similar. By the building requirements in the sale of cottage lots, one had to put up a building within three years at a minimum of $1,800. It could well be that this was instituted, maybe about four or five years ago. It could well be this minimum requirement of $1,800 could be increased to maybe $2,000 or $2,500 or some amount that would keep in line with the escalating costs of the dollar.

I think at this time this is about all I can say. The leases, I am sure, will meet the needs of the people. They will be long-term leases and based on existing regulations concerning the sales.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, just one other question. What will the length of the lease likely be?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. R. S. Smith: What will the length of the lease be, and will the lease be transferable from one person to another?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I just told the member that it will be a long-term lease. I think at this time, Mr. Chairman, that this is about all I can say. It will be a long-term lease.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How long is a long term?

Mr. R. S. Smith: "Long-term" can mean almost anything.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What would the member's definition of "long-term" be?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh, about 40 years.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A lawyer's definition would be 99 years.

Mr. Singer: Or 999.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The lawyer's definition may be 99 years; perhaps mine might be 40 years.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): What is the minister's? That is the important thing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He is the one who is setting the regulations and perhaps he should tell us.

The second question—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We will in due course of time.

Mr. Sopha: Do not give us that phrase "in the fullness of time."

An hon. member: We have been wrestling with this for months.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We just announced this. This was only announced, Mr. Chairman, in the—

Mr. Pitman: Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —Throne Speech on March 30.

Mr. Singer: This is May 11, 42 days later.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would hope, when I said the end of the month, it could well be within a week that we could have these regulations. We will have them out as soon as it is possible to do so.

Mr. Singer: What is delaying it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is a certain—the hon. member for Downsview is familiar with regulations.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The minister has to iron out the details.

Mr. R. S. Smith: All he has to do is just make up his mind.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our mind is made up.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): We can see that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: If the minister's mind is made up, would he mind letting the Legislature know what it is? I think, since it is going to be done under regulations we will not have an opportunity to discuss, perhaps it might be best if he let us know now.

Secondary to that, will the lease be transferable from one person to another, or from one heir to another? What general regulations will be set? I think it is only fair that he let us know. In the last four days we have come to a point when the minister did not know when it would be released. Now it is going to be a matter of a few weeks and perhaps a matter of a week. If we keep it up we might even get it out of him tonight.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we have been leasing cottage lots for the last 30 to 40 years. I believe we have probably over 500 leases for cottage lots, in Algonquin Park, Rondeau, Killarney and other areas—

Mr. R. S. Smith: But you are trying to recall all those leases.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: All with the approval of the lessees. These future leases will be in the length—the terms will be more generous than the previous ones.

Mr. Haggerty: What do you mean, more generous?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the length of time.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow this along. Why is the minister allowing leases to come under The Land Titles Act? I mean, you are almost guaranteeing ownership under The Land Titles Act.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): No.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These leases, I believe, will be under The Public Lands Act.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is why, at the present time, sales of land come under The Public Lands Act. The regulations will be amended whereby we will be able—the regulations will enable us to lease instead of sell.

Mr. Haggerty: But the minister is well aware that he is giving leases under The Land Titles Act on Lake Erie. Now I draw to his attention the lease agreement between the Buffalo yacht club and this department. It is under The Land Titles Act, which guarantees them ownership in a sense.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Bail him out. Will the member for Downsview please bail him out?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! There are a number of members who wish to speak, but before we continue I wonder if the Chairman might give a welcome to the members of the Downsview Liberal Association in the east gallery.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Welland South continue his questions.

Mr. Haggerty: Could the minister inform me how many agreements he has under The Land Titles Act at the present time, in leases?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That information—

Mr. Farquhar: Is the minister going to answer?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Singer: He is being advised.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I am. I am not a lawyer like the member.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But I must say I do not think my legal advice here answers this question. The member wants to know why leases come under The Public Lands Act.

Mr. Haggerty: The Land Titles Act. That is the point I want to know. Why is the minister allowing it to come under The Land

Titles Act? The point I am trying to make to him here is he is actually giving title to the land, and getting around the business of giving them a lease. He is giving ownership to them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, he is.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the ownership is being retained in the Crown. These will be long-term leases and at the end, the expiry, they will have a renewal clause. At the expiry, if the land is not needed for public use, it will be possible for the lessee to obtain a further renewal, but the ownership will remain in the Crown.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Algoma-Manitoulin was, I think, pursuing the—

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Chairman, I will just make one more point. I ask the minister, following up on what I said previously, if he will put himself in the position of a potential purchaser; that is all I ask him to do. Over the period of two years I know of many people who have entered into something of a commitment with the department with respect to the purchase of property on Crown lands on shore lots.

Something like a month ago when they read the Speech from the Throne, they found that they are not any longer going to be able to purchase, but that there is a new leasing policy.

In fact, there is no leasing policy. That is the problem. All he has to do is think about a family that I know very well, as a specific instance, think about a family that has a retarded child, that has been waiting years to try to get this particular piece of property. They have a commitment from the department with respect to the purchase—and I will put a $600 figure on it—with respect to the purchase of this property; a commitment even to the point that they knew the date when the property would be available and now, of course, under the new arrangement, they do not know whether they will get it at all or not after this amount of time.

All I am asking is that as soon as possible we get a leasing policy. I still am at a loss to understand why, when an announcement is made with respect to the cancellation of the purchase arrangements, a leasing policy did not take effect that day. That is what I am asking. Why does there need to be this vacuum?

Mr. Singer: That is a pretty obvious question.

Mr. Farquhar: The only reason I can see is that the Speech from the Throne came along and you know you just had not done your homework, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge most sales of cottage lots—that is, in the procedure we have been adopting in the past, most of those sales—were taking place in the end of May and during the month of June—in the summer months—and we will be ready at the end of this month and during the month of June to lease our cottages. If the hon. member has a case—where he feels that this family is concerned—if he would bring it to my attention I would be pleased to look into it and maybe we can sort of assure these people that they will be getting a reply.

Mr. Farquhar: I am just delighted to have that comment. I must say to the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the case is well documented at the appropriate level of his department and I will bring it to his attention. But it is not the only one. It is just an instance, but a very important instance, and I just simply use it as a specific to bring the importance of the matter to his attention. That is all, and I would hope that in rounding up the policy enunciated in the Speech from the Throne there would have been an alternative policy to take effect immediately. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough and then the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you very much. I wonder if I could just chat with the minister for a few moments on a number of other areas that I think are extremely important.

Over the past year and a half we have had, you might say, before us, the Toronto-centred region plan—at least the Toronto-centred region concept, which very quickly hardened into a plan, at least insofar as the Budget Speech was concerned a few weeks ago.

Obviously one of the things which I think is extremely lacking in the minister's department and is lacking in this entire government, not just this minister, is some concept of future recreation needs in this province. The present situation, for example, where you have over 100 parks, but only two of them, I think,

within 50 miles of Toronto is, in my opinion, symbolic of the lack of interest which this department and this government has had in the whole area of recreation.

One only has to remind the minister that it seems to me we have been wandering through all kinds of problems in relation to recreation, whether it is Algonquin Park, or Quetico Park and so on. One of the things that really bothers me very much, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that I see in the Toronto-centred region no clear concept of what recreation means to the Province of Ontario, especially as it relates to the minister's department.

In this green-belt area, in this area which you have beyond the green belt, the zone 3 area, which has been designated as recreational, there are virtually hundreds of thousands of square miles which have been zoned recreational. What I really want to know is to what extent the minister's department is concerned in the long-term plan, when this long-term plan is going to be known, when the financing of this plan is going to be known—because it seems to me there are a great many people plodding around in this zone.

For example, as the minister well knows, in the Trent Valley you have the whole Rideau-Trent system, now being designated by the federal government as a park area. To what extent is the province involved in that particular prospect? When will the municipalities know what is going to happen in relation to that land?

In the area that I represent there are only two provincial, well, two major provincial parks, and one minor provincial park, and none of them very large and yet this is an area which is supposed to be recreational. You can imagine the degree of concern, as well, over the whole question of the financing of this development. Are the people in the area expected to finance the recreation needs of 54 per cent of the people of Ontario who are going to be gathered and be concentrated in the Toronto-centred region?

I think that before this thing hardens any further—and believe me, there are a great many people across the Province of Ontario who are very concerned with the swiftness with which it has hardened before there has been any real opportunity for any kind of dialogue with the people—I might just quote the Peterborough area where, for example, suddenly we found ourselves in the Toronto-centred region. We were not even in the MTARTS plan and suddenly we were in the Toronto-centred region.

There have been no open meetings, there has been no real dialogue, there has been no attempt to find out what the people in that area feel about this Toronto-centred region plan. One of the areas of the greatest concern is the fact that it has been designated recreation without any indication—except that we are not going to get very much industry from now on—of this province's plans in relation to recreation, to how much parkland there is going to be, how it is going to be financed, the degree that transportation is going to be tied in to bring people into this area.

I would ask as well, what does the minister expect to do with the area, the green belt, the area that is zoned around this massive concentration of people? What is the plan for getting people out of this area into those parks? Has the minister any idea, for example, of using GO buses during the weekend to take people who do not have cars?

Is there any kind of a thrust—which one might call a social justice thrust—in relation to this department? Because, as you really know—the minister must know this—these parks essentially serve the well-to-do in Ontario. They are essentially public money spent for the well-to-do people, and I am wondering whether he is going to get his public parks closer to the large cities and then provide public access for getting to those parks? This is the kind of thing I want to see.

I see no recreation policy whatsoever coming from the minister's department, and I want to know to what extent he can provide that plan and when he will be able to tell us, along with other developments in the Toronto-centred region, when he will be able to give us the plan for park development in the zone 2 and the zone 3 in a very definite way, because I think that is paramount before any further development takes place in relation to this so-called concept or plan.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to say to the hon. member that we are giving a lot of attention to the recreational plan for this very important area, where an urban population is increasing and where there are a large number of ethnic people who want recreation within a very close distance. We have nine areas which have been selected as most suitable for a large number of people, and it is intended at each area that there would be available to the public a wide selection of recreational activities, and these activities

would be the sort of activities that often are not found in our regular provincial park plan.

All would be planned for very intensive use of the people and mainly for day use. It is contemplated that with the proximity to Toronto and the resulting low cost of access, I would hope that we would have some sort of means of rapid transportation to look after those—the member I think referred to low-salaried groups—and this would sort of look after the people in that class and especially those people of ethnic origin who are looking for these types of facilities.

In addition to these areas a major programme is planned within zone 2, whereby the opportunity for angling and the hunting of upland birds will be increased. Again, many Europeans are looking for this type of public hunting and we have to provide it within reasonable distance of Toronto.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might just ask a question of the minister: Are all these nine areas within zone 2 around the Toronto-centred region plan?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the area between Halton and Ontario counties.

Mr. Pitman: Well, may I then ask, is the minister already gathering land in these nine areas? Is the minister selecting land and preparing to move in and hold that land? Is it now, for example, zoned for recreation use only? The value of that land is going to rise very quickly.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. Mr. Chairman, we have selected the areas. I believe, though, there are many which are not acquired. We are hoping that as a result of the announcement by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) of the land acquisition programme—a $20 million fund—we will be able to use some of that money, because this concept will take a few years. We will start as soon as we can, but it will take a few years to implement, so we are selecting those areas and reserving them and developing them on a priority basis.

Mr. Pitman: Could the minister give an indication of how much land he is actually going to be able to gather? Is there any plan for zone 3, which has been labelled recreation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Zone 3. That is the area going toward Lake Simcoe, is it?

Mr. Pitman: Yes; it goes right across Lake Simcoe and all the way up through Peterborough. The Kawartha Lakes are in that zone 3. That is the area that is zoned for recreation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member, I think, referred also to this. We have this committee, the Rideau-Trent-Severn canal system of recreational waterways.

Mr. Pitman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This, also, as the hon. member knows, is a most interesting concept.

Mr. Pitman: Yes; but to what extent is this minister's department involved in it and to what extent is the federal government going to pay the money? The problem is that we are all interested in it, but no one seems to be paying any money for it. A lot of people are sitting up there with a lot of land not knowing what they can do with it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say at this time, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this has been really resolved as far as the waterway goes, as to who will be purchasing which plan. There are, I believe, close to 90 agencies involved, various departments, both federal and provincial.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, but it seems to me—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our department is only a member of this—

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Cranston, who is chairman of the Ontario Economic Council, seemed to be the mainspring in this whole business, and it seems to have gone into limbo. There appeared to be a great deal of interest, both provincial and federal. I would expect there is some kind of discussion going on, some kind of continuing activity in relation to this land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, there is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask the minister when we are going to get somewhere with it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I do not know. I cannot give the member a definite answer as to when, because our department is only a member of this committee.

Mr. Pitman: Is that the only responsibility the department has with zone 3 recreational area? Just that Trent waterway business?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No; I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman. I am saying we are a member of the Trent-Rideau-Severn waterway study.

Mr. Pitman: What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, and I will not take any more time of the House than is necessary, is that zone 3 in the Toronto-centred region plan is designated as recreational. Zone 2 is the green belt. It is rather indefinitely designated land that seems to be in limbo outside the concentration of the Toronto-centred region. We discover now that the minister has nine areas of land gathered. He will have nine areas of land gathered for a very wide spectrum of recreational activity in the green-belt area close to the urban centres, and I am very pleased to hear this. I am very pleased to hear that they are thinking in terms of public transit. I am very pleased to hear that we are going to get a far greater variety of recreational opportunities in this area. But what are his plans for zone 3, which is the area designated as recreational for the Province of Ontario in that Toronto-centred region plan?

Mr. Sopha: That is the question he asked you about half an hour ago.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member that we have done quite a bit. I would be glad to send him our latest issue of the Ontario Provincial Parks plan. A new park opened this year, the McCrae Provincial Park, a very nice park and with maybe 300 campsites. This is in the area that you are—

Mr. Sopha: Have you got a photograph of that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —referring to, and there are several other parks in this area, Mr. Chairman, as well as a lot of access points and also parks under the conservation authorities.

Mr. Singer: Are you any the wiser now?

Mr. Pitman: I do not want to hold back the member for Sudbury but the point is this: You have parks there, they are not very large, like Serpent Mounds park, and you have another park going up toward Lindsay; you have several small parks there. They are all overcrowded, every weekend now. Through the Toronto-centred region plan you have designated this whole zone free for recreation. You have no plans except a very vague commitment to the Trent waterway, which is largely a federally initiated scheme. You have no plans then, really, in that zone 3 for any degree of expansion of opportunities for recreation. That seems to be the message that I am getting on this side of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: The views of my friend from Peterborough are invariably refreshing, stimulating, and of course these matters are very important to the people of Peterborough. They are important to us, too, because—I had not intended to say; but—the very devastating thought comes to mind that I have had the feeling these last 10 years that this government is actively working on a policy that will create an urban megalopolis which will stretch at least from Fort Erie to Oshawa to Barrie, and intends it to be the centre of industrial activity in this province and to use and consume the natural resources that we produce in northern Ontario.

I used to decry the fact, with much more vigour than I do in recent years, that we did not have a lot of secondary industry in northern Ontario. Now my feelings are becoming less acerbic on that score because perhaps I begin to have a glimmer of our true mission and that is to provide recreational areas for the frustrations, anxieties, irritations, inconveniences, disabilities of those unfortunate people who will have to live in the megalopolis; and we will provide the area where they can come up every three months or so to get a few lungs full of fresh air—

Mr. Haggerty: How right you are.

Mr. Sopha: —and engage in some restoring, some soul- and body-restoring activity up there.

I think perhaps that is the true role that we will play in the life of this the banner province of the nation—which distracts me from my main theme. I wanted to get back to this business of Crown lands from which the member for Peterborough momentarily distracted us.

My friend from Algoma-Manitoulin of course is perfectly right when he draws the attention of the minister to the fact that there is a vacuum in respect to the leasing policy of the government. But I always look on the best side of things and the Speech from the Throne had to say something. There had to be something in it, an otherwise colourless, dispirited document, and at

the last minute the new Davis government decided to adopt my policy of refusing to alienate Crown land.

Now I only have the pages of Hansard and I would defy the researcher to look back to seven years ago when I first raised this matter that we should begin a leasing policy. I did not have a friend or supporter in the House, not one. I suffered the ire of successive Ministers of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Stokes: What are you talking about? The former member for Beaches-Woodbine mentioned it years ago.

Mr. Sopha: What is his name—now, just a moment. The big noise from Schreiber—just a moment.

Mr. Stokes: The former member for Beaches-Woodbine mentioned it before you ever thought of it.

Mr. Sopha: Look, I was raising this before you were elected.

Mr. Stokes: You have a monopoly on all the wisdom in this House.

Mr. Sopha: Your slurs and your scurrility are as nothing compared to the ire that used to be inflicted upon me by the late Kelso Roberts about this.

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: And he thought that I was some kind of a Marxist.

Mr. J. Renwick: Or by the late member for Woodbine.

Mr. Sopha: I was a Marxist for raising this. Now, I want to share some of the credit and one cannot be terribly fastidious in an election year, you know. One must seize the opportunity in otherwise barren times where the ire of the elected might turn on me. One has to point to these things. But I would really like to know whether any other land-use recreational committee included in its minutes this recommendation of surcease on the alienation of Crown land other than the one at Sudbury.

Mr. Stokes: The hon. member can be sure that it has.

Mr. Sopha: Because we did, on a number of occasions. I do not know whether the minister ever sees the minutes of the land-use recreational committee, but I think it is not telling tales out of school to say that the idea of making this recommendation to the minister certainly had the sympathetic support of Keith Atcheson, latterly assistant deputy minister; George Hamilton, sometime district forester at Sudbury; and George McCormack, until recently district forester at Sudbury. Those senior civil servants in charge of the local operation indicated that several years ago they were sympathetic to a change in the policy.

The difficulty of Lands and Forests, as it always seems, is at head office, which has not exactly the sponge-like qualities of sopping up good ideas. The fatal disability of this department, of course, is that there are too many of the senior staff south of Bracebridge. There are too many of them, as I have said in the past on many occasions, inhabiting the tall buildings next door where, in their minds, they forget what a tree looks like. They forget the great vista of the out-of-doors. They are unmindful and oblivious of the heritage of Ontario that exists up north of the French River.

But that is a disability that we will remove as we put into effect our policy of decentralization of government and this department, of course, is the very first priority. It is at the top of the heap. This is the one that should have its head offices at Sudbury, if the members will forgive me. That is where—

Mr. Stokes: The member has no trees in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: That is where the decision-making process should be made.

I will confess to the members there would be little point to these remarks if I did not venture on to a new frontier. I have always believed, I will have to say in parenthesis, that whereas—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): It is like getting back on the estimates.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. Our American visitors were always terribly welcome here to spend their dollars with us. We are a hospitable people, but I never believed that they had the right to own part of the season, to own part of the freehold of Canada. They never had that right. They are entitled to enjoy the great benefits of our out-of-doors but I want to venture on to a new frontier. I want to say that in the next decade to those who are here, those of our number who are here, I daresay that the whole question of land holding, the whole rubric of land holding will occupy the thoughts and attention of legislators.

We will begin to make a close scrutiny of it and we will begin to wonder about such things as whether those who hold land which has inculcated in its socially created value—value created by society—have the moral right to hold the rest of society up to ransom. Ransom! That is what it amounts to. The price! The price—

Mr. Gisborn: Get the attention of the minister. He is the one the member is after.

Mr. Sopha: —they demand! We will begin to scrutinize that. This is only the first step. We ought to be thankful—before I sit down—we ought to be thankful that British common law gives us, as a legacy, a different philosophy of land holding from that held by our cousins to the south. Under our system, land is held by the Crown; held by the licence of the Crown and the residuary right to land under our philosophy of jurisprudence resides in the Crown. The Crown always has the right to come back and take the land.

The Americans, on the other hand, the point to contrast, believe in the holding of land as an inalienable human right, which is vastly different. That is the continental legacy that bedevils them. This whole question will have to come under review, not only in respect of the Crown lands of which in many places we have to be ashamed as Canadians, as residents of this province, of the history of prodigality that we have endowed upon those lands.

We have been extremely wasteful. The son who went away with that which his father gave him never wasted it with more profligacy than we have wasted our Crown land in this province. If you believe in redemption—I look at my friend from Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) who smiles benignly upon me—if you believe in redemption, we have a long way to go to restore ourselves to good offices in respect of the Crown land.

Unfortunately, tonight, as I look at my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin, the minister seems to be in the position that the Premier (Mr. Davis) sloughed on to him a policy that he wrote into the Speech from the Throne, and he has been trying to grapple with it ever since. He is trying very frenetically to come up with some sort of policy and no doubt the senior civil servants are burning the midnight oil. I am never at a loss to give a suggestion and I want to make a suggestion. I would be disappointed if the lease that he grants was for any longer than 20 years. For 20 years.

Mr. Stokes: For 21.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Any rights for renewal?

Mr. Sopha: Twenty years would be quite adequate—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who would build anything for 20 years?

Mr. Sopha: —quite adequate, with an option. As I said several years ago—I am like the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), I do not go back and read my old speeches—but I could go back and point out where I said there ought to be an option for renewal, if society does not need it. But it is the 20-year reassessment of society's interest in it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What kind of a cottage will you get built?

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

An hon. member: Where is your cottage?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I would think that after 20 years amortization—is that the word the real estate people use?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Sounds good.

Mr. Sopha: —after 20 years amortization it would have to be a very elaborate, grandiose cottage not to pay for itself in 20 years. You know, in the north we do not call them cottages. That is a southern and city word. They are called camps. And I think of the many that I know in our area and 20 years would be quite adequate.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is a plain, unadorned word from what he usually uses.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is changing.

Mr. Sopha: But here is the point—and I am always interested in what the hon. gentleman from Sault Ste. Marie says—here is the point, that we assure the owner that at the end of 20 years if society does not need that land he will be assured of a further 20-year lease. It is only a reappraisal. It is a reappraisal of society's interest in it and nothing more.

All right. One other thing I want to say, and again I want to relate to the pioneering. The aspect in that is that I have raised the question of a national park many times in this House and I have told the story—and I ask the members of this House to hear it again—I told the story about Mr. Pearson almost persuading them to give the land. I mean this department—he almost persuaded them to give the

land. It was a great mistake of Confederation, you know, that the Crown lands were left exclusively with the provinces. It was a great mistake. However, we have to live with it.

Mr. Farquhar: How close he came.

Mr. Sopha: He almost persuaded them to give it, and the exact words used by Kelso Roberts were, "Tell Mr. Pearson he can go to hell."

Mr. Haggerty: No.

Mr. Sopha: To go to hell. He was very much of a Conservative. He was very much of a Diefenbaker man.

Mr. Singer: He was very persuasive.

Mr. Sopha: I hope to live to see the day that Ontario, like many other provinces, has a national park worthy of the name. And all it takes for a change, a cessation of the hostilities with the federal government—the fires of which the Premier and the Treasurer nurture every day—as a peace offering, is to say to them, "Look, let us come to some agreement about attractive land," preferably in northern Ontario, preferably not too far away from Sudbury.

Mr. Farquhar: Between Sudbury and Elliot Lake.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, well that is where Mr. Pearson wanted to establish it. And I remember the very time—so the record will be complete—the very time was when the first unemployment crisis hit Elliot Lake. Now what year would that be?

Mr. Farquhar: About 1961.

Mr. Sopha: I am grateful to my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin. About 1961 they wanted to establish a park north of Elliot Lake. Well, I merely pleaded with the minister, let us move ahead with that idea. I would cheerfully give them Quetico Park.

Mr. Gisborn: On a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: I would be willing to—I am going to sit down. The member can raise all the points of order he wants. I would give them Quetico Park, but for heaven's sake let us come to some resolution of it so we can have that benefit.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, my point of order has now become redundant because the member has been talking for 15 minutes on a $30,000 expenditure for the acquiring of land. Surely he should have waited for the proper vote. Either the member was out of order or the Chairman just lost track.

Mr. Sopha: Thirty thousand dollars? What is he talking about—$5,680,000.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to direct the minister's attention to a paragraph in the budget speech where the Treasurer said this:

> In this budget I have set aside $20 million for a new land bank programme to be operated by the Province. This will be the initial funding of the new Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation. Its purpose will be to acquire land for future public use, particularly land in and around our urban centres and recreation areas.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall with me that during the Throne debate I drew to the attention of government the very serious problem facing the borough of North York in connection with the future use of a golf course called York Downs golf course. I urged the government with all the persuasive ability I could summon to seriously examine its position insofar as securing to our urban area, to this very important urban area of North York, the open space comprising 163 acres of York Downs golf course.

The government listened politely but that seemed to be the end of that until the Treasurer came along with his budget speech. Then the Treasurer, Mr. Chairman, referred to this new land bank programme and particularly used the phrase, "Its purpose will be to acquire land for public use, particularly land in and around our urban centres in recreation areas."

After the Treasurer had delivered himself of that statement, I attempted to elicit from him some idea of what he really meant by that. The Treasurer in his not unusual way, Mr. Chairman, flubbed the question. He said, "It is part of a plan and I am not really sure. It is only the beginning, and in due course we are going to do something or other." Certainly nothing very clearly emerged from his thinking to justify the bold statement in the budget address.

Now, I would wonder, as my colleague, the member for Sudbury, wondered a few moments ago, whether or not this is another one of the problems that has been thrown to the Minister of Lands and Forests. He shakes his

head in the negative. I would wonder; it would seem somewhat logical to me, Mr. Chairman, that a programme entitled "The new Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation" and the problem relating to the preservation and acquisition of land for future public use, particularly in and around our urban centres and recreation areas, should be centred on the Minister of Lands and Forests. If it is not he, Mr. Chairman, who then?

The Treasurer disowns responsibility. If I interpret correctly the side-to-side head-shaking just indulged in by the minister, he is about to disown the responsibility. Which one, then, of his noble colleagues is going to say, "It is me"? Which one of the members who inhabit the front benches is going to indicate what the fund is going to be used for, what that corporation is going to do and what, in fact, is meant by "The government thinks it is a good idea to acquire and preserve for future public use, land in and around our urban centres and recreational areas."

If this minister has not yet seized the responsibility himself and if he has not yet been charged with it, would the minister be good enough to tell us which one of his colleagues is going to do this? Or is it going to be another one of the things that vanish into the never-never land? Another thing like the housing programme or the glories of the employment programme that are going to be achieved by giving five per cent to the government's corporate friends. Here at least is something that I would have thought the Minister of Lands and Forests could have put his teeth into. With that, Mr. Chairman, hopefully we are going to get something from the Minister of Lands and Forests. If not, can he direct me to one of his colleagues who is going to have this responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, mention of this was made by the provincial Treasurer, and I would think he would be the one to outline the details. I am not familiar with just what the procedures will be, but I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the provincial Treasurer will announce this. The lands under this bank, of course, will be used for many purposes, industrial as well as recreational. I would like to remind the hon. member that our department is the one which plans recreational areas, but we are not the agency which purchases the land. This is done by The Department of Public Works.

Also, I believe the particular park in question could very well be in the city. Normally provincial parks are built outside of the city.

Mr. Singer: This is "in and around." The Treasurer's phrase was "in and around our urban centres."

Hon. Mr. Brunelle. Parks that come within the city are eligible for assistance under The Provincial Parks Act, which comes under the administration of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr).

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me pursue this for a moment. The Treasurer's statement specifically says, "particularly land in and around our urban centres." Now "in" means inside, as I understand the language, and here is a new $20 million fund—

Well, I guess I have interpreted the minister's side-to-side head-shaking correctly. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a bold new programme, neither he nor the Treasurer have been able to tell us what it means, or, in fact, if it means anything, and no minister of this government is prepared to assume any responsibility for this paragraph in the budget statement.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of a footnote to that particular observation, it must surely on occasion embarrass the minister how much of his colleagues' follies he inherits, attempts to account for, and then subsides quietly into his chair in silence—a certain awkward and frustrated silence. This department, unlike no other department of government, is involved in basic land acquisition in a preservative sense. This department has basic social responsibilities for accumulating—around the Province of Ontario —lands which can one day be restored to public use or one day be of considerable public use, and yet, the prime programme announced in the budget, the $20 million land acquisition programme, has not had its details avouched to the minister. I imagine—pardon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was no more than two weeks ago.

Mr. Lewis: No more than two weeks ago. Does the minister mean these fellows on the front bench did not even consult him in advance of the budget? Is he a member of that cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The budget is a secret document, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stokes: Oh, come on.

Mr. Lewis: This is really very interesting. What the minister is saying to me—God knows, I find it hard to believe even at 8:55 tonight.

Mr. Stokes: The minister means he did not even get his feet in the trough before they brought the budget down.

Mr. Lewis: I think that the House should absorb the revelation.

Mr. Pitman: Good Lord!

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Lands and Forests of this government, a senior-ranking minister, certainly the minister who commands most respect on this side of the House for his insight, wisdom, reverence and knowledge—

Mr. Paterson: One of the few unchanged.

Mr. Lewis: —was not even consulted by the rest of the cabinet in the preparation of the budget.

Mr. Stokes: You know, I sort of suspected that.

Mr. Lewis: And he is one of the three wise men who held on to his previous portfolio, and they did not even think they should consult him. Well, I cannot imagine that happening in the days of MacNaughton. In the days of MacNaughton, Mr. Chairman, surely the cabinet members were called in and told that which would befall them when the budget came down.

Mr. Peacock: Requested.

Mr. Lewis: It is very difficult to believe, and if the minister accepts it with equanimity, then one feels for him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Farquhar: It just staggers you.

Mr. Stokes: Seventy-eight million dollars and he was not even consulted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Not a member of the club.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, you would want me to say this, because in your private capacity as a Conservative member of the House, you feel the same sense of offence about what has happened to the Minister of Lands and Forests as the rest of us do. When we had the former provincial Treasurer, as arbitrary and authoritarian as he was, he at least involved his cabinet colleagues in basic economic decisions. But the Minister of Lands and Forests has been excluded totally from the process.

Mr. Pitman: No wonder he is going out of the Toronto-centred region plan.

Mr. Lewis: It is a kind of peculiar thing.

Mr. Pitman: It is incredible.

Mr. Lewis: Do you attend cabinet meetings? Because some of my questions would involve cabinet responsibilities.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Is he welcome at cabinet meetings?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Those are confidential meetings, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Cabinet meetings are confidential.

Mr. Lewis: Are you allowed to attend? Are you there to attend?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Stop it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I wonder about it. Or is this a little more of the basic discrimination against northern Ontario which exists in the Tory party—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is always there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —so that those ministers are even excluded?

Mr. J. Renwick: Including the member for Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the member for Sault Ste. Marie so exercised? He probably did not know what was in the budget either, in advance. And he is Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Who is in the cabal over there anyway? Who is in the cabal?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I wish Hansard could pick it all up. I just wish they could pick it all up.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, of the minister under this heading, can he give the House a list of all the land acquired by government

to retrieve the Niagara Escarpment, and how much money has thus far been paid?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in the Niagara Escarpment area we have acquired up until March 31, 1971, 10,963 acres. This is under our department, but there has been land acquired under the conservation authorities which is aside from that. These are lands under our department.

Mr. Lewis: Do you have a dollar figure for those lands?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Or a billion-dollar figure?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I mentioned in a press release in the last two weeks that we had acquired in the last year I believe it was something like 3,000 acres at $1,600,000.

Mr. Lewis: But you do not know the total cost of it as far as—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, but I could—Mr. Chairman, I will get these figures for the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: You can get the total cumulative costs?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Now may I ask: do you know how many dollars of the $20 million land acquisition programme announced in the budget will be spent through your department on Niagara Escarpment lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, Mr. Chairman. This announcement by the provincial Treasurer referred to recreational lands, industrial lands, lands for housing and so forth.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I understand that and I appreciate your pique in not being consulted in advance but now that the budget has been out since April 26, have your colleagues yet informed you which portion of that $20 million you will be able to spend through your department for escarpment land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is too early yet, Mr. Chairman, I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: You do not know? Well, let me ask another question. Do you know how any of that $20 million will in fact be spent?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Lewis: Other than the broad generality?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I do hope that we will get as much as we possibly can for recreational purposes, but I do not know and I cannot tell you what division that $20 million will be —how much will be for recreation land, how much for industrial land, how much for housing.

Mr. Pitman: How do you plan over there? How do you plan?

Mr. Lewis: It is just unbelievable.

Mr. Pitman: It is incredible.

Mr. Lewis: I do not want to sound naive, but how do you people arrive at programmes? Look at what you are saying tonight. You are saying the government has taken a $20 million figure out of the air, it has plunked it beside a category called land acquisition, and you as the primary department involved have not been consulted in advance.

Mr. Pitman: It is incredible.

Mr. Lewis: You cannot during your estimates indicate what it is you intend to purchase.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we are dealing with the estimates of my department.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Yes, I see.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Thank you. We are dealing with the estimates of my department.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Page 191.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Right. This $20 million does not come under my department. This was an announcement in the budget. It has nothing to do with our estimates.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, Mr. Chairman, surely a portion of that money will be expended through the department? Your department is involved in recreational lands—vote 1103 is recreation programme. You have a considerable sum of money designated. You do most of the purchasing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Right.

Mr. Lewis: Then how is it that the minister does not know? You are the responsible minister. The budget is not a secret document divorced from cabinet decision-making surely?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No more. It was made public on April 26.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Minister!

Mr. Lewis: You mean on April 26 the minister learned about the programme? Is that what he is telling us?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I found out that it was mentioned in the Throne Speech on March 30 that there would be a—

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister's party never get together?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was mentioned in the Throne Speech that there would be a special fund. I do not believe that the amount was mentioned.

Mr. Pitman: How does the government write speeches over there?

Mr. Lewis: It is breathtaking is all I—the minister is reducing me to silence which does not happen very often. He is telling me that he learned of one of the chief programmes affecting his department in the Throne Speech. He waited breathlessly and expectantly—

An hon. member: It cannot be much.

Mr. Lewis: —until April 26 to find out how much money would be applied to it and to this day he does not know nor was he consulted.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned with is with the amount of money that is budgeted for The Department of Lands and Forests. The amount of money that is budgeted for land purchases.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And it is in our estimates. This is where I am mainly concerned. I am interested, of course, in this $20 million announcement that the provincial Treasurer made.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We do hope that we will get as much of those funds for recreational purposes.

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But again, I must say that I do not know what the division will be. That information has not been given to me.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that is really worth putting on the record.

An hon. member: Indeed it is.

Mr. Lewis: That the cabinet minister responsible had not been told, nor does he know, what the $20 million will be spent for! The information has not been shared with him. He was not involved in the decision-making. He needs it in his estimates and he is completely uninformed about what the budget called "new dimensions" in Tory programming.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I respect the hon. member but sometimes he goes off at a tangent and he is way in the bottom of a—this is a $20 million announcement, and we are dealing with my estimates.

An hon. member: What does the minister say to the $20 million?

An hon. member: Where is it going to come from?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, just so that the Chairman need not feel any of us are out of order. When we have dealt with budget announcements before, the Treasurer and other ministers have indicated where relevant portions of the budget have specifically turned up in their estimates. Because a budget is not a ball park figure. It is broken down. It appears in the estimates. It underwrites the considerations of this House. What the minister is saying—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works)**:** It is both—

Mr. Lewis: —incredible though it may seem, is that he, as the chief minister responsible, has not even been talked to. They have not even condescended to consult with him which makes some of us believe, on this side of the House, the whole programme is without substance.

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: It is another piece of bravado. This $20 million land acquisition may, in fact, not exist at all except as a figure.

Mr. Pitman: They may not have the money to spend the $20 million.

Mr. Lewis: I would be glad to be corrected because I think money should be spent. Nothing would please me more than to have the minister itemize what the hopes are for his individual department. No wonder he

is not able to tell the member for Peterborough how he is going to use the recreational area in the Toronto-centred region. Nine areas, he says, and he holds up a map which, if one looked at it very closely, would not reveal as much as might be expected.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The member should ask a question about the estimates.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has absolutely no knowledge of how much of this money will go to the acquisition of Niagara Escarpment land.

The minister has no knowledge of what it will mean for recreational land generally—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I know that this is a Provincial Parks Act and I hold the hon. member that we have some provincial parks and some public access—

Mr. Pitman: We know that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle I also said to the hon. member that we have selected nine areas in this Toronto-centred region—

Mr. Pitman: In the green-belt area.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —between Halton and Ontario counties: We have selected those areas. We know where they are. We are planning on them.

Mr. Pitman: What about the planning? The minister is not even consulted.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is simply too nice a fellow. That is the basic problem.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Why not ask a question on the estimates?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is taken advantage of by his colleagues. His colleagues simply say to him, "You are Minister of Lands and Forests and you will manage the department as you see best, and we will give you so much money." None of his submissions is paid any attention to, as he pointed out himself. He has told us almost weeping in this House that he does not have enough money to buy Niagara Escarpment land because he cannot get it. He has cried copiously in his seat while he explained to us that he would like to cut down more diseased elms, but he has not got the money.

The minister has indicated to us that he would like to plant more trees for reforestation, but his hardhearted colleagues will not give him the money. Now, when he is finally on the verge of the great dramatic infusion of wealth for Lands and Forests in a $20 million programme, they will not even share the details with him.

It must be a sort of unhappy slap in the face to the minister. The whole government is falling apart. I cannot understand how those people work. They do not talk to each other. They do not consult with each other.

Mr. Pitman: They do not plan.

Mr. Lewis: They do not plan in advance. Their programmes emerge in the budget and, one after the other, they collapse under scrutiny.

Mr. Pitman: The Minister of Trade and Development is in this mess too.

Mr. Lewis: It must surely be an embarrassment. Everything bombs so extravagantly that the government now has to postpone the election until the fall.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We could even go to next fall if we wanted.

Mr. Pitman: If the minister could hold on that long.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is the only way they are going to be able to hold on.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the budget says its purpose will be to acquire land for future public use, particularly land in and around our urban centres and recreation areas. I have presumed long enough on the time of the House, although I do not think too long.

Can the minister indicate what they have in mind when they say "recreation areas?" Has he any idea whatsoever of that to which this major new dimension applies? Any detail?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: You are really reaching, are you not?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am trying to get details.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, recreation areas in the Toronto-centred region. We have also land in mind in the Georgian Bay area, in many other parts of the province. So I do hope that of this $20 million a large part will be available to us for recreational purposes.

Mr. Lewis: Right, but you do not have at this point any particulars about it at all?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We know, on a priority basis, where we would like to—

Mr. Lewis: Where you would like to spend it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: And as you told us earlier, they never give you the money you want.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh yes, they—

Mr. Lewis: To spend it where you would like to spend it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They gave us an increase over last year.

Mr. Jackson: They do not even talk to you.

Mr. Lewis: Well, as my colleague from Timiskaming says, "Alas, they do not even talk to you." You sat and listened to the budget on April 26 and you learned about the $20 million then.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I found out about it in the Throne Speech

Mr. Lewis: You found out about the programme—you learned about the money—in the budget. In a month or two they will call you in and tell you how much you can have, and then in the fall they will tell you where to spend it.

That is not the way to run a government, and I really think it amounts to a pretty substantial indictment of the irrelevance with which the whole government views the acquisition of recreational land in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Paterson: What happened to the $200 million you were supposed to get five years ago?

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister realizes, as I do, that most of the $20 million is going to be found through his department. Now a week ago in discussion of ARDA estimates we found out that most of this money is going to be for land purchased for uses in perpetuity—not necessarily for any existing programme that will take place immediately, but for the purchase of lands that can be used for future use and not necessarily all in areas surrounding urban areas.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Manitoulin Island would be.

Mr. Farquhar: Thank you very much, you just gave me my lead. I know about negotiations that have taken place with respect to purchases of the kind of property that would take a good chunk of that $20 million. I have hesitated to interfere on the floor of the House with respect to that matter. I do not intend to go into any particular detail, but most of this $20 million worth, I am convinced, is going to be bought through your department. I am sure it is going to be spent through your department because in previous questionings that seemed to be what came through in Department of Agriculture estimates and ARDA estimates.

I want to ask the minister, however, at this particular point in time about negotiations that have taken place. I am only hoping that this particular property has some priority in the scheme of things. I would like to ask him if the negotiations with respect to purchases on Manitoulin Island would be part of the $20 million expenditure—if they happen to materialize.

I would like to hear any comments the minister has in respect of this matter because, you know, I have watched that property disappear mile by mile, and anything that I can do that will move it into a situation of priority it is my responsibility to do.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member has brought this to my attention on different occasions. The matter was discussed at the last meeting of the park integration board. We have asked Public Works to carry on further negotiations. There is a meeting tomorrow morning of the board and this matter is on the agenda, so it is under very serious consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5 carried?

The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, in following the remarks of the member for Scarborough West, the leader of the New Democratic Party, I looked up the $20 million vote as it appears under Treasury. It is not strictly under this estimate, but it leads one to ask, is The Department of Lands and Forests not the leading purchaser on behalf of the government of lands for recreational use in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is quite true. We are the department for which most of the lands are purchased for recreational use, I guess, under The Department of Public Works. There are also recreational lands purchased under The Department of Energy and Resources Management, of course, again through Public Works.

Mr. Stokes: Surely under the advice of your department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Some of these lands in that $20 million programme will be for industrial purposes, for housing, and other purposes. It will not be entirely for recreational land.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, as the minister in charge of the department with the most experience in land purchasing, why would the Minister of Lands and Forests not be consulted in the preparation of the Treasurer's budget? The budget-making process insofar as tax reductions and tax policy changes are concerned is certainly the prerogative of the Treasurer. His colleagues in the cabinet are probably very happy that he does not take them into his confidence in preparing his tax changes. But in regard to the introduction of new programmes, certainly those which immediately affect a major department of government, such as The Department of Lands and Forests, in the acquisition of land for recreational purposes, which is clearly set out on page 22 of the Treasurer's budget statement, surely those cabinet ministers, such as the Minister of Lands and Forests are consulted in advance. There must be a cabinet committee, there must be a subcommittee of Cabinet, if not the Treasury Board itself, if not the branch of Treasury which prepares the budget statement, that goes to each minister in turn and says, "Prepare us a statement on your particular interest in the budget." Why, in this case, was the minister—

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member speaking about land acquisition?

Mr. Peacock: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I am wondering if any discussion on land acquisition in this departmental estimate should not come under vote 1103, for park purposes?

Mr. Peacock: Probably. I was referring to the phrase on page 190, land use planning.

Mr. Chairman: I just finished reading that, too, and I find no reference there to land acquisition. I do, however, in vote 1103.

Mr. Peacock: I am not touching on the actual purchase in my remarks right now, but on the government's land use planning function and the role of the Minister of Lands and Forests in determining what use lands will be put to in the Province of Ontario. That use is determined by the ability of the government to purchase the lands. If it is for recreational use, land use planning, which apparently this department has the prerogative for carrying out, I thought it would be germane to follow through under vote 1102.

Mr. Chairman: In other words, the programme description mentions land use planning. Was that the point on which the hon. member is speaking?

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And I asked why the Minister of Lands and Forests would not be consulted.

Mr. Chairman: But not about the expenditure of any funds for capital acquisitions.

Mr. Peacock: No, the department would not be consulted about the planning, about the use to which the lands would be put for recreation.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member is in order in that respect.

Mr. Peacock: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Why would he not be consulted in advance of release of the budget statement, just as the Ontario Housing Corporation obviously was consulted in the preparation of the Speech from the Throne, or in the budget statement itself when the figure of a $500 million programme was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, or the figures in terms of the expenditure on housing were mentioned in the budget statement?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We plan where recreational lands should be. We have quite a vast programme, as the hon. member knows, in the Niagara Escarpment, on the shores of Lake Erie. The hon. member just mentioned Manitoulin Island, and these things are all planned. We submit this to Treasury Board and our people are part of a planning team. As a result of our submissions to Treasury Board, it is aware, and that is why this land bank was announced. So I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, why they are making such a hullabaloo about this.

Mr. Lewis: It is preposterous.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, was there a subcommittee of cabinet in existence prior to, at least, the presentation of the budget dealing with land use planning under the minister's aegis?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What kind of cabinet?

Mr. Lewis: Subcommittee of the cabinet. Is there a subcommittee of cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is a cabinet committee on policy.

Mr. Peacock: Policy on land use?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, not necessarily on land use, but there is an established committee on policy.

Mr. Peacock: Policy bearing on what?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On various matters, policy matters.

Mr. Peacock: There are 101 different cabinet committees, Mr. Chairman. Surely there must be one in which the Minister of Lands and Forests sits, insofar as his responsibility for land use planning is concerned under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, my responsibilities are for a lot of the recreational lands. Again I would like to repeat, we plan these on a priority basis. We have submitted the amounts to Treasury Board. They are aware of the amount of money that we need, and since the expenditures are away beyond the amount voted in the estimates, this is why this land bank will look after these additional expenditures.

Mr. Lewis: Without consulting the minister. Without talking to him about it. When we form a government, Rene Brunelle and Arthur Wishart will be consulted. Just by way of paying homage, so they enjoy the process.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to deal with the problem of Crown lands and Crown surveys. I believe the minister is well aware this is one of the most contentious things or matters dealing with beach rights on Lake Erie.

I would like to ask the minister, has he taken the necessary action to define the property definition of the beds of The Navigable Waters Act? The beds of The Navigable Waters Act in 1940 defined that high-water marks mean the level at which the water is a navigable body of water and has been held for a period sufficient to leave a watermark along the bank of such navigable body of water.

Of course, this was changed in the amendment, I believe, in 1950, to The Navigable Waters Act, which leaves the question of who does own the lakeshore. Also under that Act the Minister of Lands and Forests may, upon the recommendation of the Surveyor General for Ontario, fix the high-water mark of any navigable body of water on any part thereof and his decision shall be final and conclusive.

The question I want to bring to the minister—I wish he would get off his good intentions and get on to this section I just read to him of The Navigable Waters Act—he is well aware of the present applications of Walker - Stockton, Stockton - Letchworth under The Quieting Titles Act of lots 16 and 17 in the township of Bertie. The matter is being referred to the appeal court of the Province of Ontario.

Another question I would like to ask is, if this decision does not favour the biggest majority of the people of the Province of Ontario, will the minister initiate a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada?

It is also amusing to read in the local newspapers that The Department of Public Works, I believe it is, made a survey in the township of Bertie dealing with the views of purchasing lakefront property. There were two sites that were suggested and this was at the area line east of the Buffalo Canoe Club in Bertie township. I believe it probably would be lots 30 and 29. The other one deals with the property lying east of Bernard Avenue.

Mr. Gisborn: Is this under firefighting equipment or lands?

Mr. Haggerty: I should perhaps go back to the story which, in fact, I told him some few years ago.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to raise for the minister, is that the second announcement was that The Department of Public Works was trying to obtain property lying east of Bernard Avenue on lots 16 and 17, I believe, and part of 18, to Six-Mile Creek in Bertie township. This abuts the part and parcel of land that is coming under The Quieting Titles Act by the owners—

Mr. Lewis: You told me to raise this on 1103, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Permit me to interrupt just for a moment. Is this again land acquisition for recreational use?

Mr. Haggerty: This deals with Crown land and Crown surveys, Mr. Chairman. This deals with ownership of beach property on Lake Erie. This is Crown lands.

Mr. Chairman: This is what the hon. member mentioned at the beginning of his remarks, but I thought that he was straying a little on to the acquisition of lands for recreational purposes. The matter of the surveys or research into the lakeshore properties is one thing. The acquisition of lands for recreation is another.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to tie this in—I am sure I will tie in with the proposed application of Walker-Stockton and Stockton-Letchworth under The Quieting Titles Act. This land is close to the adjoining property that the department is trying to purchase. It seems to be rather peculiar that they go in at this time and say, "We want to buy this adjoining land."

Under the Crown survey dealing with fronts of lots 16 and 17 on Lake Erie—that is a broken front lot—the first concession in the township of Bertie included all beach rights to the water's edge. Lot 16 was patented by the Crown to one Daniel McQuinn by letters patent dated March 17, 1798, and the records were checked at both the land registry office and the provincial registry office. The following is the description of lands originally patented:

> In the township of Bertie, containing by measurement, 240 acres, more or less, composed of lot 16 in the first and second concession with the broken fronts and situate, lying and being in the township of Bertie, the aforesaid together with all the woods and water thereon, lying and being under the reservations limiting it in conditions hereinafter expressed; the said 240 acres of land abutted and bounded, they may be otherwise known as follows; and it is to say beginning at a post in front of concession mark 15 and 16 on Lake Erie, then north 134 chains, more or less to the third concession, then west 20 chains, then south to Lake Erie, then easterly along the shore to the place of beginning.

It goes on further to say that the matter of description along Lake Erie defines the coast on Lake Erie; there is a Crown survey post on Lake Erie.

If the minister is a little bit in doubt about this, I wish to take him to an area, particularly my area, off Holloway Bay, walking out to the beach last fall, I happened to come across a road allowance and some youngsters were building some type of a little hut or something in the trees. They were digging around in the sand and in that vicinity where the hole was dug there was a landmark, a post, a survey post, put there by a Crown surveyor some 130 or 140 years ago. I contend all along the shores of Lake Erie these posts were planted by surveyors to define the boundaries of Lake Erie, and that would be to the high-water mark for vegetation growth.

While the minister sits by doing nothing, without applying his authority under The Navigable Waters Act, we find that applications have been made year by year by a certain few privileged landowners on Lake Erie to take this land from the public.

I know the minister and I sat down with the former Attorney General to discuss this particular case. Mr. Justice Stark, in one of the poorest arguments that, I think, he put forth, said that one of the reasons he favoured the decision going to the applicant was that they maintained the lakeshore and that the province neglected to do so. The point I raised to the minister was that where I live —I have some 30 acres of land; 660-foot frontage—I mow that to the edge of the road, keep the grass trimmed.

I thought if the decision of the judge for this particular case was as he said, that they maintained that, then by all rights I should be able to claim rights to the edge of the road. It is the same principle. I thought if everybody applied this same principle as the judge did, The Department of Highways would only own to the edge of the pavement and I would have the right to go out and stick a fence up there, saying that this was mine.

The minister is well aware of the problem of fences projecting out into Lake Erie. Perhaps it is from the western end of Lake Erie to the eastern end of Lake Erie that these fences project out into the water. He can remove them under The Navigable Waters Act if he gets off his good intentions.

Mr. Gisborn: The member did not get on the bandwagon until—

Mr. Haggerty: Do not give me that line now; I have heard enough from the member. I would like to know where he was back in 1955.

Mr. Gisborn: You got on the bandwagon when the appeal committee was set up.

Mr. Haggerty: That is your party policy. Every time there is a rumpus you get on the bandwagon and want to take the glory, but it means nothing.

Mr. Gisborn: You climbed on right from the start until the pressure got tough and now you are climbing back on again.

Mr. Haggerty: Climbing back on again? I wish the member would read the newspapers in my area. I think a few years ago I told the story about being a farm boy and that the member was a jackass and I think it still goes today.

Mr. Nixon: A farm boy and a jackass?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, that is right. But the minister has these rights and I wish he would move on them.

Mr. Pitman: Tell us everything. Wait until I speak to Morris Teck about—

Mr. Haggerty: I have nothing to worry about with Morris Teck.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Does the hon. minister have any comments in reply to those remarks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the first part of the member's question. The member referred to this case that was dealt with by Justice Stark, the Stockton and Walker case against the Queen. They elect that they own the land to the water's edge and the hon. member knows that this case was upheld by the court. The Department of the Attorney General and Justice has appealed the case. The appeal will be heard this fall.

With reference to the second matter I would say that each patent would have to be examined separately and up to the water's edge varies considerably on Lake Erie.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you not amend the Act instead of examining every patent?

Mr. Pitman: It is your job to do that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member, if he was dealing with this case, would he pass legislation whereby the beaches would become public without compensation to the owners?

Mr. Lewis: Of course we would give compensation, but we would have public access to the beaches most certainly by legislation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And give compensation? The price of land on Lake Erie is about $150 per foot.

Mr. Lewis: Well, as a matter of fact—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Multiply this by 100 miles, it would come to over $100 million.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact it is more important. Since I have been drawn into this by undue provocation, there is no reason in the world why certain parcels of land along Lake Erie—not the entire frontage, but certain parcels of land—should not be acquired and compensated by law or—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Who is doing this?

Mr. Lewis: There is no reason in the world why the government cannot legislate rights of way without great compensation so that the public has access to the beaches. They have a variety of formulae to use but they are hiding behind endless litigation protecting the private rights of Buffalo cottage owners. That is what they are doing.

This government is relinquishing the rights of the people of the Province of Ontario for the sake of private American landowners so that we do not even have access to the beaches in that area. And it waits until Justice Stark and everyone else in the world hears the cases, and then this minister has the audacity to stand tonight and say it will be heard again in appeal in the fall. Well, we lost the summer of 1969. We lost the summer of 1970. Now we lose the summer of 1971. What a proud tenure he has had as a minister.

Mr. Pitman: It will not matter very soon. A lot of people cannot even swim—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, a lot of those landowners are also Canadians and some of them are Ontario residents—

Mr. Lewis: Well, some of them are.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and on Lake Erie our policy is to acquire those areas that we feel have value for recreational purposes. We are doing this, and I would like to remind the hon. member that we have on Lake Erie at the present time—

Mr. Lewis: Not the map again? Not the all-purpose map!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have 53.7 miles open to the public, and this represents about

20 per cent of the total shoreline of Lake Erie. Some of these are the best beaches and we are acquiring more, so the public has many areas to go to.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Of course they do.

Mr. Lewis: What about where the public would like to be?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Right in front of everybody's private home—that is where everybody would like to be.

Mr. Lewis: Under discussion now.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, that is not true.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is. I can show you.

Mr. Pitman: That is not true.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of a question, Mr. Chairman, assuming that the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has discussed this with the minister in advance, which is no longer an assumption one can make, but assuming that the minister and his colleagues have decided to appeal the decisions—which they are doing; they are constantly appealing the decisions—the implication of their wish to appeal is that they are not satisfied with the judicial decisions in the sense that they do not serve the public interest.

Decisions, I have no doubt, are arrived at in a perfectly appropriate way. I do not challenge them for a moment. But they do not satisfy the public interest, which basically this minister feels should be served. Well, why is he procrastinating endlessly? Why does he have to wait for several more years to pass? Let me ask the minister a question. Suppose he takes it all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada and the appeal of the Province of Ontario fails—the courts rule that it is private land in perpetuity—what will he do? Will he relinquish the land or will he amend the legislation?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): What would you do?

Mr. Lewis: We would amend the legislation.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You would walk right over them, I am sure. You would nationalize the land.

Mr. Lewis: We would amend the legislation. We would provide proper public access.

It is very interesting to see that the provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Lands and Forests—they have all—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development: I am just biding my time.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. Let the Minister of Trade and Development get into it. Do not let the Treasurer barrack alone. He feels defenceless, vulnerable, there in that front bench. Join him. He cannot rely on the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. He is too quiet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He cannot deal with the rights of civil servants.

Mr. Lewis: It is perfectly all right for the Treasurer, as my colleague points out, to trample all over the rights of 70,000 civil servants in this province, but on occasion to protect the public interests outside his own area never occurs to him.

Mr. Deans: That is typically Darcy. Step on the little guy.

Mr. Gisborn: When they amended the Act in 1951.

Mr. Lewis: I am asking the minister a question, almost independent of the prompting of his colleagues. Suppose the courts rule definitively against him right to the top. Will the minister then amend the legislation to provide access? That does not mean expropriation, as the minister knows. It does not have to mean that. It can mean rights of way; it can mean a certain holding in the land. The member for Riverdale has spelled it out in a dozen different ways. Professor Jackson at Brock has also set it out very eloquently. There are all kinds of avenues, short of the Tory mechanism of outright expropriation, and there are very many ways of doing it. What would the minister do? I think that is a fair question to ask now that the appeals are under way.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we have done a lot in the past and we are doing more. We are intensifying our land acquisition on Lake Erie. Aside from regular provincial parks, we also have selected certain areas adjacent to the 66-foot right of way that leads to the beaches. Those areas will be day-use parks. They will not be for camping; they will be for picnicking and so on for those people who want to go to the

beaches. We are doing this, and we have planned and are working on it.

Mr. Lewis: Why has he appealed the decision?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Why have we appealed the decision?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is the hon. member against our appeal?

Mr. Lewis: No. Why has the minister appealed the decision? Why?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have appealed the decision because we felt it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Pitman: The right thing to do?

Mr. Lewis: He thought it was the right thing to appeal? So obviously he felt that the lands to which Justice Stark's decision applied, parts of it at least, should be available for public access?

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: Obviously the minister feels that he is not going to be able to acquire that because it is private land in perpetuity. The only way the minister can do it is by legislation. Why does he run from legislation? The government had it once on the books. It was only The Navigable Waters Act, the amendment that reversed the decision.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The legislation was not enforcible.

Mr. Lewis: The legislation was not enforcible?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Lewis: But is the government not able to draft legislation which is enforcible? Is it not able to grant, by law, a right of way? Is it not able to take by law certain property to provide access?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We believe that our present policy of purchasing land in those areas that have a high recreational value is the proper approach. Once we acquire these lands, then we develop them. We put in comfort stations—

Mr. Price: At a price.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and all the many requirements of a day-use park.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the minister does not know what the $20 million for land acquisition is going to be used for anywhere in the Province of Ontario. He was not consulted by the Treasurer in advance. The minister does not—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He certainly was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it becomes almost unparliamentary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect—

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Yes. We are listening.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I said that I was in favour of this $20 million.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure he was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, what I said to the hon. member was that I did not know the details of the allocation of the money, how much for housing, how much for industrial and commercial purposes, and how much for recreational purposes. This is decided on a priority basis.

Mr. Deans: How does the government arrive at the figure then? Does the Treasurer know?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the minister is improving his artfulness as the night wears on. But Hansard will show that the minister announced to the House that he learned about the $20 million for land acquisition when he heard the Treasurer read the budget on April 26.

Mr. Deans: Right.

Mr. Pitman: Right.

Mr. Lewis: That is really a remarkable way of policy information.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This land matter was mentioned in the Throne Speech on March 30.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The minister heard it in the Throne Speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You have to hear it someplace.

Mr. Lewis: You have to hear it someplace; you sure do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: You know, I cannot handle this. The minister has a major programme which they do not discuss with him in advance of the Throne Speech and, then, they tell him the amount of money in the budget.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If the Minister of Lands and Forests continues to reveal to the House the inner secrecies of cabine-decision-making and of policy formation, it approaches absolute chaos. Nobody talks to anyone. No one. Just the Treasurer and the Premier. Arm in arm, everything is decided and they do not understand that which they decide.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Lands and Forests whether he knows whether any of the $20 million is designated for purchase of these particular beach-front properties which, just to start had, as part of his—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They command a very high priority, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes, I know they do.

Mr. Gisborn: I bet they do.

Mr. Lewis: A higher priority cannot be imagined. Is any of the $20 million designated for this high-priority area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into this, just to ask the right question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I was next on the list, Mr. Chairman. Let him take his turn.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Stokes: Let him take his turn, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: He is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out—point of order?

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, there are at least six of us on this side looking for recognition in this debate. Surely the Treasurer is not going to come in and take preference. If he wants to wait his turn, fine.

An hon. member: There should only be five.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Treasurer is out of order. I had the feeling that the hon. members were inviting some comment or discussion. I am sure the provincial Treasurer will wait. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I think it is very ironic that the now provincial Treasurer should interject at the time he did with the remark that he did. You would wipe out everything.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I did not get a chance to say anything.

Mr. Stokes: But if you did—

Mr. Lewis: You are looking desperately through the estimates now, trying to find out where your programmes are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are in the estimates, that is why he is looking in there.

Mr. Stokes: Let us go back to the—

Mr. Lewis: You do not even know where it is. "Which page," you say, "which page?"

Mr. Stokes: Let us go back to the latest annual report of The Department of Lands and Forests under the land section where they are asking for $5,963 million and they say—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are sitting too close to the member for Oshawa there.

Mr. Stokes: —three new restricted areas were set up to control and regulate the improvement on land and this was done when the now provincial Treasurer was the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Apparently before my arrival here this evening some few minutes ago—coming from pressing government business—there had been some discussion of the Ontario Land Acquisition Corporation—

Mr. Lewis: That is true.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I draw to your attention that that is shown in the estimates on page—

Mr. Pitman: We already know that. We are aware.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that is shown in the estimates on page 323, under vote 2404—

Mr. Stokes: What else is new?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of The Department of Treasury and Economics and it has nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time—

Mr. Peacock: I pointed that out myself.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests. Now I can understand—I say to my friend, the Minister of Trade and Development—

Mr. Lewis: The only man who can, would be in the cabinet.

Mr. Gisborn: He is out of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —how upset that group are today with the headlines in the Toronto paper about how mill rates have been cut in the city of Toronto. That is what is getting to them.

Mr. Stokes: Is that a point of order?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Twenty dollars, 10 mills—here, all over the place, mill rates being cut and they are upset. Now I say to my friend, the former Treasurer, if we are talking about doing things which were good for the Province of Ontario, the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) could have made a statement—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —about the Province of Ontario in reducing mill rates and it is no wonder that over there they are upset.

Mr. Nixon: John Bassett was impressed with that. You should read something other than the Tely.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think you might call him to order.

Mr. Stokes: Is that a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not take your shirt off.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no question why you are upset, because you are wrong—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister is out of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —about mill rates. You are wrong about the budget.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister is out of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And you are completely wrong about Lake Huron. You are wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, are you defensive?

Mr. Stokes: Is that a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: You could not do it in your budget speech. You have to do it now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are wrong. Fold up and go home.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Now you found out.

Mr. Pitman: The minister is going to burst a blood vessel over there.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is going to have public apoplexy.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Go back to that socialist Valhalla and nationalize and expropriate everything.

Mr. Lewis: Just relax.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Education has that white pallor he gets whenever he is overcome with embarrassment.

Mr. Chairman: Order, th hon. member for Thunder Bay has the floor.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, before I was so rudely interrupted by the provincial Treasurer on a so-called point of order, I wanted to call the House's attention to something that the now provincial Treasurer did in his former portfolio as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he invoked—

Mr. Sopha: Come on, Darcy, another point of order.

Mr. Stokes: —land use control and regulated improvements on privately owned land in the Shebandowan area in Thunder Bay, which was set up to control residential development in connection with the new mine in the area. He has also done it in Timmins and Cochrane and he has the colossal gall to sit there and abuse us for trying to protect the interest of the people of Ontario with regard

to the beach land on Lake Erie. Now I want to get back to this $5.93 million that we are talking about under item—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did the member for Scarborough West say about apoplexy?

Mr. Stokes: Item 5 of vote 1102. I want to ask the minister specifically—

Mr. Jackson: The Treasurer is losing his audience.

Mr. Sopha: Do not give up your right to speak. Do not ask him a question.

Mr. Stokes: —since his department sold 5,830 patents during fiscal year 1969 and 1970, he sold 5,830 of those—

Mr. Sopha: He did? Shame on him.

Mr. Stokes: —seventy-nine per cent were sold to residents of Ontario, five per cent to residents of other provinces and 16 per cent to residents of other countries. In that sale he realized on behalf of the Crown $1,279,000. In the estimate of receipts on page 64 of the last annual report he paid out for the maintenance of the land activities $3,198,000, so that he actually spent about twice as much as he realized on the sale of Crown lands.

If you figure that out, Mr. Chairman, on the sale of 5,830 parcels of land he actually realized $1,279,000. That means that the Crown got an average of $219 for the 5,835 parcels that were alienated from the Crown. I want to know to whom they were sold and if there are any more available I would like to get in on it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is all going to be leased from now on.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, our sale of Crown land—

Mr. Gisborn: We should have a confession first.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Her Majesty needs the money too.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, our sale of Crown land—a lot of it was summer cottage lots, and then we also sold 245 lots for residential townsites. This is in the last six years. Summer cottage lots, 5,830; lots for special uses, 846; for agricultural purposes, 186; making a total acreage during the past six years of 35,378 acres. The sales of our Crown land are in the regulations; for agricultural land there is a certain set value, and for cottage purposes they are I believe $2.50 per foot plus the survey fees, so they average about $700 to $800.

Mr. Stokes: It cost $860,000 in that fiscal year for land surveys. All I am saying is, I would like some explanation as to why the government only got $1,279,000 for selling 5,830 patents? Correct me if I am wrong, but this is the only thing I have to go by, the estimates book and the annual report.

Is this a true reflection of the amount of money received as a result of the sale of that many parcels of land, or the issuing of that many patents in that year? By rough figures it works out to $219 a patent. Is that a true reflection of what you got for those patents that were issued?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the land surveys branch, we have got the summer resort lands, the 77,160. Which of these are you questioning? Which ones do you feel that—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Good question.

Mr. Stokes: I am suggesting that if you refer to your page 56 under the land section of the annual report—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Page 66, yes.

Mr. Stokes: All right! At the top of the page this review shows that 5,830 patents were issued. Now you look over to the receipts of the department and you see where you brought in—at the middle of page 64, land sales and fixed assets—you actually brought in $1,279,000 on the sale of land. That works out to $219 per patent. It cost you $850,000 just for surveys. It cost you $3,198,000 for the maintenance and operation of your land activities within the department. I mean, what kind of economics is that?

Mr. Gisborn: Pretty costly votes.

Mr. Deans: Tory economics.

Mr. Stokes: At that rate you would be better to give the land away.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The sales and the patents each year—they do not tally. The sales run ahead of the patents usually. I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to get the hon. member a complete list of the number of acres that we sold last year and the amount per acre. And I can assure the hon. member that our prices were certainly adequate prices.

Mr. Gisborn: Is it in there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Gisborn: Is it in your statistical report? It should be, but it does not have them either.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Under land sales, yes, there is information.

Mr. Gisborn: If anybody wants to go crazy, try to make out what is going on in your department and read that book.

Mr. Jackson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like—

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. minister is looking up the answers to—

Mr. Jackson: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, in this statistical book, on page 18, land and surveys revenue, for the past year, 1970, the Crown land sales were $1,279,054.

Mr. Stokes: That is the figure I quoted.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And the Crown land rentals were $447,174, the park rentals $36,915, and miscellaneous $626,471, making a total of $2,389,614.

Mr. Gisborn: That justifies his argument.

Mr. Jackson: Carry on.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions, but first of all I would like to ask the minister if he would explain what the 846 lots that were sold for special use were sold for? Is this commercial, industrial, or for what purpose?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, a lot of those special uses are industrial and commercial sales. For instance, like commercial summer resorts. Also, if a person, say, a plant, establishes, say, a large pulp and paper mill. Today it is an investment of many millions of dollars. We do sell land for those purposes.

Mr. Jackson: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is 846 individual sales, the way I understand it, is this true?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Where do you get those figures?

Mr. Jackson: I just received them from you, sir.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The figures I quoted, Mr. Chairman, were in the last six years—special uses—and special uses as I just mentioned would include industrial and commercial purposes.

Mr. Jackson: Well, that is the way I understood it, Mr. Chairman, and at the same time we sold 530 cottage lots. What bothers me in this situation is that over the past three years I have talked to the minister on several occasions about the sale of commercial properties on lakes that were inaccessible except by aircraft or except over land by foot or by canoe route. Several times I asked why a person was refused a cottage lot on a particular lake and he said: "Because there was not road access to that lake." At the same time, on two occasions, they sold commercial properties on those same lakes. He said that the commercial persons did not necessarily need a road because they would fly in their customers and maybe the fact that there was no road access would make it much more viable as a commercial enterprise.

At the same time, I tried to point out to the minister that a lot of persons in this province like a little solitude and would be quite happy to fly in to a lake or to canoe into a certain lake and establish a cottage in that area.

What bothers me is that now we are moving into a lease system in Ontario where cottage lots will be leased to the individual when at the same time commercial lots will be still sold to those persons who want to establish commercial enterprises. This in my opinion defeats the whole purpose of the lease, which was to preserve prime recreation area for the use of Ontario residents, and to make sure that in the future The Department of Lands and Forests, or the government of Ontario, would have access to that land if it became necessary to take access to the land, in the interest of the people of Ontario.

At the same time the government is selling 846 special-use lots, which means that we are cutting up a great parcel of land, we are selling it outright, and it will be in private hands; we sell 530 cottage lots that now we are going to lease. The whole purpose of our lease system, if there is such a thing going to come into being, will be defeated before it even starts because two-thirds of the property that is sold by this government, or leased by this government, will be held by commercial interests and be denied to the people in the future, the people of this province.

Surely we cannot lease to the individual and say: "You have a lease for five or 10 or

21 years, and at the end of that lease period you might lose that property," while at the same time we say to commercial interests: "We will sell you half of the lake and we cannot take that back in the interest of the people of this province."

I am just somewhat puzzled by the government's thinking. Surely if we are going to lease to one person we must lease to everyone? We cannot sell to a person who is going to buy up a vast parcel of land and lease to a fellow who is going to buy up 100 feet of waterfront. Let me tell you that when a commercial enterprise enters into an area they do not take second-grade land, they want prime waterfront property and they get it.

So what this really means to me is that this government is willing to go along a little bit with what has been said over here. It goes along to fool the people a little bit by convincing them that we are keeping out those people across the border, to go along with some of the anti-American feeling that this government has promoted. At the same time, it is selling off the prime cottage and recreational areas—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have promoted anti-American feeling?

Mr. Jackson: The government has promoted it. At the same time it is selling off the prime recreational land, creating a situation that will be a parallel to what we have on Lake Erie and all of the Great Lakes at this moment.

I would just like the minister's comments. How does he justify selling 826 special-use lots, as against 530 cottage lots, while now he tells us this year they are going to continue to sell special-use lots and make leases available to cottage users? It just does not make any sense and I would like his explanation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is mixing certain things.

First, there is recreational land and non-recreational land. In recreational land our policy is this. On those lakes that have recreational value we set aside certain areas that have good beach land for public beaches, provincial park purposes, public access. In certain areas we have subdivision plans for cottages. Up until now we have been selling those. Our new policy is that we lease them.

However, in those areas—and the member has on different occasions brought to my attention some of his constituents who own, or would like to own, a parcel of land in an isolated area where there are no roads—the only way you can get there is to fly in or get there by canoe.

Our policy up until now has been that we do not sell land in those remote areas. We issue land-use permits which are renewable every year. We have, however, a committee that is looking into this question, especially in northern Ontario, and it is possible that in the future we could have a licence of occupation that would sort of give a longer tenure. However, on non-recreational lands—lands for residential purposes, where a person wants to build a house within, say, the municipality of North Bay, or for industrial purposes; they want to build a mill or plant of some kind—again our policy on that is under review. There is an interdepartmental committee that is studying this whole question of non-recreational lands.

The figures that I quoted were over a six-year period. The number of cottage lots—I think the member had this and maybe I was the one who read it wrong—was 5,830 and, under special use, 846 lots were sold in the last six years. Special uses were mainly industrial, commercial and other special-use types.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I did make an error on the number of cottages. I said 530; the minister has corrected me. It is 5,830. But the point I am trying to make is that in these remote areas where the minister says we will give land-use permits or leases and has refused to sell cottage lots over a number of years, at the same time they do sell commercial properties. They will allow a commercial outfitter to go into those areas—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Very few were sold, and it is a maximum of 15 acres.

Mr. Jackson: I can name two: one on Lake Timagami and one on Welcome Lake in the Sudbury area, both of which I have been involved in. Both of them were in areas that were zoned so that those people could not go in until that zoning was changed. While the minister is selling those lots to commercial enterprises, they are being denied to the individuals in this province.

The minister is now telling us that the individual will be able to lease a lot and go in and build a cottage, with the knowledge that at any time this government can step in, in the interests of the public, and take back the lot. I have nothing against that. In the interests of the public the government should have that right, but at the same time

it is going to sell outright to commercial enterprises—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We did not say we were selling outright.

Mr. Jackson: —on the same lake, right next door to the fellow who has a lot under lease.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We did not say that. I said there was an interdepartmental committee studying the disposal of non-recreational lands.

Mr. Jackson: In other words, you have not made any decision.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Jackson: Let us put it in the minister's own context. He is studying it; he has studied it to pieces over many years. And everything that has been said in this House over the last few months has been aimed at cottage lots. Never at any time has the minister talked about commercial lots or industrial lots. Surely if we are going to lease to the cottage owner in this province, who is an individual and has every right, then the same must apply to the commercial operator and the industrial person.

What bothers me very much is that the minister denies the right for any one of us to go into many lakes in Ontario and buy or even lease a cottage lot, while at the same time he will allow a commercial person to go in to establish a lodge on a lake. And he uses this as an excuse to deny the right to the individual, the fact that there are no roads and no access. My argument to him over the last two years has been that many persons, myself included, would like a little solitude, and if I choose to paddle a canoe four or five miles up a creek or up a river—

Mr. Peacock: Especially after the way the Treasurer comes in here tonight.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The public is going to go up and down your beach. That is solitude!

Mr. Jackson: The way to get solitude in this province is to become a member of the cabinet, because they are all loners. That is obvious tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What?

Mr. Deans: Loners.

Mr. Peacock: Loners—the minister is the biggest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was almost flattered. I thought he said "owners."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Can the Treasurer not use more modest language? He is the most hyperbolic member of the cabinet.

Mr. Jackson: If we are going to have a policy of leasing, it must apply to everyone equally.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Item 5 agreed to.

Item 6, research.

Mr. Lewis: Are we still on vote 1102?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1102; item 6 is research.

Mr. Lewis: I want to get a ruling before we go past research—many ills can come in under research—about where we should be raising the question of the sort of fire sale of Canadian land, some of which is Ontario land. The minister will know what I speak of, the various advertisements—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Treasury and Economics.

Mr. Lewis: I know the Treasurer would like to gather everything under his umbrella, but there is a fellow on his right who eased in just ahead—the Premier.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am just trying to get things sorted out.

Mr. Lewis: The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is the question of the Niagara Escarpment lands and detals. The minister said he would provide certain dollar breakdowns. Can that be done in vote 1103?

Mr. Chairman: Under parks section, under item 3 of 1103.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It would be under 1103.

Mr. Lewis: We can do the escarpment under 1103? Which part? The parks section of 1103?

Mr. Chairman: Item 3.

Mr. Lewis: Item 3 on that? And what about the first question, dealing with advertisements which purport to sell land at fire-sale prices, and so forth, a dollar an acre?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This, I believe, Mr. Chairman, would be under land, under the vote on lands.

Mr. Lewis: Vote 1102.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, 1101—1101; or 2204.

Mr. Pitman: Rework your budget. Start all over again.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is very fortunate that this is a debating chamber, because I am sorely constrained to take him on.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is referring, I believe, to private land —is that right?—which is outside the purview of our department.

Mr. Lewis: Outside the purview? No, I am not speaking just of private land. I am speaking of Crown land as well. I do not like to put anything more in the minister's department than his narrow shoulders already have to bear. Most of this pretends to be for recreational purposes, Mr. Chairman. That is why I thought perhaps it would be more appropriate under 1103. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, if he wants to speak on private lands now, or under this vote—

Mr. Lewis: Well, let me ask the minister under—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It would probably be under land.

Mr. Lewis: —research on this vote since this is probably as appropriate a place as any, whether his department has looked at the wide range of advertisements which appear with frequency, usually in American journals, about the acquisition of Canadian land. Sometimes Ontario is designated at a dollar an acre, or very small amounts per acre, or purportedly available in various parts of the province on the cheap. Has the minister looked at any of that? Has he done any research into that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have. We have looked at it and it is legal. Any person can buy land for tax purposes and can buy private land. You can go to northern Ontario today and you can buy private land, sometimes for the nonpayment of taxes from the municipalities and you can buy private land—

Mr. Stokes: For a buck an acre? Then why does the minister not buy it on behalf of the Crown?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We do. We are buying a lot of land. We own today—

Mr. Stokes: At a buck an acre?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —in the Province of Ontario in 1971, we own more than 150,000 acres more today than we did 10 years ago.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No thanks to the member for Thunder Bay either.

Mr. Lewis: It sounds an awful lot like creeping socialism to me. It is all public land, eh? The government owns it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, that would make it hurt.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, right.

Mr. Pitman: We are going to get the Treasurer all excited there.

Mr. Lewis: A policy of land nationalization on the part of the Tory government.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Surprisingly, Mr. Chairman, no more than one per cent of the Crown land sold in the Province of Ontario is sold to Americans—no more than one per cent.

Mr. Lewis: No more than one per cent.

Mr. Deans: One per cent—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right—no more than one per cent and that one per cent is mainly cottage lots at the rate of about 150 cottage lots a year.

Mr. Pitman: It is where that one per cent is, though. That is the thing.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 6 carry?

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister saying that the survey which—

Mr. Pitman: It is not up in James Bay, let me tell the minister.

Mr. Lewis: —showed so much of the Kenora district in the hands of non-resident cottage owners, was that part of the one per cent?

Mr. Stokes: This report says 16 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Of cottage lots. I am referring to Crown land. What I am saying is that in the Province of Ontario we sell no more than one per cent of our Crown lands to Americans—about one per cent, and out

of that one per cent about 150 cottage lots. They are maybe all cottage lots.

Mr. Lewis: Mainly all cottage lots? All right. I do not know exactly what invited that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: I was not here. I am asking about these advertisements.

Mr. Stokes: We are talking about recreational land.

An hon. member: I know these advertisements. They are perfectly legal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that much of Ontario is owned by the Crown and it is not much use for recreational and cottage purposes.

An hon. member: Oh, shame, shame.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Have a little faith in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister please stop interjecting.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Have a little faith.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what I am asking the minister is, is he satisfied that these various advertisements to which I have referred are acceptable to the government? Is he not anxious about the land which is being acquired by these various companies, private or otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I remember about a year ago at the Union Station that a person could buy land in Florida for a very cheap price.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A lot of it is swamp land and a lot of the land that is advertised for sale in American publications is swamp land and in northern Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Have faith in northern Ontario. Has the minister no faith?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And we have looked at it. This is perfectly legal. If the member wants to go to northern Ontario—I use this as an example because land is very cheap—he can buy private land, sometimes for $2 or $3 an acre. Nothing prevents the member from coming to Toronto to put an ad in the newspapers saying that he owns a piece of northern Ontario and he can resell it at $10 or $15 an acre—whatever amount he can get for it. And it is legal.

Mr. Lewis: Is that what the minister's research shows?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government is not interfering. It should not interfere with private lands and if the member thinks there is something unethical in this he should refer it to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Will item 6 carry?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6, research.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not my estimates.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On the same programme, did the minister say that one per cent of the total of Crown land sales were to non-Canadians?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is that what the minister said? That one per cent of the sales of Crown lands were to non-Canadians?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I said that one per cent of our Crown lands sold are to Americans. About one per cent a year and these are mainly cottage lots.

Mr. R. S. Smith: By Americans, does the minister mean non-Canadians? Does he group them together?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Americans.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Because the minister's report says of the total acreage sold, 80 per cent went to residents of Ontario, three per cent to other Canadians—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member is referring to this?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes—and 17 per cent to foreigners.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These are recreational. When I say Crown lands, this includes lands for recreational purposes and non-recreational purposes—lands for industrial purposes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Does the minister mean other than cottage lots?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I guess we are back on lands, are we? Is this where we are?

Mr. Chairman: Not really, no. The lands item is carried. If the member remembers, the member for Scarborough West spoke about—I forget what he called it—free land.

Mr. R. S. Smith: We are on research? Then, I would like to ask the minister a question, particularly on fisheries research. About what amount of this budget for research of $2.2 million is being spent on fisheries research?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Nine hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is this research being done on individual lakes or is that included in the next vote?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is both, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is some in each vote?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is some in each vote? There is some in this vote and there is some in the next vote?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: How does the department establish the priorities with regard to on what lakes research projects will be undertaken in each particular year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our priorities are based on various factors. For instance, the lakes in areas that the hon. member represents, like Nipissing and Lake Timiskaming, are lakes that are being surveyed, where we have fisheries management units. Lake Nipigon is another lake. Those are the lakes where due to the tourist potential, as well as the interests of commercial fishermen, we felt it advisable that we should concentrate.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is most of the minister's research geared to the commercial fisheries or to sport fishing?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In some lakes, it is both. Take Lake Nipigon, there we have both. There is a lot of interest for sport fishing and we also have commercial fishermen there and there is a decrease in fish population, But in Lake Timagami, of course, there it is, I believe, entirely sport fishing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Could the minister tell me if included in this vote is an increase for the fisheries research that has taken place in Algonquin Park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About the same level as last year.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I do not think this is outside the reference of the committee, but was any attention paid to the request of the advisory committee on Algonquin Park to increase the fisheries research funds that are available in order to set up a programme that would produce an investigation or a research investigation into the activity of all the lakes in Algonquin Park that would take any less than 100 years?

Under your present programme it has been established that it will take at least 100 years to do a proper research investigation of all activity of all the lakes in Algonquin Park. Now the minister says that in the present year there is not going to be any increase in the amounts of money that are made available for that programme. Is he aware that the advisory committee made a specific request in regard to this matter and that no attention is going to be paid to it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I am aware of the recommendation of the advisory committee and I would hope that we would be doing work there this summer.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But this recommendation, I think, went to the minister about almost a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that this is not a research programme, it is a management programme.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It comes under vote 1103?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I see. Fine.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes? Oh, research, yes. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister, maybe at the risk of incurring the wrath of many thousands, what kind of research was done to bring about the determination that we ought not to sell fishing licences in the Province of Ontario?

I cannot help but wonder. I remember back to the statement made by the government at the time fishing licences were introduced and how this money was to be used

for restocking and replenishment and the anti-pollution efforts in order to protect the waters and provide for better fishing facilities.

I may well be speaking for a very small minority, but the only people who have spoken to me since this was introduced by the government in the budget have been those who thought that the step taken by the government was rather ridiculous. The fishermen who have come to me, the anglers who have spoken to me, have spoken very much in the negative. They said they thought they were contributing something to the overall well-being of leisure-time fishing.

What research was done by the department in determining that there ought not to be any continuation of licensing in this Province of Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: He did not know until he read the budget.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister tell me that?

Mr. Lewis: He had no idea, until he read it.

Mr. Nixon: Marty Goldfarb told him.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I know that there will be more discusion and I do think that this subject matter should come under the next vote.

Mr. Deans: Surely the minister does not bring about these kinds of changes without doing research? He surely did not implement the licensing system without first of all determining that the sale of licences would bring about sufficient revenue to do some worthwhile things in the protection of fish and the making of a more pleasurable fishing atmosphere?

Now having done that—and I give him the benefit of the doubt—having done that, then something must have been uncovered in the continuing research conducted by the department to bring about this sudden change of mind, and I want to know.

Mr. Sopha: The member is out of order, it is the next vote.

Mr. Chairman: The discussion of this could more appropriately be taken under vote 1103. If we could finish this we could get to that right away.

Is there anything else on item 6 of this vote? The member for Nipissing?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have one more question here. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister in regard to research, does he include under this vote amounts of money that are being spent in fisheries research in regard to mercury pollution?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: To mercury pollution? Yes. For instance, we have purchased equipment to do our own analysing called an electric spectrometer.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Electric spectrometer—is that what he is—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I may not have the right—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, could I ask of the minister if there is a broader programme of testing into the content of mercury in fish being done than there was last fall? Or since the last tests were announced at the end of January, has the programme now been curtailed, or is it continuing to the same lengths as were included in the announcement that was made in February?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we have intensified considerably our sampling and analysing programme. We are doing about 218 lakes right now, practically all the major bodies of water in the province, and we are doing some of our own testing. There is some testing done under the Water Resources Commission here in Toronto and by some of those laboratories in Winnipeg.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Was it the intention of the minister to publish every four or five months a rundown on the results that have been obtained from these 218 lakes?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is right, Mr. Chairman. As the hon. member knows, I had a release a few months ago and the next one is just about ready, I believe. I hope to have it within the next day or two.

Mr. R. S. Smith: And regardless of what the mercury levels are, you have done away with the programme of putting signs on these lakes in regard to "fish for fun"? Maybe you could explain the evolution of this.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, we have not done away with those "fish for fun" signs. We have not posted any this spring, but we are in a much better position now than we were last year. We know a lot more about mercury. And the hon. member is familiar with the little booklet that we put out entitled,

"All About Mercury." And also, we feel that only in those bodies of water that have a high concentration of mercury, for instance, say more than one part per million, probably only those areas would be posted.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is that the booklet where you said there was no known way to clean it up?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is the same book.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is the book where you said there was no known way to clean up the mercury?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I never said that there was no known way.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The booklet—

Mr. Singer: Yes, the booklet says that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well, I would just like to follow along on that previous question—

Mr. Singer: We will read the minister the paragraph if he wants.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —in regard to the limit of one part per million. If the limit is above one part per million—is this what the minister is saying—he is going to put the signs up? In other words, in a large number of lakes in northwestern Ontario you are going to put these signs up? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in those areas where we feel there could be a health hazard we intend to put posters up and that position will not be made just by our department, it will be made by the four departments involved, mainly The Departments of Health, Tourism and Information, Energy and Resources Management and our own. And it will be in those areas where there is a high concentration of mercury—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, but is the hon. minister going to set a level, or is this going to be a decision made by perhaps the hon. minister and the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) regardless of what the level is? Does it depend on the pressure from the area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What does it depend on? You must have some scale you are going to follow.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I just indicated, Mr. Chairman, that in those areas where there is a mercury concentration of more than one part per million—

Mr. R. S. Smith: So the minister has set a new limit now of one part per million, as opposed to 0.5 parts per million.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have not set a new limit. The standard of health, I believe—

Mr. Stokes: World Health Organization.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —the federal Department of Health, the Food and Drug Directorate, are using the 0.5 parts per million. This is their tolerance level that they are using.

At the same time, we have indicated in this little booklet here on page—in the middle of it, anyway—whereby in Sweden they can eat fish at one meal a week. I had better read this over.

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. minister saying the Swedes have only one meal a week? What would our socialist friends say to that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The booklet says:

> In Sweden, only fish containing less than one-fifth part per million are considered suitable for unlimited human consumption, with the recommendation that fish in the range of one-fifth to one part per million should not be eaten more frequently than once a week. The average fish consumption in Sweden, however, is roughly two to three times greater than in Canada.

Again, on this whole question of mercury, I am told that dill pickles, for instance, have maybe 20 times more mercury.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. minister has just lost the dill pickle vote.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Remember last fall, Mr. Chairman, I believe it was the University of Toronto in the chemical engineering department. There is mercury in bread. There is mercury in many of our foods, but the danger level is the amount that one eats—

An hon. member: But the hon. minister changed the level.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and of fish that have less than one part per million it is quite permissible to eat one meal a day.

An hon. member: One meal a week.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon me, one meal a week.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to go back on this for a moment because in September last year the minister put out a list of lakes where the levels were over 0.5 parts per million. He then said that for those lakes where the main species of fish were caught by sports fishermen and eaten, he would put up signs where they had a species showing over 0.5 parts per million.

The Provincial Department of Health has established the safe level at 0.5 parts per million. Now the Minister of Lands and Forests has come along and, in spite of what the Minister of Health says and in spite of what the World Health Organization and the federal Food and Drug Directorate says, set his own level at one part per million.

I would just like to know on what basis the minister set the new level.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have not put any signs up yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. S. Smith: If it was a dangerous level at 0.5 last year, why is the dangerous level doubled this year? I just cannot understand the reason.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What does the member figure?

Mr. R. S. Smith: What do I think?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I would think that the minister made a mistake last year and that perhaps he should have followed some other guidelines other than the 0.5 figure.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we did not make any mistakes last year. This year we know a lot more about mercury than we did—a lot more—and we are not the only ones. We are consulting with experts in the United States, with Sweden and Japan. This is a world-wide problem and we are much more knowledgeable.

Mr. Nixon: In the United States, they do not know how to clean up their own pollution, but they do in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, about the consumption of mercury, it is the amount that you eat. For fish that have a small amount of mercury, as long as you do not eat a steady diet, it is quite acceptable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is trying to catch your eye, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would inform the members that on Thursday we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, followed by the estimates of The Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). Also on Thursday I notice a number of bills that will go to Committee of the Whole House and we will come out of committee to deal with those.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1473

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 1506

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 36

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 13, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from the Whitney Public School of Porcupine and from the Frank Oke Vocational School of Toronto. In the west gallery are students from St. Raphael's Secondary School of Malton and the Woburn Collegiate Institute of Scarborough.

At 3 o'clock we will also have as guests in the east gallery students from Amherstburg Public School of Amherstburg and St. Nicholas Separate School from Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House on a subject that has attracted a great deal of public interest.

The subject is that of Quetico Provincial Park which, as the hon. members of this House know, lies west of Thunder Bay in the northwestern part of Ontario adjacent to the international boundary. I will not dwell on the historic aspect of this park, nor on the details of some of the recent controversy which has surrounded it. Most of this information is known or available.

One June 11, 1970, an advisory committee to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) was appointed. Its general terms of reference were to examine the issues concerning Quetico and to make recommendations to the minister. In recent weeks the advisory committee has held public hearings in Atikokan, Thunder Bay and Toronto. A total of 262 written briefs and many thousands of letters were presented to and examined by the advisory committee.

The advisory committee held its first full meeting following the hearings on Tuesday of this week. At this meeting, the committee unanimously approved a recommendation to discontinue commercial logging within the boundaries of Quetico Provincial Park. The recommendation included the condition that suitable alternate areas be provided outside the park for the Jim Mathieu Lumber Company. A further recommendation was that the economic viability of the lumber mill located at Sapawe be preserved.

The announcement I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the government has accepted both the recommendations. From this point onward there will be no further commercial logging in Quetico Provincial Park. Furthermore, I wish to announce that discussions with respect to alternate areas have already commenced. These are the second and third recommendations of the advisory committee, all of which the government has accepted.

The House will recall that on January 15, the Minister of Lands and Forests announced that the area in the northwest corner of the park which had been included in the volume agreement with the Ontario Minnesota Paper Company was deleted. The net effect of these three recommendations and their acceptance by the government will be to have the entire 1,750 square miles of the park free of commercial logging.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the appreciation of the government to the chairman of the advisory committee, Mr. Syd Hancock, and to the members of the committee for the extremely diligent manner in which they have approached their tasks. The advisory committee will be proceeding with its other assignment—that of recommending a management plan for the future of Quetico Park—and we are looking forward to their further recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have William D. Robson sitting in your gallery. Mr. Robson is here in his capacity as vice-president of the Medic-Alert campaign for Life Underwriters Association.

As many of the hon. members know, May has been designated as Medic-Alert month in Ontario by the Canadian Medic-Alert Foundation. For many years now the foundation has been providing a service for many citizens of Ontario who have medical problems that may not be obvious even to the trained eye of a physician. In the event of an accident,

when these people are unable to identify their condition, serious illness or even death could result. The Canadian Medic-Alert Foundation provides identification bracelets for such people and around-the-clock emergency information service for physicians or authorized persons.

Medic-Alert has provided, as a memento of this occasion, a Medic-Alert identification bracelet embedded in a lucite block to you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis).

As Minister of Health for Ontario, and on behalf of the government of Ontario, I would like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the work being carried out by the Medic-Alert Foundation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Correctional Services.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I was asked a question on bail procedures by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), and I promised at that time to report back to the House on this matter.

The hon. member's first request was with respect to the text of the notice which the Attorney General's department proposed to have circulated to all inmates at the Toronto jail. I have been advised that the text of this notice is as follows:

NOTICE TO PERSONS IN CUSTODY OF THE TORONTO JAIL

If you have not appeared in a provincial court and if bail has not been set by a justice of the peace, you may apply to a justice of the peace for an order setting bail, and a justice of the peace will attend to hear your bail application. When someone is available to post the bail set by the justice of the peace or by a court, a justice of the peace will attend to release you on bail. The senior officer on duty at the Toronto jail will telephone a justice of the peace on your behalf.

This notice, I am advised, will also be made available in French, Italian, Greek and German.

Recognizing the importance of informing the members of the family or friends who attend the jail for the purpose of posting bail, it is our intention to post the following notice in the jails:

BAIL

If you wish to post bail for an inmate in this jail please ask to see the justice of the peace. If there is no justice of the peace at the jail the correctional officer will phone him in order that he may attend and release the inmate when the bail is posted.

This also will be translated into French and appropriate foreign languages.

One of the hon. member's supplementary questions was a request that I make available to this Legislature instructions which are given to staffs of the jail to make certain that bail procedures are carried out expeditiously. He asked if there were any such instructions and the answer is yes. The last such set of instructions was updated and sent out in August, 1969, by the deputy minister for issue to all staff and future members of staff. The memorandum reads as follows:

August 22, 1969

Memorandum to: All jail staff

From: Deputy minister.

Over the years The Department of Correctional Services has continually sought to develop progressive methods and policies in line with sound modern thinking in corrections in order to best meet its responsibilities for the protection of society through custody and rehabilitation of its charges. It is essential that each employee is, and views himself as, an important member of the correctional team.

In this connection an illustration of the change in roles and concepts within the department has occurred in job designations, where there has been a progression in job titles from guard through custodial officer. The designation correctional officer is in keeping with the department's statement of purpose which, while recognizing the dual role of staff in custody and rehabilitation, place special emphasis on the latter. Specifically, the statement of purpose stresses the importance of staff developing healthy relationships with prisoners as well as with the general public.

All staff must be guided by the statement of purpose in the daily performance of their duties.

The following are examples of some situations in which the exercise of sound judgement and courtesy will assist the individuals concerned, and at the same time enhance the image of the correctional officer, the institution and the department.

Special visits: All reasonable requests for visits with prisoners outside of regular visiting hours should be accommodated where possible, especially in instances involving clergymen, lawyers, out-of-town visitors, relatives unable to visit during regular hours and so on.

Bail: Prompt and courteous assistance in contacting a bailing magistrate or justice of the peace, should be provided to any person who comes to post bail at any time of the day or night.

Fines: Courtesy and promptness should be exercised in accepting payment of fines at any time, in keeping with the intentions of the court.

Telephone calls: All reasonable requests to staff from prisoners regarding the relaying of a telephone message should be acted upon, particularly when the calls are of a compassionate or urgent nature and are to be made to members of the immediate family, the prisoner's lawyer, or a clergyman. Repeated attempts to contact the designated party should be made if necessary.

Legal aid: Every effort should be made to ensure that a prisoner is aware of his rights with respect to legal aid.

Identification: In any situation where a prisoner alleges to a staff member that he is a victim of improper identification and is wrongly incarcerated, the staff member must report immediately to the officer in charge who in turn will contact the appropriate authorities, for example, police, Crown attorney and so on. The governor must also be informed of any such allegation and where necessary, he will seek advice from the administrator of jails.

Obviously, sound judgement, courtesy and commensense should guide the actions of all staff in dealing with the matters mentioned above and other related matters.

I know that you share my concern and desire to act in the interests of justice and good public relations. I am also aware that, in the daily performance of their duties, the majority of staff make special efforts to meet the needs of prisoners and the general public, and on many occasions staff have initiated and carried out commendable projects, such as arranging and supervising the writing of examination in jails by students, assisting community organizations, etc., which reflect positively upon themselves and the department.

L. R. HACKL
Deputy Minister

I think the hon. members will agree that this is in keeping with the way members of this Legislature would expect staff of The Department of Correctional Services to act and that in doing so they will be acting in the best interest of all the people of Ontario.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what we have done so far and I propose at the end of this statement to table it.

I should add that following the completion of the information booklet for inmates of adult male correctional institutions, we started to prepare an information booklet for all inmates of jails and this is now in its final draft. When this is issued, it will bring together in one handy booklet all the various pieces of information which are available to inmates and it will guide them in the solving of their problems.

It will, of course contain such things as information on how to appeal, statutory remission, bail procedures, temporary absence and many other subjects which are of vital interest to the inmate and I have urged that top priority be given to the production of this booklet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this statement be tabled for the information of all members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial Treasurer.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of some questions today, I thought perhaps I might make a brief statement about the reported comments of the federal Minister of Finance yesterday.

Mr. Benson is reported to have said yesterday that some provinces have failed to apply pay restraint policies worked out at federal-provincial conferences in 1970.

In the spring of 1970, Mr. Drury, chairman of the Treasury Board at Ottawa, visited with ministers of the provincial governments on the question of containing the rate of increase of the costs of hospital and medical care programmes and of higher education. These visits were pursuant to the decisions of the tax structure committee that: "Greater attention should therefore be given to this extremely difficult problem, with a view to reaching agreement upon viable target ceilings on their growth in the immediate future," a decision which was supported by the Prime Ministers and Premiers at the February, 1970, federal-provincial conference. It was understood that when individual targets have been agreed to, each provincial government would attempt to keep its expenditures within the specified rate of increase for each of the programmes.

This subject was discussed at the June meeting of Ministers of Finance when no firm targets were agreed upon, Subsequent correspondence resulted in amendments to the proposed targets for shared-cost programme expenditures as they related to Ontario. These targets were never formally accepted as the basis for federal-provincial agreement. The Ontario government did cut expenditure estimates, both in 1970-1971 and this year, very much in line with the proposed guidelines, and in fact significantly bettered them in the medical insurance programme.

While there were implicit wage constraints in the limited shared-cost programme guidelines, the six per cent guideline mentioned by Mr. Benson was a separate proposal.

At the Winnipeg meeting of the Ministers of Finance, in June, 1970, Dr. J. Young, of the Prices and Incomes Commission, proposed federal-provincial endorsement of a general six per cent upper limit to wage settlements in both the private and public sectors.

The Treasurer of Ontario expressed general sympathy with the proposals of the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission but indicated that he could not commit his government to them. Although Mr. Young subsequently visited the Ontario government on two or three occasions regarding wage and salary increases, there was no formal federal-provincial agreement arrived at.

The Ontario government did adopt a strong policy of restraint in wage and salary increases for civil servants, and in fact most categories of civil servants received not more than a six per cent increase last year as part of a two-year contract settlement. This year the government has declared its intention in the budget to contain the increase in wage and salary scales to an average of five per cent for 1971-1972 as well as increasing complement by only 1.6 per cent.

I believe, therefore Mr. Speaker, that it would be inaccurate to charge this government with failure to live up to agreements on pay restraint.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I would like to announce the construction of a new centre of forensic sciences building here in Toronto. I know the hon. members will appreciate the coincidence when I tell them it is going to built in the great, grand, old riding of St. George. This centre is responsible for the provision of scientific services to all law enforcement agencies, other investigative agencies and coroners. It currently has a staff of about 80 people, most of whom are professionally qualified in the various disciplines of science.

The centre is now split between two locations, both of them also in my riding, 8 Jarvis Street and 875 Bay Street. The Jarvis Street location was converted from light industrial use and is shared with the headquarters staff of the Ontario Provincial Police.

When the centre, then known as the Attorney General's laboratory, moved to its present location from the old Hospital for Sick Children on College Street in 1957, the gross floor space available was increased from 3,000 to 11,000 square feet. An active training programme for investigators and the development of new scientific techniques and services resulted in a rapidly increasing demand for laboratory service.

During the 1960's the present organization of the centre evolved with the development of sections to handle very specialized work. This has resulted now in the centre's ability to offer to the police forces of Ontario as complete a range of forensic science services as may be found in the world today.

Recently there has been a disruption of the pathology services. But the department, by taking a long range view of the needs of the people of Ontario, has reached an agreement which I would also like to announce today, whereby the centre's resources will be combined with those of the pathology department of the University of Toronto. This agreement will ensure the finest training for future forensic pathologists and, at the same time, provide the best of services to the department.

It became apparent in the late Sixties that a new building should be erected to enable the centre to perform the duties imposed upon it by the community. In January of 1968, The Department of Justice assumed responsibilities for additional services including the morgue facilities here in Metro. Because these facilities were inadequate and obsolete, it has now been decided to incorporate a new morgue facility in the forensic sciences building.

The new building will be built on Grosvenor Street and will provide about 150,000 square feet. It will incorporate facilities for pathologists, chemists, biologists, firearms examiners, toxicologists and document examiners, together with the auxiliary services

necessary for this branch of the department to fulfil its function.

In addition, facilities for the supervising coroner's office will be included. This new building, sir, to cost an estimated $14 million, will provide services in this field which are not surpassed in any other jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

QUETICO PARK POLICY

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, following the statement made by the Premier on the parks' policy, is he prepared to tell the House whether he will make public the recommendations from the advisory committee on Algonquin Park, and whether the new policy position taken in connection with Quetico would apply in Algonquin, where the controversy has been before the public for an even longer period of time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Lands and Forests will be making this document available for perusal by members of the House either later today or first thing tomorrow.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier indicate when the government is prepared with a policy statement with regard to Algonquin similar to the one he has made with Quetico?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were two or three specific recommendations in the report from the advisory committee on Quetico which the government has had an opportunity to consider and has accepted. Members of cabinet have not seen the Algonquin report, nor will we have an opportunity to do so before members opposite have the opportunity to study it.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask the Prime Minister what steps have been taken to protect the jobs of the loggers during this transition period until alternate opportunities for logging are found?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted to know the member for Peterborough is at long last accepting there are certain complications in all of these decisions.

Mr. Pitman: We have always accepted that. The alternative opportunities were there and the Prime Minister knows it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my statement, the negotiations for alternate proposals or sites for continued commercial operation outside the park are currently under way.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary? Has he suggested to his fellow minister, the Minister of Lands and Forests, that he actually provide jobs within the park service for these loggers, if indeed there are some put out of work as a result of this transition period?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Now the hon. member worries about that. They are a bunch of scribes and Pharisees.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, once again we are dealing with a hypothetical situation, in that the department is conducting negotiations now with those firms that have been in the park previously; in that there is no determination there will be loggers unemployed, it is very hypothetical to say what we will do if they do become unemployed.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, will the government guarantee that during the period of these negotiations there will not be any layoffs in that particular company?

Mr. J. S. Randall (Don Mills): It cannot be guaranteed.

Mr. Pitman: Find the alternative first, find the jobs!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Speaker, in that—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Members of the socialist group would say that.

Mr. J. Renwick: Stop the commentating.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that once again some of the complexities are sinking through to the members of the socialist group, I would say this—

Mr. J. Renwick: Stop the editorial comments.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Riverdale is the last one to make observations about editorial comment in the question period. I say that with the greatest of respect.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mine are very apt and correct.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As there is some hiatus in the commercial logging period and we are at that time of the year, I anticipate the negotiations, which are in fact current, will be resolved before the logging season commences again in the fall.

Mr. J. Renwick: Can we take this as a guarantee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this cannot be guaranteed.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary question?

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has yet answered the allegations made by Abbott Conway on behalf of five conservationist groups with regard to the composition of the membership of the advisory committee, and whether he is prepared to refute the allegations made?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: He said they were going to come out with a loaded decision, did he not? And he was all wet, was he not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure the member for Thunder Bay knew in advance the answer to the question but in case he did not know the answer, of course, is no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

COST OF EDUCATION

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier if he is aware of the continuing difficulty faced by the standing committee on human resources in investigating the cost of education in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the only difficulties I know of, if there were some, were what I read in this morning's press.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question. In view of his knowledge of these continuing difficulties, will he undertake to establish a select committee with independent research staff that can pursue these investigations independently of the standing committee over the summer months?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is quite customary for the government to establish certain select committees at the conclusion of a session to operate during the off-season. There has been no determination by the government at this time, first, when the off-season may begin and, second, what select committees may be appointed.

Mr. Pitman: Might I ask a supplementary? Could the Prime Minister indicate whether he is prepared to accept the $25,000 offered by the OSSTF covering the group of researchers who have been co-opted by that committee to try to carry out this analysis over the next few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is very doubtful that the government will accept the very generous offer of the OSSTF.

Mr. Pitman: Could the Prime Minister indicate why he would be unwilling to accept this offer, in view of the fact that the people who can carry out the research are already there? Could the minister indicate what right these researchers will have? Will they be accepted by all parts of this government in their attempt to discover what really is going on in relation to the cost of education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I personally have not been informed as to what the steering committee recommended to the committee regarding what function the researchers might perform, quite obviously I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps the Prime Minister might answer the first question as to why the government is unwilling to accept the $25,000 offered in good faith by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the offer was made in good faith, but as a matter of policy, the government is not accepting funds given by a specific group for research which may or may not be within the terms of reference of the committee.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, is the Prime Minister willing to give an alternative sum of money to that committee to carry on its activities, in view of the fact that the government's policy is not to accept outside finances?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker. The government is not prepared to do this at this moment.

I have an alternative suggestion to put forward. As I read the report, I think there was sufficient meat in the material available to the members of the committee, including the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) and the member for Peterborough. They could have got into the report provided by the officials of The Department of Education at some length. As I read the report, I gathered there was some reluctance to come to grips with it.

Mr. Pitman: Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that The Department of Education was requested to give some information on the cost of education but was not requested to make a frontal attack on the position of the OSSTF? In other words, The Department of Education was playing politics with a report that was presented by the OSSTF in good faith.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Is that a question?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member is playing politics.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into who was playing politics except to observe that there were certain politics being played by the member for Scarborough East and the member for Peterborough.

I would suggest, with the greatest of respect, there was sufficient material in the report presented to the committee to give them the very real basis for a very continued dialogue, with members of the committee, the members of the staff and with the OSSTF themselves.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On a non-political basis!

Mr. Pitman: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the Prime Minister regard it as fair game for the OSSTF to be expected to answer charges related to their brief when this report was all ready and was available to the committee by April 30? Would the Prime Minister expect the OSSTF to be able to comprehend and answer charges of that nature virtually without having seen that report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think if the member for Peterborough were to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) he might determine that a good portion, if not all, of that material was available to the OSSTF prior to the meeting yesterday.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Perhaps some of it was.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier can inform the House as to which of the specific employment programmes which were entered into, either on a shared basis with the government of Canada or independently by this government—which of the programmes designed to make employment are still extant—besides the ones specifically directed toward students? Which ones are still in operation?

Second, with reference to the continuing high rate of unemployment, can the Premier indicate that he is either in communication with the government of Canada, or with his colleagues, to continue these make-work programmes at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the municipal programme goes to the end of June. We extended by one month the programme initiated by this province, and of course, the student programme is an on-going one throughout the entire summer.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary: Is it possible that some of the programmes, some of the employment projects of the last two months, could be continued if they are about to be phased out, or be resurrected if they have already stopped—such as the cutting down of the elm trees, which did employ a good many people—in view of the figures that have been released just in the last day or two?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, one of the complexities of extending the removal-of-dead-elms programme relates to the supervision that was carried on during the winter and spring months by personnel from The Department of Highways who, of necessity, are now involved in their, shall we say, more traditional responsibilities.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hire some more supervisors.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, the member for York South says: "Hire more supervisors." Supervisors just do not always exist.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That is a typical socialist comment.

Mr. MacDonald: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are taking a look at this, Mr. Speaker, to see if there is any possibility.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The Premier has 10 million to 15 million trees to cut down.

Mr. Pitman: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister, in his rather off-hand way this afternoon, realize that unemployment in Ontario has increased more than in any other region in Canada, by 0.8 per cent? Does he realize this?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A month ago the member was pooh-poohing it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if that point was not made abundantly clear by myself and the Treasurer over these past three or four weeks, I would like to know where the member for Peterborough has been? That is just the point we have been making.

Mr. Pitman: I was right here. Is the minister prepared—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: —to revise the entire housing programme announced by the Minister of Trade and Development and do something effective about the problem?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The question is not supplementary.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Prime Minister: Are directives going out from your various ministries in relation to make-work programmes to lay off heads of families who are working on a temporary basis in departments to make room for students this summer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Given the interim that has passed since April 26, when the budget was brought down, does the government now have an estimate of likely job creation as a result of the budget proposal, given the unemployment figures today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, once again I think the answer to that question is rather obvious. No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT PURCHASE

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if he is concerned as to the facts revealed on the costs of the acquisition of land for recreation and conservation purposes on the Niagara Escarpment? Is he prepared to set up some type of a committee, either within the government or external to it, to investigate these unconscionable escalations in costs and particularly the special conflicts of interest, political and otherwise, associated with the ownership of the land before it is purchased by the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Lands and Forests will be dealing with this question during the estimates either later today or this evening.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Whether or not the minister deals with it, is the Premier himself concerned as a matter of policy that his announcement on land bank programmes in the Speech from the Throne has so far not been implemented and no steps have been taken to remove this from the ministerial direction which has been so much to the detriment of the taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that the land bank programme was announced some three weeks ago, I am not concerned that the $20 million, or whatever was allocated to it, has not been spent at this precise moment; of course not.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier, further, is he under the impression that I am concerned that the money is not being spent quickly enough? In fact, my real concern is that the money is being wasted.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government is always concerned about waste, yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: Will the Premier consider placing a moratorium on the sales or the disposition of lands on the Niagara Escarpment until such time as this problem is sorted out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very foolish to place a moratorium on acquisition of land in whatever area if the acquisition of land is in the public interest.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: It was not a moratorium with respect to the acquisition by the government of land. My question was whether the government would consider putting a moratorium on the sale or the disposition at this time of land within the Niagara Escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are some—I do not know whether the word "prohibition" is right—but the applications say, for approval of plans of subdivision that are being processed by The Department of Municipal Affairs, require that they go to the various government agencies, one of these where approval is required being related to the acquisition or the need for public areas on the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Deans: By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will the Prime Minister and the government freeze all land transaction on the Niagara Escarpment until such time as a decision is reached?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, those lands that are directly on the escarpment are, in fact, in that position now.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense, they are not. By way of a supplementary: Would the Premier take a look at the top priority A classification established by Gertler and attempt to see whether the government can now use its $20 million to purchase those lands? How much of the $20 million will the Premier apply to Gertler's A classification?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the $20 million will not all be applied to acquisition of land on the Niagara Escarpment. It has a very high priority but, with the greatest of respect, there are other areas in the province that will also have priority.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary: Could the Premier explain to me how he can freeze all sales of land unless the government, in fact, acquires ownership of them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He can by zoning.

Mr. Singer: He cannot stop alienation of a self-contained piece of land which does not need a plan of subdivision on it or land division application. What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: The member is right; we will get to that later today. May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: On the Niagara area—why did the Premier tell me on April 30 last that he knew nothing of a second report which flowed from the Gertler report on the Niagara area, when he himself corresponded about the Niagara fruit belt report and called it an internal document just two weeks previous?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the question, as I recall it very clearly as stated by the member for Scarborough West, related to a second Gertler report.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I thought that was the way the Premier would get out of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was exactly what he said.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier knew what I meant, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, as a matter of fact I did not.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Davis: As a matter of fact I did not, and there was not a second Gertler report—which is what I told the hon. member. To my knowledge there was not one, and there is not one.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: There have been a reasonable number of supplementaries. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

ROCK FESTIVALS

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): A question of the Minister of Justice: Is the Minister of Justice planning legislation to prevent rock festivals in this province this year?

Mr. J. Renwick: Or is the Minister of Justice going to hold another one this year?

Mr. MacDonald: Hold it in St. George!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this question is under very active advisement by the government right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Downer: Mr. Speaker, did the owner of the Rock Hill festival park pay amusement tax on the admission charges last year?

Mr. MacDonald: Amusement taxes?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He should have—there was a lot of it there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think that question would be more properly directed to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Wells).

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of supplementary question: Does the minister consider the Conservative convention a rock festival?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We will rock you!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It was far more of a swinging party than other conventions I can name.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We did not go to sleep through boredom, I can tell you that.

Mr. Lewis: The Attorney General was the only one who threw rocks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT REPORT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier: Is it not accurate that a second report on the Niagara fruit belts flowed from the original Gertler report on the escarpment, and is being contained by government as an internal document? And if that is so, why is the government sitting on that document?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is an internal report related to the Gertler report, and this is true of many reports that have been obtained by government. There are internal reports between departments or within departments which are the property, very naturally so, of the government. This is how we have to do business. There is a report related to the Gertler report, but I want to make it abundantly clear to the hon. member for Scarborough West that it is not a second Gertler report as he suggested in the House.

Mr. Lewis: I did not ask that this time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, he asked it before.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am asking the Premier a different question now. Why is the government sitting on the report from the Niagara fruit belt area, which flowed directly from the Gertler report, and which I do not think was internally prepared, but was prepared by someone outside?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government is not sitting on any report. Internal reports to the government are acted upon as matters of policy if they can be accommodated within our priorities, or if they make sense from a policy point of view. I am not sitting on any internal report.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: The government, after 15 months of sitting on the Gertler report, released it. Why will it not make public a crucial document relating to government policy on the Niagara fruit belt and subsequent public acquisition in order to preserve that part of the Niagara area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, for the very same reason there are a lot of internal reports within this government and any other government that are internal and confidential to the government. That is a policy decision on the part of the government. And this is internal.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Who prepared the Niagara fruit belt report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I would tell the hon. member in that it is an internal report—

Mr. MacDonald: What a hugger-mugger the Premier is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As a matter of fact I do not know. I shall determine this.

Mr. Lewis: One final supplementary: Is it true that the government is sitting on that report because it makes specific recommendations to save an area of the escarpment which this government is prepared to dismember like all the rest of the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the answer to that is very obviously no.

Mr. Lewis: Well, then, will he make it public?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answer to that is no.

Mr. Lewis: Right. In that case we will get to the escarpment later today, as the Premier suggested.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): What has the government got to hide?

BAIL PROCEDURES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr. Speaker: Will the bail instructions be posted in all the jails under the minister's jurisdiction, or simply in the Toronto jail?

Hon. Mr. Apps: The instructions we are getting from the Attorney General at the present time will be posted in the Toronto jail, and I indicated in the statement the instructions that have gone out to all the jails throughout the province as to their procedures in connection with bail and many other things.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason to believe that the instructions that the minister referred to today will be any more observed than the previous instructions given by his predecessor less than a year ago, which were ignored?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the fact that they were ignored.

Mr. Singer: Of course they were.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I cannot accept that fact that they were ignored. And I am confident that the superintendents throughout the jails are doing their best to make certain that when inmates come in they are given the information they need to protect their own rights.

Mr. J. Renwick: A supplementary question, in three parts, with respect to bail procedures: Will the minister clarify the instructions which he read into the record today to make specific provision that once bail has been granted or fixed by a justice of the peace the prisoner or the inmate to whom the bail applies is given immediate access to a telephone or other method of communication to his family or friends in order that he can obtain the posting of bail?

Second, will the minister reissue specific direct instructions not included in an omnibus circular of what they would like their staff to do but specific, precise instructions to the members of his staff imposing on the members of his staff the obligation to make known to inmates the bail procedure set out in the notice?

Third, will the minister clarify, for the benefit of the members of the House, whether the ministerial responsibility for ensuring that persons have access, readily, to bail falls upon him as Minister of Correctional Services in charge of those institutions or whether the ministerial responsibility falls on the Minister of Justice and Attorney General?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please! The very length of that question indicates it should be placed upon the notice paper.

Mr. J. Renwick: On a point of order! If the minister is prepared to answer, does that ruling stand?

Mr. Lewis: You know, we have played games with bail a great deal in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think—

Mr. Lewis: Tell me, what do you think?

Mr. Speaker: The standing orders do indicate that lengthy questions requiring some considerable amount—

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a point of order, this is—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has already made one point of order.

Mr. J. Renwick: —a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please resume his seat.

I was speaking to his first point of order, and I indicated that the standing rules clearly

indicate that a lengthy question is better placed upon the notice paper in respect of getting the proper information in answer to the question.

It would seem to me that the length of time that the hon. member took to phrase his questions—three of them—was in the nature of a question that should be placed on the order paper. However, if the hon. Minister of Correctional Services can answer that lengthy question in a brief reply he may do so.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member would ask the questions separately, then I will endeavour to answer them separately.

Mr. Speaker: He has no assurance that I will permit that many supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Apps: In that case, Mr. Speaker, if he will put them on the order paper I will endeavour to get the answers.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: There can be no supplementary to the question until it is asked. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

OSHAWA REGIONAL GOVERNMENT STUDY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I take it—I am asking that with an interrogative inflection—that the minister knows the area municipalities have rejected the Oshawa regional government—the OAPAD—study paper as a result of the confusion introduced by this government? What, then, now follows? Will there be a second report emanating from the Toronto-centred region plan? What will the minister's department do about the OAPAD study?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept what the member has said in reference to this government's actions. The study has been terminated by the local people. In my view they put a good deal of effort into it and there is still a need for the problem to be resolved for a better system of government there.

In view of the decision of the local people—and I have only been advised that they are sending me two papers for information purposes, and I will study those—the burden will fall upon the province to continue, not that particular study but to continue any study of the matter; and to do so we will need the help and co-operation of the local people.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it the intention of the minister to follow the threat of one of his departmental officials which indicated that the government or the department would continue with the study on a unilateral basis and come to its own conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that the province would need the help and co-operation of the local people, and that is exactly what I said.

Mr. Lewis: That will be a change; that is a change in policy.

Mr. W. Hodgson: It is not, if the member knew what he were talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Oshawa a supplementary?

Mr. Pilkey: A supplementary then, of the minister, Mr. Speaker: Does the government then plan to initiate any further discussions with the executive of the OAPAD study?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that they were going to forward, as I understand it, two papers for information purposes. I want to receive those and see what their views are on it. I will undoubtedly want to speak to Mr. Sims, who headed the study, before I make a decision.

Mr. Pilkey: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the government now concede—in view of St. Catharines' threatening to secede, the York region's being bitterly disappointed, the Oshawa regional study being terminated—that the government will have to review its position of providing financial resources and incentives to the new regional governments?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker. When regional governments are formed, just as when the metropolitan government was formed in Toronto, I think it is a matter of ongoing policy to work with the various areas of the government and see what steps need to be taken from time to time to assist them in becoming stronger units within themselves.

Mr. Pilkey: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the government make an effort to alleviate the obviously strained relationship between provincial and regional governments?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have been doing that all along and we will continue.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. W. Newman: I would like to ask the minister if the Oshawa area planning development study people contacted him or his department for a meeting before they terminated this study?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I was advised of the executives' views, but they did not meet in committee until yesterday. I received notice of it through the newspaper this morning and some further information that I requested.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Scarborough West further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial Treasurer has answers to questions previously asked.

EFFECT OF MARK REVALUATION ON ONTARIO LOANS

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on May 10, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) asked if there were reserves to provide for differences in exchange values. I have looked into this and there are not, in fact, reserves in the normal sense of the word. I think perhaps when the former Treasurer answered this question, he might have had reference to the fact that one of the loans, for example, was left in deutsche marks for some time and, actually, we did not lose on the revaluation because it did not come back to Canada until after that time. There is the point that—

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister not get them to write it out for him before he says it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is also the point that on maturity in the case of some loans, we would have the option of refinancing the loan, which can spread out the effect of any revaluation over a longer period of time. I think the concept of a reserve, or a large reserve, obviously is in conflict with the thought of borrowing for capital purposes. Why would you establish that kind of a reserve? Certainly, it should be pointed out that although we may at some point lose something on the deutsche mark loans, we are gaining, I suppose daily, on the something like $1 million which we have borrowed and Hydro has borrowed over the years in the United States. As the Canadian dollar strengthens relative to the American dollar, we are more than making up for any losses which may hypothetically be incurred in terms of loans in Germany.

The member for Scarborough West asked me a question—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Supplementary to the first question, before the minister goes to the second one, please—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: In view of the widespread publicity given to the freeing of the mark for some weeks before it actually took place, why did the government not buy a future for its requirements on the market, as so many businesses did over the past few weeks, so as to prevent the government of Ontario from losing money?

Mr. Lewis: Where is the government's free enterprise capacity?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government of Ontario has never read "How to Make a Million" and does not propose to do so.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps it should.

Mr. Lewis: The government needs a million right now.

Mr. J. Renwick: Protect the Treasury.

Mr. Singer: Guys who bought the futures are unloading them today, too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Since the time of the borrowing of the funds in Germany, there was a definite saving in the interest rate paid in Germany compared to that which would have been paid in the Canadian market.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member ask his question?

Mr. Deacon: I am trying to explain the situation, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not consider it advisable to set aside a portion of that saving as a reserve against the possible change in exchange rate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would not. We might borrow money on the Canadian market today at 7.75 per cent and expect that rates are going to go up to 8.5 per cent six months

from now. Would the member expect me to set aside a reserve for that contingency?

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the minister expect them to go up?

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Since there is a saving in interest rates over domestic rates when one is borrowing abroad, would the minister not consider it advisable to set aside a portion of the saving as a contingency against exchange differences in the time of repayment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would not, Mr. Speaker. The member for Scarborough West also asked a question on the same day related to this matter He asked:

> If the West German mark revalues at approximately eight per cent and Ontario then requires an additional $1 million a year to service its debt on the German foreign loans, where will that $1 million come from in current budgeting accounts?

First of all, if you use a figure of eight per cent, it would be $500,000—not $1 million. The fact that the Canadian dollar is up reduces the impact greatly, and the answer which I gave was correct: it is a statutory matter and would not even require a Treasury Board order.

OMERS RATE FOR 1970

The third question was asked by the member for Waterloo North yesterday about the final rate of OMERS for 1970, and that rate was 9.1 per cent.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: All right, a supplementary.

Mr. Good: To the last question, did the minister look into the fact whether the Metro Toronto Police pension fund is tied into OMERS?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In fact it is not, no.

Mr. Good: It is not. Why it is not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because I think the member will find that Metropolitan Toronto and the police have never thought it advisable to come into OMERS on the previous fund. With the rate of interest of 9.1 per cent being paid last year—and it probably will not be as high this year; it is an average rate for the year—I would wonder whether they would not be reconsidering that decision.

Mr. Good: One final supplementary: Does The OMERS Act not require that the pension fund of existing personnel being taken on go into the OMERS?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the reference in the paper was to the old fund. New personnel would be coming into OMERS.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways and Transport has the answer to a question asked previously.

PORT DOVER LIFT BRIDGE

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce asked me what the final cost of the Port Dover bridge was and I am able now to inform him that it was $1,060,000.

Mr. Singer: If it would work, how much would it cost?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister when he anticipates that the bridge will be fully operational? It is being tested now, I gather.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot say that with any degree of accuracy. May I say it will be put into operation when we are sure that it operates properly.

Mr. Singer: When it will work, yes.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Hopefully before freeze-up.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. MacDonald: In the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

YOUTH DRUG PROGRAMME

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister whether he would tell the House whether any branch of his department has a programme wherein former young drug users, following their period of withdrawal, are engaged to communicate their knowledge, the suffering and whatever they have learned through the experience to other young people

of their age? Is there any branch of the department that makes use of these people in that way?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not as a programme, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe the Addiction Research Foundation, either, has a programme of that kind.

As I mentioned the other day, my department, The Department of Education, the Attorney General and probably Social and Family Services, will be sitting down fairly soon to work on youth drug programmes.

The kind of proposal that is implicit in the member's remarks is very interesting to me, because I have had an opportunity in New York City to see such a programme in operation and it was very impressive.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the minister agree that the brochures and other written material that are released by the Addiction Research Foundation, although very embellished and very well thought out, really in practice do not help parents to cope with the problem of drug addiction? In other words, does the minister recognize that unless they have spoken to someone who has been or is a drug addict, the parent never really gets the message?

Further, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether, during his deliberations with other department heads next week, he would consider having this investigated and perhaps suggesting that these young people who have had the experience be engaged as a corps in perhaps another type of student summer employment programme, to travel the length and breadth of the province to bring the message home to the parents?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes Mr. Speaker; broadly, I am very sympathetic to the points that are implicit in those questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington South.

CHARTER FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. H. Worton: (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Could he inform the House as to the reason for the delay in issuing a charter to the Ontario Government Employees Management Organization? The application was made in July, 1970.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and get the answer to the hon. member quickly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

CO-OPERATION WITH "GRASS ROOTS"

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Prime Minister. Will the Ontario government co-operate with Toronto city council and with various organizations grouped together under "Grass Roots", as requested today at city hall, in supplying the land of the Mercer Reformatory during the course of the summer months for a tent city for transient youth travelling across the country?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just noticed this in the press. There has been no request to the government, as I understand. When it is made we will certainly consider it.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the members of committee of council today asked me to make this request of the government, will the Prime Minister now consider it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

NAMING OF FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. When the new centre of forensic sciences is opened, would he consider in some way—perhaps in its name—honouring the memory of Dr. Ward Smith, who was one of the first people who headed that centre and did tremendous work on behalf of the people of Ontario and the people of Canada in that regard?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is a very worthy suggestion which we would be glad to take under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

ASSISTANCE FOR NEW MINES BAN ON STUDDED TIRES

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a two-part question for the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. Will the minister

advise how much success he has had with his colleagues in getting a $10 million to $15 million supplement to his estimates to provide assistance for exploration and development of new mines, as reported in a speech that he made about a week ago in Thunder Bay? And will he explain the embarrassment that he spoke of with relation to the change of heart in his stand on studded tires—and the solidarity that he referred to in cabinet?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the additional increase of my budget, of course, this is something that will be discussed with my colleagues; I have no further comment to make on that at this time. And I do not have any further comment to make on the other statement that the hon. member for Thunder Bay made.

Mr. Lewis: Funny thing what cabinet solidarity does for a change of heart.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

OWRC AND MATTERS OF HEALTH

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Would the minister explain to us, in reference to the differences between the OWRC and the medical officer of health in Ottawa, what he meant by a "personality conflict"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is difficult to hear the hon. member's question.

Mr. MacKenzie: Second, why should the OWRC profess to be expert in matters of health?

Third, does the minister not now think there is adequate indication that an authority other than OWRC should assess and rule on the end results of what the OWRC is doing as it relates to health?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall making the statement attributed to me by the hon. member. It is quite possible during the discussion during my department's estimates I had indicated that there was some conflict, as far as authority was concerned, between the local medical officer of health and representatives of OWRC.

There has been some objection, I think, by many local medical officers of health that they have been accused of not carrying out sufficient inspection of septic systems and things like that. This may have resulted in some difficulty in the Ottawa area, particularly in relation to the local MOH there.

As far as the Ontario Water Resources Commission is concerned, they do not claim to be any more expert, or possibly as expert, in matters of health as doctors would be. However, the hon. member is referring to a report issued by OWRC in respect to certain beaches in the Rideau and Ottawa area. I might say that that report was issued some time after the local medical officer of health had indicated those beaches should be closed, and also after certain corrective procedures were taken by OWRC and owners of septic systems, so that the condition of those beaches could very well have changed.

I certainly agree with the hon. member's insinuation in the third part of his question that in matters related to health that there should be some authority other than OWRC with some input, as there is at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: I regret that the question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Auld presented the annual report of the Ontario Department of Public Works.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Cadmus Associates Limited.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Cornwall.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the Village of Wasaga Beach.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the City of North Bay.

Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the City of Barrie.

Mr. Hamilton from the standing natural and physical resources committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved;

that supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of The Department of Energy and Resources Management be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972.

Department of Energy and Resources Management	
Departmental administration programme	$14,949,000
Renewable resources management programme	15,454,000
Waste management programme	387,000
Air management programme	4,313,000
Ontario Water Resources Commission	
Commission administration programme	$3,099,000
Management of the quality and quantity of water programme	7,547,000
Provision of sewage and water facilities and related funding programme	52,897,000

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; the concurrence in the supply that has just been put to us by the Clerk will be adjourned for further debate?

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, as is usual, Mr. Speaker usually indicates to the House the names of the pages who have served during the last period. The four girls who have broken tradition and made history by being the first to serve as legislative pages in this assembly will be leaving us tomorrow and will be replaced by grade 7 girls at the beginning of next week.

The young ladies who have served so well and who now leave us are: Annette Hoekstra of Bethany from the riding of Durham; Betsy Scott of Taunton from the riding of Durham; Diana Tax of Pontypool from the riding of Durham; and Christine Tukendorf from the riding of Durham.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(Continued)

On vote 1102:

Mr. Chairman: Page 190. When we rose last we were considering item 6 on vote 1102. The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, as I recall when we adjourned the debate on Tuesday evening, the minister was explaining to us some of the matters that his staff had ascertained in connection with research. He was indicating to us that there were certain lakes that were posted last year in relation to the dangers that might arise from eating the fish and that the same procedure, by and large, was going to be followed this year.

Could the minister tell us whether or not any efforts are being made by his department to remove mercury pollution from any of these lakes?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, we are co-operating very closely with the Ontario Water Resources Commission which is the main agency that deals with these matters. We are, of course, responsible for the management of the resources—the fisheries as well as the wildlife. We do a lot of the stamping and a lot of the testing of the fish and all our work is co-ordinated with OWRC.

Mr. Singer: With regard to this co-ordination, interestingly enough, last Tuesday when we were also dealing with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, particularly water resources, I tried to find out from the department, with which the minister said he is co-operating, what it knows about the removal of mercury pollution from the water once it has got in. To say the least, their information was not too clear. I was wondering if the Minister of Lands and Forests knows anything about the removal of mercury pollution from our waters, once it is recognized?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I know that the member for Downsview is familiar with this little booklet here, which was put

out by our department in close co-operation with The Department of Energy and Resources Management and The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Health. I think it indicates in this booklet the steps that are being taken.

Mr. Singer: I see. Is the minister telling me in fact, that this little booklet, of which I just happen to have a copy also, is the last word on the situation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh no. There is no such thing as the last word.

Mr. Singer: More specifically, Mr. Chairman, can I ask the minister if the last paragraph on the second last page is the last word about removing mercury pollution from the waterways? That paragraph reads this way:

> The Ontario Water Resources Commission is studying the feasibility of dredging mercury deposits from lakes and river bottoms. Other methods such as physically covering mercury deposits, or chemically de-activating them, have been proposed, but it is not known yet if any of these might be successfully used. Unless some method of stopping the movement of mercury out of the bottom sediment is developed, the mercury problem is likely to be with us for years to come.

I ask the minister particularly, is that the last word on the solution to this very serious problem?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the hon. member that sometimes he should turn the page. On the other page it says:

> Because the mercury problem is relatively new, a great deal of information is lacking that would be useful in answering some of the questions raised in this booklet. The answers given here make use of the most recent information available, but it is probable that some answers may require modification as the results of new studies become available.

Mr. Singer: I read that. That just leaves the door open.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, yes.

Mr. Singer: I am asking the minister, in light of the paragraph that I read, and in light of the paragraph that he read, if he has any new information that he can add through this open door?

Does the minister know anything more about removing mercury pollution from the waters? He says it is at the bottom of page 2. He says on the last page that he might want to revise that information. Is there anything more known? Does Ontario know anything more about taking mercury pollution out of our waters? Is it in this booklet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is an on-going study. As I mentioned to the hon. member, the government does not have the last word. It is consulting closely with its colleagues in the United States as well as in Sweden. It has sent one Mr. Loftus of The Department of Lands and Forests who went with members of the OWRC last fall to Sweden. The government is also consulting with those in Japan where they had this problem a few years ago, as additional information is available, the government will utilize it. There is no end to this research.

Mr. Singer: I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. What I was trying, in fact, to ascertain is if the government is satisfied there is a known method of taking mercury pollution out of our water? That is the simple question. Can the minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government is never satisfied.

Mr. Singer: The government is never satisfied? That is the answer that I wanted to get because, fascinatingly, the minister's colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) says there is a method, and that is what we were pursuing, Mr. Chairman, with the Water Resources Commission.

Then they talked about dredging, and they talked about neutralization, and they talked about cover. By the same token, Mr. Chairman, they indicated that nowhere in the world has there been any successful dredging operation conducted to remove mercury pollution, that nowhere in the world has there been any successful operation conducted by way of neutralization for mercury pollution, nor was there any place in the world where the cover system had worked.

All that had been done, as far as I could ascertain from Mr. Caverly's answer, was a series of investigations, the type of which this minister is now telling us about, where his officials have spoken to the Japanese, and spoken to the people in Sweden, and spoken to the Americans, and perhaps even spoken to the people who operate the federal laboratory in Winnipeg. What I want on the

record, if I can get it, is the frank statement as to whether or not this government believes there is a known way of removing mercury pollution from our waters?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very difficult question to answer, and it all depends on the location. For instance, I would think that in certain parts of Ontario where we know that there is mercury in the bottom and the beds of those waters—and if it is a river, a narrow river—that maybe dredging would be quite feasible. But in a large body of water, where it is very deep, it could well be that dredging may not be the right answer. It is something that is really a very technical and scientific matter.

Mr. Singer: I know it is very technical and scientific. What really puzzles me is that in a certain lawsuit that is pending one of the claims is that a sum of money—I think $10 million—be awarded to the government so it can remove mercury pollution from the bed of the St. Clair River. Now if, in fact, you got the $10 million, what would you do with it toward removing the mercury from the bed of the St. Clair River?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I know this is a very interesting discussion but I do believe that it really does not relate to this vote. I do believe that this comes under specifically The Department of Energy and Resources Management; and more specifically under the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

Mr. Singer: Then you are concerned about it, and you are sending your officials around the world to inquire about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With the OWRC.

Mr. Singer: With the OWRC. All right, if you are ducking that in the St. Clair River, let us go to one of your small lakes in northern Ontario where there are fish which your officials feel should not be eaten; where we are only going to fish for fun but not for eating. Why would your department not begin to experiment either by dredging or by neutralization or by cover in a small body of water to see if you cannot get rid of the mercury pollution? Has that ever occurred to you?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, as a matter of fact we are exploring all these and maybe this is planned. I do not need to say that we want to do everything that is physically possible to remove mercury.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think all the people in Ontario want to do something that is possible to remove mercury if it can be done. This minister says "we are exploring it." Mr. Caverly tells us what a wonderful laboratory he has, and you are all sending officials all over the world. We have been reading some of the scientific studies on it. But other than studying and reading each other's documents and sending people all around the world, can the minister tell us of anything that he knows of that the government of Ontario—either in his department or in any other department—is actively experimenting with or doing in trying to take the mercury out?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised, again, that in co-operation with the OWRC, we are investigating certain bodies of water. We have identified these sources of mercury and we are looking into the means of removing it. Right now we have a lot of information that we are gathering as to the depth and so forth and this will be done this year.

Mr. Singer: What will be done this year? Will you be examining some more studies? Will you be reading some more scientific papers or will you be sending some more people around the world to find out what other people think about it? Are you going to physically do anything to attempt to take mercury out of the water?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we are. First, we have to obtain the information; we have to do the investigation.

Mr. Singer: You told me you had the information.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have some but we need more and then we will. Once we have this information, we are, again with OWRC, prepared to do this but we are getting this information.

Mr. Singer: All right. Let me try to pin the minister down. I know the minister is not anxious to be pinned down but can you tell me, to your knowledge, if there is any programme by the government in the next six months or nine months or 12 months that would be directed to taking mercury out of our polluted waterways?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can say any more than I have said before—that we are gathering this information.

Mr. Singer: You told me about gathering the information. The information does not reduce the mercury.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, but you must have this information beforehand and once we have this information, we certainly will do our utmost to remove the mercury.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6. Is that about all?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Singer: I am not finished yet. I think this is important enough, Mr. Chairman, that we can pin it down.

Mr. Chairman: The chairman has called for order. These questions are becoming very repetitive. We are getting the same answers to the same questions and it is just too repetitious to be carried on. Now if there is a new—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is not repetitious. There are variations and I think the minister has an obligation to be very specific about this and he is being something less than frank with us, that is the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The minister I clearly heard has indicated these are questions properly directed to The Department of Energy and Resources Management and he has no further answers to it.

Mr. Singer: He did not say he had no further answers. I do not think you should put words in his mouth, Mr. Chairman. I do not think you have any right at all to put words in his mouth.

Mr. Chairman: I did not think I did.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am going to keep at this because I think this is very important. I could not get any answers from Water Resources either, but I want to ask specifically of this minister, Mr. Chairman, whether or not he knows of any of our dollars that are going to be spent for dredging mercury out of our polluted waters this year.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, again, I would repeat that I do not believe that there are in our estimates any funds voted to remove mercury. We have funds there for our fisheries management programme whereby we work closely with OWRC in sampling and providing samples of the fish. We have our own electronic spectrometer, I believe it is called, to do our own testing. We purchased this equipment in the last year and I do not believe I can add any more to that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Well, Mr. Chairman, the line of questioning by the member for Downsview has been very good. Certainly the minister must have some idea that there are methods suggested by experts in the field, as far as we know.

I have read about and heard about the three basic methods that have been talked about today. If his department is doing some research, it must have known about those three methods and he should be able to elaborate as to the extent that these methods may be used in any particular area.

Mr. Singer: They have never been used anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Gisborn: There is the dredging method; a method of covering with fill to a suitable depth; and the bacterial chemical treatment that I understand has been used in Japan in regard to their situation with some success.

Has the minister had any report from his research people as to the feasibility of these methods and the feasibility of using them in any particular area? We have the serious problem of deep, fast-flowing rivers. We have the situation of our streams and rivers and our lakes, both deep and shallow lakes, that would demand certain types of treatment. Certainly, at this date, we should have some idea as to what advances there are in research on this point.

Mr. Singer: Read his pamphlet. It is very definitive.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As indicated in this brochure, Mr. Chairman, we are looking into the feasibility of dredging mercury in co-operation with OWRC. And we have no—again I would like to repeat—we have no funds in our estimates for this type of work. This strictly comes under The Department of Energy and Resources Management—the question of dredging for mercury.

Mr. Chairman: This line of questioning is clearly in the other department.

The member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister under this vote—under subsection 2.

As the minister may be aware—we are on subsection 2, are we?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Research.

Mr. Chairman: No. We are on vote 1102, item number 6.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Oh, I am sorry. I thought we had gone over to 1103.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further to item 6? Then the member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a few questions in regard to the experimental trawling that is being done under the auspices of the Wheatley research station, which is one of the largest research stations in relation to commercial fishing in the province.

It is my understanding that last year a ship, or more than one ship, began fishing a grid pattern in the Essex county basin to determine the levels of mercury content in the fish at specified locations. As a result of this, I believe a voluntary suggestion was made to the commercial fishermen to desist from the fishing from a point west of the Arner town line over to the mouth of the Detroit River.

Specifically, I would like to know from the minister if the levels of mercury content in the various species in these checkpoints in the grid have increased or stayed at the same level as a year ago, or are they on the decline from last year?

Hon. Mr. Burnelle: Mr. Chairman, I will be tabling in the House, within the next few days, our latest report on the mercury analysis of fish in the various bodies of water, and of course it will include the area the hon. member mentioned. I should have that information available perhaps later today or tomorrow. At the moment, I cannot give it to him.

Mr. Paterson: I will await that report. Specifically what I am driving at is this: Is there any future for the commercial fishermen in Lake Erie, especially in the Essex county basin? Should those persons who are fishing strictly for, say, white bass, just dispose of their assets and get out of the business? Should those set up for pickerel get out of the business? Or is there going to be a future in the Lake Erie commercial fishing business?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, in answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Chairman, yes, I would say there is. We are optimistic that fishing in Lake Erie will continue to be an economic operation. However, those species that the member for Essex South mentioned, the white bass and pickerel, those are two species that do not look as though they could be fished.

Mr. Paterson: In relation to this, since the minister put his ban on these two species—and maybe I had better speak directly in regard to pickerel, which consume large quantities of other fish—has the research department come up with any long-term forecasts on exactly what is going to evolve in the lake or in the western basin with the prevalence of this species, which no doubt, is devouring perch, smelt and other species at an increasing rate?

Is this not going to affect the whole ecological balance in relation to fishing in that lake if these particular species are not removed on a continuous basis? Is the minister optimistic in relation to pickerel that they may be able to shed this mercury content over the years and then become a valuable commercial fishing species again?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The mercury in the pickerel could well be there for quite some time. However, by not fishing for them we do not anticipate this will mean a greater increase in pickerel at some later date—say, years from now.

Mr. Paterson: The minister's studies do not show that the population of pickerel is on the increase at all?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask one further question in relation to research? I believe last fall the department commissioned a ship, the Leo Charles, to do some experimental trawling for species of fish other than smelts in various areas in Lake Erie. Has the report concerning those activities and the full detailed analysis of those efforts been made available to any of the commercial fishermen on Lake Erie to this date?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, this has been an internal report and so has not been given to the fishermen.

Mr. Paterson: I believe I asked the minister in the session last year if this information would be available to the commercial fishermen in the various ports along the north shore. I think the minister gave me an undertaking at that time that such a report would be made available to them as to whether or not this method of commercial fishing was going to be viable. I hope that the minister

would just check his records in which, I am sure, he gave me an undertaking of looking into the job.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As soon as the trawling work is complete the department will make the report available to the fishermen.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have one short question regarding mercury. Is there some discrepancy between the Swedish limits and those set in Canada in regard to the 0.5 or one part per million? Do they use a dry method of determination or do they use the same method as we do here?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they use the same method as we do. They use the same method as has been indicated before. They do not recommend but they say that eating fish that have up to one part per million is acceptable on the understanding that it is about a meal a week.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, the minister's department has come to about the same thing as—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is why, in this little booklet about mercury, we indicated that. However, I would like to say that it is really The Department of Health that have the main responsibility for determining what should be the acceptable level of mercury.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The Department of Health has stated that it follows the guideline of 0.5 parts per million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, but in this little booklet that has been issued, The Department of Health were consulted.

Mr. Paterson: On this same point, Mr. Chairman, is the minister specifically stating that for those persons who are angling and catching fish which may have a content of up to one part per million of mercury—the poor fisherman such as I am who eats fish maybe once a week—this is acceptable in the minds of you and your officials? Am I correct that the Federal Food and Drug Directorate are still maintaining the position of 0.5 per million of mercury content before they will allow fish caught commercially to be sold either in the Canadian market or in the export markets?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, I would like to refer to this little booklet here. It says here "Is the 0.5 part per million mercury level used world-wide?"

Mr. Paterson: Right!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That little booklet is a veritable fountain of knowledge with nothing in it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. Several countries, including the United States, have accepted this standard but it is not universal. In Sweden only fish containing less than one-fifth part per million are considered suitable for unlimited human consumption, with the recommendation that fish in the range of one-fifth to one part per million, not be eaten more frequently than once per week. Average fish consumption in Sweden, however, is roughly two to three times greater than in Canada and—

An hon. member: The member for Essex South is safe.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —as you gentlemen know, the average Canadian is not a great fish eater.

Mr. Paterson: Therefore what you are saying is that any of us who like sports fishing and occasionally catch a fish, can go ahead and eat it? It will not—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I should not be doing this. I am giving my own personal opinion. There are more people in Canada who die—and I guess it is the same in the United States—from heart failure which is probably the biggest factor. Fish is considered to be good for the diet. It is a sort of non-fat and most of our foods have mercury. These are as a result of—

Mr. Paterson: Of dill pickles!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and therefore, if you eat—I mentioned the last time about dill pickles which have about 100 times more than eggs.

Mr. Paterson: We produce those in Essex county too.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Okay. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I should not—

Mr. Gisborn: Is the minister's department doing any research on substitutes for fish?

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into this debate—

Mr. Singer: Get some of those eggs that they cannot sell anywhere.

Mr. Stokes: —and specifically raise with the minister a telegram he or someone in his department received about a week and a half ago raising the problem confronting commercial fishermen in Lake Superior. The main agent in northwestern Ontario for the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board—head office in Winnipeg—threatened to go out of business if he does not get some kind of commitment from this department as to whether or not the level of mercury in the fish caught in Lake Superior is well under the tolerable limits.

I have been waiting patiently for a reply to that telegram for about a week now. I think I also mentioned in my opening remarks that one commercial fisherman did go out at his own expense, at the request of the department, to get about 100 fish so that they could be sent to Winnipeg, the closest place where they can be analysed with regard to mercury content. I am wondering what the minister is going to do about that specific problem?

With regard to the tolerable limits and the safe limits from a health aspect, I commend to the minister and members of his department the reading of some research that was done on this very subject by the recognized authority on mercury pollution. Indeed, the member who raised it in this Legislature—my colleague the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) is recognized as one of those in the Legislature who has done more homework. I would like to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, some comments he has made as a result of very comprehensive research in this field. And I quote him. He said:

> Scientifically, the guaranteed safe level for toxic substances in food is zero. But if we ate only food without any trace of toxic substance, most of us North Americans would die of starvation within one month. Politically and economically, therefore, governments feel forced to set administrative or so called "safe" levels for poisons in foods.
>
> The government acted correctly in banning fishing in certain lakes and streams because of the potential risks involved. But now that further research has been done—and after months of searching there has been not even a rumour of anyone in Ontario having suffered from the mercury poisoning as the result of eating such fish—it is time to review the standards previously established.

—and he is referring to the 0.5 parts per million.

> Dr. Robert E. Jervis, University of Toronto researcher, is reported as saying that meats and cereals may prove to be more significant than fish as sources of mercury in the human diet. If fish containing no more than one part of mercury per million were substituted once a week for meat, presumably there would be little or no increase in the total amount of mercury an individual ingested.
>
> If it is the government's aim to protect the public from consuming any mercury at all, then logically it should ban meat and cereals as well as the fish that contain mercury; if it is the government's aim to protect the public from consuming too much mercury, then, of course, it must inform the public how this can be done, i.e., how many ounces of certain fish, certain meats and certain cereals can, with reasonable expectation of safety, be consumed per week. As consumers, we would then be free to make an informed choice of the amount we are willing to risk.
>
> If, as Dr. Jervis indicated, the presence of 200 parts per million of mercury in human hair represents the danger point and if the average Canadian has only about four parts per million of mercury in his hair, then apparently there is a safety factor of 50. Therefore, one part per million level of mercury would appear to be tolerable.
>
> There should, however, be no slackening in research to discover not only the effects of mercury on the human fetus, but also mercury's synergistic effects with other toxic substances.

My colleague from Sandwich-Riverside concludes by saying:

> I would approve raising the acceptable level of mercury in fish for once-a-week consumption (one-half pound for adults, less for children and none for pregnant women) provided the government undertook to redouble its efforts to reduce the amount of all toxic substances, including mercury, that find their way into our foods.

I am wondering, in place of the Fish for Fun campaign that has been engaged in by The Department of Tourism and Information, why does the minister not take down those skull and crossbones signs at lakes and give the public the benefit of the latest research that has been done on this subject, having regard for the tolerable limits and the amount of mercury contained in certain fishes in certain areas, many of which are not the result

of industrial pollution but are there naturally as a result of leaching from our minerals? Why does he not put up the actual data that he has with regard to the content of mercury in certain areas and let people make up their own mind as to whether or not they want to just fish for fun or whether they want to consume mercury, that is, in the opinion of many other jurisdictions such as Sweden and, I think, maybe even the World Health Organization? Why does he not do that and allow people to eat these fish, having regard for the latest knowledge that the minister has in this regard? I want specifically to get back to the question I raised on behalf of the commercial fisherman in Lake Superior. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister is prepared to answer at this time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, may I first reply to the last part, that there are no signs with skull and crossbones.

Mr. Stokes: The minister has taken them down?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have not put any signs this year yet. However, if we decide that areas need signs to protect people's health, we are prepared to do so. This again will be in consultation with these four departments, namely, Health, Tourism and Information, Energy and Resources Management and our own.

I would like to tell the hon. member that we are keeping the public very well informed, as much as we possibly can. We put out this little book about mercury every two or three months, and I will be doing this again within the next few days. There will be a statement coming out about, at least, all the major waters in Ontario which are about, I believe, 218, giving the mercury levels above and below the 0.5 parts per million and with reference to that 0.5 parts per million. Again this figure has been established by the federal Department of Health which are drug and food directorates, I believe, in conjunction with their counterparts in the United States.

I, for one—and there are others—would like to see this raised. At the same time, this is really a health matter. So we are doing as much as we can to inform the public about these conditions.

With reference to the telegram which the hon. member referred to the Lake Superior commercial fishermen, we replied to them. They have our answer. What we have done is we have allowed the sampling, the taking of mercury, before the season opened. We did this and we sent the results to the various laboratories. Also, as the hon. member knows, the inspection of fish comes directly under the federal Department of Fisheries and Forestry, and the fisheries inspection branch. Apparently, they are allowing mercury as mainly found in the larger fish, and there is a possibility that they may allow the smaller fish, those that are say, less than 24 inches to 26 inches, to go by without inspection. This is being looked into. As far as the commercial fishermen on Lake Superior, they have been consulted and they are aware of what our answers are.

Mr. Stokes: If I may, I would like to find out what the reply was to their specific request for information and whether they are going to be allowed to fish or whether, in the light of the information that the minister has on it, it is going to be a viable operation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I indicated, again this is a matter where we deal with the federal fisheries people, and there is a good possibility that they will allow those fish that are less than 24 inches to go by without inspection because most of those fish are low in mercury. I will be glad to send the hon. member a copy of the letter and the telegram that we sent to the commercial fishermen.

Mr. Stokes: Does the minister have enough information now to say categorically whether they will or will not be allowed to fish?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. Definitely, Mr. Chairman. The commercial fishermen have been told that they can fish.

Mr. Stokes: Will they be able to market their fish?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, they will be able to market, depending of course on the content of the mercury.

Mr. Stokes: I explained to the minister earlier that if these people catch the fish, say, they bring them in on a Friday and truck them to Thunder Bay to the agents of the fish marketing board. Then, after about 24 hours' delay there, they go all the way to Winnipeg to the federal Department of Fisheries and Forestry, where they are analysed. It is at least a week before the fishermen find out whether or not these fish are fit for human consumption or for export into the American market. By this time the quality of the fish is so low that in many cases it is not even worthwhile.

Is there no way in which the minister can provide facilities to have these fish analysed, say, in Thunder Bay, where the agent is located, so that these people will be able to determine whether or not they are going to be able to market these fish?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, again the inspection is done by the federal department and, as I just told the hon. member—

Mr. Stokes: But they have an inspector in Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —those fish that are less than 24 inches will be able to be sold directly without being detained for analysis. I am optimistic that this year, after a year, the situation will be better of course than last year. For those fish that have to be tested, there are more laboratories—everything has been intensified to make the operation as viable as possible for the fishermen. These matters are being looked into and are—

Mr. Stokes: All right. I have two other small matters that I would like to get into with regard to research.

I am wondering if the minister can advise whether any action had been taken with regard to forestry research. I think it appropriately can be raised here; I think it is the only place where it can be raised.

The professional foresters' association some number of years ago called for the appointment of a forest research advisory committee for the Province of Ontario. They suggested that on it would be representatives of the provincial and federal governments, industry and the universities. Its function would be to delineate the areas of research for each body and co-ordinate their activities.

This seems like a useful suggestion and, now that the forestry course at Lakehead University has been extended from a two-year to a four-year course, I am wondering whether or not this could not be assisted by the establishment of research facilities in Thunder Bay, maybe at Lakehead University or to complement this four-year course, so that we would get the kind of research that is so necessary having regard for the unused allowable cut.

I am also thinking of basic research to provide more or better uses for wood fibre, more research having to do with silvicultural practices and the kind of seed that we should be using under certain climatic and soil conditions. I am wondering whether this advisory committee, if it is in existence, could suggest to the department the kind of research that could be carried on, say, at Lakehead University or some place in the north much closer to the source of the raw materials.

I am wondering if the minister would care to comment as to whether such an advisory committee has ever been set up and if not, will the minister take it under consideration. Hopefully it could work in the north as an adjunct of the four-year forestry course at Lakehead University, something complementing it. I think the minister is aware that they do have field studies going on the west side of Lake Nipigon in facilities which were formerly used by The Department of Lands and Forests, which have been taken over, I think, for archeological, biological and geological studies. I am just wondering if that kind of facility could not be used for a research station to complement what will be going on in the four-year forestry course at Lakehead University.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is a good recommendation. I would be pleased to look into it.

I would like to remind the member—he is probably aware of this—there is a forest research station at Thunder Bay, and we recently appointed Dr. Norato, who is a specialist in poplar, to the Thunder Bay station.

Mr. Stokes: One final comment on research. The minister referred to a remark that I had made last Monday with regard to research that is ongoing, with regard to stream flows, water levels and water quality on the five major rivers that flow into Hudson and James Bay. There is mention made of it in the latest annual report—that some research is going on with regard to the ecological effects of water diversions.

Would the minister just elaborate a little bit more about the nature of these studies, the reasons for taking them, who might be using this information and what prompted these studies in the first place? Was it that somebody suggested that maybe we should be diverting water from the Arctic watershed down in to the Great Lakes system? If so, for what purpose?

I am wondering what prompted these studies and what kind of liaison is there between this department and the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the federal

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. One cannot go into the north without seeing some experts studying this particular question and it is very foggy in the minds of people in the north just what the nature of these studies are, what the reason is, and what might be the outcome. I am wondering if the minister would care to comment on this kind of research, what the reason for it is, and explain it in a little more detail so the people in the north will be aware of the purposes and the reasons for it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, the reason for this research study is to detect the ecological effects on our fisheries as well as on our wildlife. I would be pleased to send to the member information on this. I do not have this available at this time in a more fuller report, but I will be pleased to make it available.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Chairman, a few years ago a rather irresponsible fisherman in the Lake Simcoe area introduced smelts into the lake and as a result, due to their rapid propagation, they are now very prevalent. Local conservation authorities and local fishermen feel that these smelts are killing the pleasure and semi-commercial fishing that takes place in Lake Simcoe.

Have the minister's people have given any study as to whether this is correct, whether it does injure the fishing? If so, what could be done to attempt to control the smelt population; is there perhaps some commercial use, or some way of reducing them, or using them up? I would like to have the minister's comments on this.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, our fisheries people have looked into this. It is quite true that the introduction of smelts has added another species, but it has not been detrimental to the existing species of fish which, of course, are pickerel and lake trout. The smelts are not interfering with these more important species.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would agree that they perhaps are not interfering with them, but according to what local fishermen say the fish are not biting because of the fact that the smelts are there. They are feeding on them, and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They will be bigger next year.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Also, they are growing out of normal size and the quality of the meat is not as good.

But what I was coming back to is, I think there have been studies made, over the last couple of years, as a result of which the amount of ice fishing on Lake Simcoe has been reduced, and I think some of the minister's people in the area feel that it is because of this that the hobby or the recreational interest is diminishing.

I think if the minister assesses it, the reason that there are not quite as many fishing is that they are getting more frustrated and it is a little useless.

An hon. member: That is fishing for you.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Being in the centre of an almost-year-round recreational fishing area, I think it is very important to the continued economic well-being of our tourist industry to take a good look at it. As the minister indicated, it is not harming the fish that are already there, but it is hindering the fishing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the government knows no way of controlling the smelts. I was not aware that there was a decrease in the number of fishermen. Is this what the member said, that there were less fishermen and also their catches had diminished? Is that correct?

Mr. G. E. Smith: This is what I am told by local conservation people and what I read in the area press.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Generally speaking—I do not know about Lake Simcoe or whether the same would apply to Lake Simcoe—but generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, the real problem in our fisheries has been the degrading of our waters and this is the main factor that has an effect on our fish population. Of course, today with the awareness of a clean environment and pure waters, I am optimistic that, as time goes on, our waters will become purer and that our fish population will increase.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would like to discuss for a few moments with the minister a matter which has been brought to my attention and which I think should be concerning him considerably. I was interested to see that over the last few weeks there have been a number of articles in national

periodicals in regard to the practices we as Canadians use in hunting, particularly in hunting, and the kind of thing which we allow to go on within our borders in the name of sportsmanship.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, unless this is angling and fishing in parks, it will come under the next vote.

Mr. Pitman: This is in regard specifically to research—i.e., to research which your department is not doing. Now, in this particular case, it was considered at least by one writer that the people of the world look upon us Canadians, as perhaps as one of the most inhumane peoples in the world in terms of our reluctance to do anything which will in some way alleviate the suffering that animals unnecessarily have to undergo as a result of our hunting practices, and particularly our trapping practices.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Under the management of fish and wildlife resources, would that not be the one? It is the management of resources.

Mr. Pitman: I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this can be regarded as nothing but research.

Mr. Chairman: Well, they are very closely related.

Mr. Pitman: It is a request for funds for research that I am going to refer to, Mr. Chairman, just as quickly as I can gather my thoughts and move on.

Now in May, 1968, the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, the national institution, attempted to get some kind of assistance to end what they regarded to be one of the most inhumane ways of trapping animals; that is what could be called the steel-jaw leg-holding trap.

I suppose the minister and his officials can look upon this group as a "bunch of bleeding hearts"—the people who are involved in bringing something of less than important consequence to the minister—but I suggest to the minister that people in this country are beginning to judge the government, and people in the world are beginning to judge us by the way in which we are prepared to treat animals.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And we are very conscious of this.

Mr. Pitman: I am glad to hear that because I will be able to give the minister some opportunity to indicate the full extent of his compassion.

In 1968 the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies wanted to do their best to end this form of trapping, and so they set up a humane trap development committee to try to get the facts, to try to get information so that they could understand how they could find alternative ways of trapping animals. Now it has gone through two years of very hard work and a great many calculations in determining how much money they would need. They have decided it is going to take four to five years of research and development and it is going to cost something between $40,000 and $50,000.

During 1970 they have been using the services of two academic gentlemen—Dr. George Kardos who is assistant professor of mechanical engineering af McMaster University, and Mr. Harland Lund, a consulting engineer. Both of these men gave their services to the project. Now in the following year—1971, this year—they intend to continue their project at Guelph University under the direction of Dr. Keith Ronald, the director of mammalogy at that university, and Dr. Harland Lund, who previously had provided services in the preparation of the activity, to get this project going.

They have been collecting funds. They have not just been asking government for money; they have been collecting funds themselves, and they have either on hand or promised some $30,000. That is $30,000 of the $40,000 or $50,000 that they have calculated it will cost to continue a five-year project of research to try to end the steel-jaw type of trap, in which animals either die of exposure, hunger, cold, or they chew their own legs off. The amount of pain and suffering which this involves in terms of animals is pretty considerable.

I think the minister would surely agree that that is rather a well-thought-out concept of dealing with what is surely a pretty barbarous activity. I would like to comment, too, to the minister, while we are at it, while we are discussing this whole question of barbarity.

I must say I find it rather disconcerting to hear, to read in the national press that we hunt wolves from airplanes, which seems to me a rather strange way of going about that activity too.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, permits have been discontinued as of March 5 this year.

Mr. Pitman: There will be no more hunting wolves from airplanes in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Pitman: I am very pleased to hear the minister's concern in that area.

In any case, I brought this matter to the minister's attention some months ago and what bothered me more than anything else—if the minister had said no, I think I would have been willing to accept that the minister does not have any money; after all he is not going to have his licences this year. But it was the way the minister answered the question.

I recognize that the minister's letters are written by somebody else. I would like the minister to determine who wrote this letter because in my estimation it was a sneering comment he made upon the efforts of a group of people who are trying to deal with what is essentially a form of barbarity the minister should have some concern about. I would like to read this comment:

> Dear Mr. Pitman:
>
> This will acknowledge your correspondence of February 11, 1971, concerning the project of the humane trap development committee of the federation of humane societies.
>
> There has been a formal approach to the government for support of this project by the Canadian Associates for Humane Trapping, a member organization of the federation.

Now, listen to this:

> It is the considered opinion that the programme as proposed is, in part, an academic exercise in metallurgy and engineering.

Well, I can assure the minister, and his officials should know, it is not an academic exercise in metallurgy and engineering:

> The devices with which these studies are to be carried out are being manufactured commercially—

—obviously, they were studying the devices which are being used now in the first stage of the research:

> —and are already in use in varying numbers in the harvest of wild fur bearers.

Obviously, these are exactly the traps that are being complained about. These are exactly the traps which are barbarous:

> The extent of their use in this respect is dependent upon their practical application, determined by the individual trapper.

Now, how helpful that is! The individual trapper decides what devices are going to be used. Obviously this committee realizes that, that is what they are out to try and end.

> On the basis of the information available and presented to date, it has not been considered to be in the interest of the government to provide financial support.

Well why is it not in the interest of the government to provide financial support? Why would it not be in the interest of this government to support any group of people who can find any way of trapping animals which does not involve the pain and suffering which the present system creates in every part of this province?

> However, this department is prepared to arrange for intensive field testing of any techniques or devices developed and provide assessments of them to the committee. It is not known to what extent the professional trappers have been consulted or are involved in this proposed programme.

Well, I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, there are over 900,000 animals trapped every year in this province. The value of the fur taken in Ontario is approximately $4.9 million, and the Ontario government collects, I understand, an annual revenue of about $263,000 from that fur. It seems incomprehensible, at least it is beyond my comprehension entirely, that this government would not be prepared to involve itself very directly in research which would end the barbarity of the steel-jawed trap type of trapping in this province.

The people involved are not saying you must stop trapping animals. They are not saying you are going to put a whole group of trappers out of work. What they are trying to do is provide a service to this government and to this country and to the people of this province. And I am just appalled, utterly appalled, that a letter like that would be sent, as I say, indicating a complete lack of comprehension and a complete lack of compassion for a group of people who are trying to find an answer to a very difficult problem.

None of us, I think, who have seen any trapping in this country feel very well about the way in which we try to trap animals. One would hope that this minister would have some concern over that kind of a problem

and would be prepared to grant a good deal of money to any group of people who are trying to continue the economic necessity of trapping—or at least some of it seems to be an economic necessity, I am not sure about some of it—but, nonetheless who are prepared at least to act in a most moderate, sensible progressive way and try to solve this kind of a problem. And I would hope that the minister might now be able to react certainly in a more effective way than he did in answering my letter in regard to the request of the Canadian Council of Humane Societies and in particular their committee on humane trapping.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the member that we are certainly very concerned about humane trapping and we are doing our best to try and find as humane a trap as possible. At the present time this has not been found. We work very closely with the Ontario Trapper's Association. There has been a lot of research done on this—

Mr. Pitman: In which way would they be concerned on that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —also I would like to remind the hon. member that more than 90 per cent of the animals that are taken in traps are aquatic animals like beavers, muskrats, minks and otters, and that these drown within the matter of a few minutes.

Mr. Pitman: All these traps are set under water, are they?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are set on logs or close to the water and the animals are drowned. Mone than 90 per cent of the animals that are caught are drowned—within a matter of two or three minutes they are dead. There is very little suffering, and as far as the fur is concerned there is very little damage, and the trappers are also anxious and interested to find a very humane trap.

I would also like to mention that there is a trap often referred to as a Coneybear trap, but this is not a suitable trap for the other animals such as fishers, martin, foxes and wolves. So, this whole question, Mr. Chairman, is one that we are very interested in and there is a lot of research being done.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps the minister could indicate exactly what research is being done in his department? How many men are working on the research? How much money is apportioned for that particular kind of research, and why the minister would not co-operate with the group of people who are prepared to put up $30,000 of their own money in co-ordination with people who have a great deal of academic status in the universities in this province? Why would the minister not involve himself with that kind of a thrust?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At first, I would like to mention that the president of the Ontario Trappers' Association is a director of the Humane Trapping Association. We have also met with the group that the member referred to, but they are not prepared to listen to any of the facts that the government gives them. We deal with facts. I admit the importance of emotions, but we deal with facts and they are not prepared to accept the facts.

Mr. Pitman: What facts?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Some of the literature that was sent to us, some of those pictures are not accurate it appears. Some of those pictures were not accurate, they were—

An hon. member: Posed.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —posed.

Mr. Pitman: First, I think we should define what could be called literature. I am quite prepared to accept that in some literature that has been sent out, not necessarily by this committee but by people that have supported that cause, or supported other types of development. But certainly the activities that are going on under the eyes of that particular committee, I think are academically responsible.

I understood the minister to say that they are not dealing with the facts. They intend to find out what the facts are. After all, it seems to me that the chairman of the department of mammalogy at the University of Guelph would scarcely be prepared to involve himself in a programme which was, you might say, academically irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the hon. member that I would be prepared to meet at any time with this organization. We have in the past, and I am prepared to meet with them again. But I do believe that they should also listen to our side of the story where we are presenting factual information.

Mr. Pitman: What factual information are they unwilling to accept? What information does the minister have which is so unacceptable to a group of people who are trying to find information?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The information that I just outlined a little while ago, that 90 per cent of the animals are drowned and they die within a matter of a few minutes.

Mr. Pitman: What has that got to do with, for example, finding a humane trap in order to alleviate the suffering of foxes, deer and any other animals that are liable to get trapped? What has that got to do with it? The fact that a beaver drowns is not going to alleviate the suffering of a wolf or a fox.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Hear, hear! A fairly elementary truth which might penetrate the minister's officials at some point.

An hon. member: The member speaks from the basement.

Mr. Pitman: I do not get the logic of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Why does the member not come with that group into my office and we will be glad to discuss this and maybe we could enlighten the member about some of these things?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, through you, I would suggest to the minister that when I received a letter back, suggesting that what they are doing is "an academic exercise in metallurgy and engineering," it certainly does not endear this committee to the views of the minister to any great extent. Do they have any reason to feel that they are going to be treated in any kind of a friendly or open fashion when that is the kind of statement which is made about their efforts, when they are putting out $30,000 of their money, when they are involving people of unquestioned academic reputation in this province in their activities? Is that the way the minister is going to get that kind of help?

One cannot help feeling that the minister is far more concerned with protecting what very little research is going on in his department and does not want to be embarrassed by the fact that some of his people might very well be wrong. I think he should be a little bit more concerned. Indeed, there might even be a loss of $1,000 or $2,000 from this $263,000, if you turn to a trap which alleviates the suffering, but which is not quite as effective as the traps which are being used now which do cause all the suffering. One cannot escape the feeling that the minister is far more concerned with that than he is with trying to co-operate with a group of people who really are concerned with what I suggest. Not only young people, but most people in this country are concerned far more with the kind of suffering which is perpetrated upon animals in the name of trapping in this province than with the efficiency of trapping.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again I would like to say—

Mr. Pitman: And I know 90 per cent of the animals are drowned.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If the hon. member is sincere in what he is saying, why does he not come with this group into my office with my people, and we would be glad to sit down and discuss that.

Mr. Pitman: I would be glad to see if they might just be prepared to do that.

Mr. Chairman: This completes vote 1102.

Vote 1102 agreed to.

On vote 1103:

Mr. Chairman: The recreation programme. Is there anything on item 1? The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am a little perplexed, so I am rising on the first section of this vote, because I think that programme administration is probably the appropriate place. I want to question the minister for a little time on the Niagara Escarpment, Bruce Trail area, land acquisition and a number of matters related to that. By no means does all of it, Mr. Chairman, involve parks, so I rather doubt that it appropriately falls in the third section, nor does it fall in the second section. Yet I have been assured during the estimates that it comes under the broad heading of recreation, which is obviously accurate, so perhaps to handle it and get it over with I could do it under programme administration, and simply have it done.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it could well come under parks.

Mr. Lewis: It matters no great moment to me, Mr. Chairman. It is just that much of the discussion I want to have with the minister involves land other than parkland and therefore I think it is a matter of programme administration, independent of parks. It is a matter of the basic policy towards recreation within this division of the department.

All right; thank you then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to stay on points all the way through this. My notes

and thoughts are a little scattered but there are a number of matters I would like to pursue in detail with the minister—some broad, some specific. Let me begin for the minister with this observation, if I may.

The Gertler report on the Niagara Escarpment was given to cabinet, as I understand it, in June of 1968. We are almost at June of 1971. A full three years have therefore passed. It seems to me, then, entirely appropriate that this Legislature should now learn, after three years from the receipt of this report, what in fact has occurred in the interim and where we stand and how we account for certain matters within the broad range of the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Chairman, what I think I am going to be able to elicit—and it underlines the points I would like to make—is that this government, with design and knowledge, is allowing the Niagara Escarpment to be sold, dismembered and denied to future public use. I think that it will emerge that we are alienating our finest recreational heritage in southern Ontario through a perverse combination of neglect, indifference and special favours, and I hope to deal with all of those as we proceed in this discussion.

There are basically three points I want to make Mr. Chairman: No. 1, that we have scuttled the Gertler report, the government never took it seriously at the outset, still does not take it seriously, and to all intents and purposes has abandoned it.

No. 2, that the government has engaged in transactions, or avoided transactions, of questionable political judgement. I am phrasing it as carefully and as respectfully as I can.

No. 3, that The Department of Lands and Forests is above all responsible for the systematic denial of a valued public resource, that it is this minister—as unhappy as I am to point it out because he knows that many of us on this side of the House have regard and affection for him—who is ultimately responsible and is therefore primarily at fault. He is paying the price of the total cabinet's neglect.

In order to try to set the perspective, or try to do it in terms of question throughout, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Lands and Forests, first: Since the receipt of the Gertler report, precisely how much top priority land has been acquired by the provincial government and at what cost to this government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the Gertler report was sent to the government sometime, I believe, in 1968. It was a large report, very voluminous, and therefore we thought in order for the public to be able to read this in a much easier manner, we had this condensed and this is the revised report. This took a certain amount of time and I would like to refer to him to the very beginning of the report, the introduction by the then Premier, Hon. John P. Robarts, in October, 1969, and he says this:

> While we welcome the report, I should make it clear that its release does not imply government acceptance of the recommendations. The decisions regarding implementation will have to be taken in the light of a wide range of factors and in concert with consideration of other programme priorities of the government. It is my hope that the Gertler report will serve as a source of information and guide in future discussions and decisions regarding the future of this important natural resource, the Niagara Escarpment.

I also would like to remind the hon. member that up until now, we in The Department of Lands and Forests are responsible for the acquisition—which is done directly by the way, by The Ontario Department of Public Works. However, we make the recommendations.

We have purchased 10,963 acres in prime areas, and then also we have an additional 5,356 acres, which was not given priority in the Gertler report but which we felt had a lot of value. This has been added, making a total of 16,319 acres, plus the land of the conservation authorities, who have purchased 4,125 acres, which gives a total of 20,444 acres.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, out of our total budget for land acquisition, 40 per cent was spent on the Niagara Peninsula. There again, Mr. Chairman, I state through you to the hon. member, that this is a sizeable amount. Again, during the past year we purchased 3,030 acres at a cost of $1,626,595. Within the amount of money available and on a priority basis, I feel that we have done reasonably well. Certainly we would have liked to have done more.

Again, we have also purchased land south —he will probably come to this matter.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I can deal perhaps with the Gertler report and the

government's intentions as we go along. I would be more happy to read into the record the statement of the Premier, which happened to be read for him by the present Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), on May 6, 1970, when the government pretty well committed itself to the Gertler report yet again and indicated the controls required in order to facilitate its achievement. I can remind the minister, as I will, of the observations of his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), when asked why he could not purchase Niagara fruit belt said because of the priorities on the escarpment—but I am not going to be detoured into those areas for the moment, nor am I going to be snowed by a lot of irrelevant figures.

I want to know how much the government, through Lands and Forests, has purchased since the Gertler report was received. Not the land it purchased in the early 1960s, but the land it has purchased since the Gertler report was received.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The figures I gave you I believe are accurate.

Mr. Lewis: No, they are not accurate. I do not believe that they are accurate or you would have the dates at which time purchase was made. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in answer to a question earlier on in the session—I guess it was in April some time—the minister talked to me of a programme since 1962 which encompassed the 10,000 acres. I am asking him for the programme since June, 1968, or October, 1969, whichever date he most cherishes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, the figures that I gave are those since 1962. We were aware prior to the Gertler report of the importance of that Niagara Escarpment and we did take action as early as 1962. I could have ready for the member the amount of acreage that we have purchased since the announcement of the Gertler report.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest what that total purchase will be. I stand to be corrected but I suspect the figure is accurate. You have purchased 3,030 acres since the Gertler report came to you as a minister and cabinet decided to act on it. That is the amount that you purchased.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is the amount we purchased this past year.

Mr. Lewis: In the past year, that is right. Now my instincts tell me that all the additional land, or most of the additional land, was purchased prior to October, 1969, and that in fact what you have largely purchased, which you so proudly tabled in the House by way of press release, acting on the recommendations of the Gertler report, is 3,030 acres for a price of $1.7 million.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: During the last fiscal year.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Let me point out—and until I am corrected by the minister I assume—the last fiscal year means since the Gertler report. The minister says: "It took a lot of time to absorb that report; we had to condense it, we could not get it ready until October, 1969." All right, I will concede that since October, 1969, you have spent $1.7 million on 3,030 acres.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Gertler advised in his study the immediate acquisition of 55,000 top-priority acres for $18.5 million and what we are hearing from government this afternoon is that you have purchased 3,030 of those 55,000 acres, which Gertler recommended, amounting to 5.4 per cent of the total land acquisition requested, and that you have spent, as it happens, ironically, 5.4 per cent of the money which Gertler said would be required.

The government had that report in June of 1968. Voluminous document or no voluminous document, it does not take that long to set your priorities. Yet three years later, Gertler gave you a four-year maximum on the 55,000 top-priority acres. Three years have gone by, you have bought five per cent of the land, and you have spent five per cent of the projected money, and you have therefore effectively abandoned the priority areas of the escarpment as Gertler set them out, and it is absolutely impossible to argue otherwise unless you are prepared to commit yourself in this Legislature to the purchase of another 52,000 acres at the expenditure—of God knows how much money—given the appreciation in land value over the next fiscal year.

But when one puts that proposition, how ludicrous it emerges when I now ask the minister how much money—not in percentages, but in dollar terms—did you have in last year's budget for purchase of escarpment land, and how much money do you have in this year's budget for purchase of escarpment land? And I ask you to give me those figures independent of the Caledon purchase, because I want to deal with that separately.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are answering that, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say to the hon. member again, I would like to repeat, that last year 40 per cent of our land purchases were—

Mr. Lewis: That is fine, that just says a lot about your land purchasing, nothing about the escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Niagara Escarpment commands a very high priority.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, a 40 per cent priority.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the same time, Mr. Chairman, there are other areas in this province which demand a high priority and if the member will look directly behind him and see the member for Hamilton East, he can tell the member that he made a lot of representations as well as for us to acquire Fifty Mile point, and we did this.

Mr. Gisborn: The same thing is happening to the escarpment property that happened to that one.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What I am trying to say is that our funds have to look at other areas that also command high priority.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that. I am dealing with the escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not think it would be reasonable that we should spend all our funds in one specific area.

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister go ahead and answer the questions, please. I accept those arguments, I understand what the minister is putting.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year we had in our budget, I believe it was $750,000 for the Niagara Escarpment. Then we added $1 million to it—

Mr. Lewis: For the Caledon purchase?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that was included. And that made a total of close to $1.7 million.

Mr. Lewis: This year, how much has there been budgeted for the escarpment purchases, just to show what a high priority it has in the department's land acquisition?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have budgeted about $750,000.

Mr. Lewis: I see. So you spent $750,000 last year by way of budget and you have budgeted another $750,000 this year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I said we added—the total amount was $1 million—

Mr. Lewis: But leaving out the exceptional purchase of Caledon, as I understand it the minister budgeted $750,000 last year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: And this year there is $750,000 budgeted again?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: We are all overwhelmed on this side of the House with the force of the commitment to preserving the escarpment. That is a very major increase in funding.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What about the land bank that the member made such a big fuss about?

Mr. Lewis: I cannot believe it. I cannot believe that the minister would walk into it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is $20 million and a lot of it will be for recreational purposes.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Mr. Chairman, if the minister holds the budget with which he was blessed by learning the figure on April 26 last, pulled once more into the bosom of the cabinet, can he tell us now how much of the $20 million will be spent on the escarpment? The Premier was not able to do it at the question period. Can the minister do it now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As much as we possibly can get.

Mr. Lewis: Then, Mr. Chairman, I come back to the reality that, despite Gertler's request to spend $18.5 million to retrieve 55,000 top priority acres, you have spent only $1.7; you bought 3,000.

You have had the presumption in this cabinet to budget only $750,000 one year and $750,000 the next.

I cannot imagine a more gross display of bad faith towards preserving a unique recreational heritage. Now those are, in fact, the truths about the escarpment. All this nonsense, all the rhetoric and chest-beating and protestations that we have heard from the government benches about the escarpment sound pretty hollow in the light of those bald financial statistics, do they not?

Does the minister recall just last week—I do not know whether it was in his estimates or whether it was in a speech in Hamilton—the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, when asked why he was not buying up

the Niagara fruit belt said, and I quote, "Right now I am concentrating on saving the Niagara Escarpment and after I have that all bought up, I'll consider this project." If you do it the way you are doing it now, you will be lucky to buy up the escarpment in 30 to 40 years, because of land appreciation—as some members of the fourth estate indicated in articles all over the province today, land appreciated as much as 10 times in the last year to year and a half alone, while the government sits on its $750,000.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What about the money of the conservation authorities? They are all spending money in that area.

Mr. Lewis: I am not talking about the conservation authorities. I am talking about Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is all part of the effort.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Well, I want to make the defence more laudable. If you add the 4,000 acres which have been pulled together by conservation authorities, you have a total of 7,155 as a percentage of 55,000. My colleague for Windsor West is at this moment beginning to calculate what percentage 7,000 is of 55,000. I suspect that this is roughly—

An hon. member: Hurry up.

Mr. Lewis: —I suspect that this is roughly 12 per cent to 13 per cent.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Pretty close.

Mr. Lewis: That, too, is concurrent evidence of bad faith. When the Premier read into the record the controls that were to be applied on May 6, 1970, and extolled the virtue of the Gertler report and the importance of the escarpment, everyone believed that the government might move.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prevail unduly upon the time of the House, but let me recall for the minister what Gertler said on page 12. He said:

> The point that needs to be stressed is the unique, highly valuable and many-dimensional character of the Niagara Escarpment as a natural parkland corridor in the rapidly urbanizing belt of Ontario. By 1980, an additional 2.3 million people will be added to the towns and cities of the province and most of these will be within 150 miles of the escarpment.

On page 18, Mr. Chairman, Gertler wrote:

> The approach to priorities in this study arises out of the nature of the escarpment, a unique and irreplaceable resource of high recreational and amenity value in the nature of things. Action to preserve the escarpment where it is under the kind of pressure that will destroy its essential qualities will have to be taken quickly if it is to be effective. For this reason, we set a relatively short period of time.

Then he sets out the three categories with which the minister is familiar, the top priority acreage to be purchased outright, 55,000 acres in four years, another holding in the land—what do they call it—taking some kind of option on the land, another 35,000 acres over six years, and then getting easement rights to another 300,000 acres over the entire eight-year period. But let us deal with the top priority for a moment, the 55,000 acres.

All right, Mr. Chairman, so much for the sincerity of the government in the purchase of escarpment land. Now, let me ask the minister about Caledon Mountain Estates.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, that is a good one.

Mr. Lewis: Good. I know the minister feels more comfortable with that. Caledon Mountain Estates, as I recall it, purchased the land under question from May to August in 1969 for $726.5 an acre—500 acres. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is 506 acres.

Mr. Lewis: Five hundred and six acres? I was using the phrase "500 acres" from the quote of the minister, but I suppose I should not have been as trusting.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, I updated this since then.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The accurate figure is 506.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The government then purchased it from Caledon Mountain Estates for $1,450 per acre—I assume in early 1971—and paid over $300 thousand of additional money to Caledon Mountain Estates. Now, I have a question, Mr. Chairman, and I would like an answer from the minister. The minister purchased 506 acres. I think the facts I have given him so far are correct. Am I right in that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Let me refer him to the Gertler report dealing specifically with this land acquisition. Gertler says:

> A major regional park should be established in the area of the Credit forks to include the face and rim of Caledon Mountain and the Credit River and gorge. Such a park would serve to relieve some of the public pressure for recreation facilities already well apparent in this area.
>
> Acquisition of the river lands and escarpment face would place most of the outstanding features within the protection of a public park. It should be noted that the rim of the Caledon Mountain has been subdivided and sold in two to eight-acre parcels, though no construction has proceeded at the time of writing.

And Gertler advocates the outright purchase of 1,070 acres. The government bought 506 acres, not 1,070. If my understanding of the land ownership is right—and one of the people in our research department checked the land titles office at Brampton and I have the lot numbers with me and I think they all fall within Caledon Mountain Estates—the rest of the land is owned by Caledon. The 506 acres which the government purchased lie in the valley. The rest of the land still held by Caledon Mountain Estates is the face and the rim which Gertler specifically says should have been acquired by the government.

Now the question I have to ask the minister is this: How is it that Caledon Mountain Estates—let me put it another way, to be careful—am I correctly informed that Caledon Mountain Estates, shortly after selling the 506 acres to government for parkland, received approval for subdivision development along the rim and face of the escarpment in the remaining 500-odd acres itemized in the Gertler report, or a part of that acreage?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, to reply to that question, Mr. Chairman, they received approval. This comes under The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: I see, but the minister concedes that they received approval—

Mr. Gisborn: Did you fight?

Mr. Lewis: —for subdivision development?

Mr. Stokes: Were you consulted before approval was given?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They have received approval for some land in that area.

Mr. Lewis: For some development in the area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not know and I should not be expected to know.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I am not so sure you should not be expected to know, because there is something more than coincidence that a company which parts with 500 acres for parkland in the valley bottom and has been seeking subdivision or partial subdivision approval for most of it, then gets approval for a part of it on the face and the rim.

Those who were unkind would suggest that there was a trade-off, the public getting 500 acres in the valley and the company getting a fairly major appreciation of the surface and the rim by way of houses and subdivisions. Now, I take it that the government—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the member from Scarborough West a question?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Singer: How many acres were subject to the subdivision approval?

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure. I am saying that part of that additional 500 acres, I am assuming, was subject to subdivision approval and that that approval was granted. The minister concedes that, and I am just simply putting the point and letting the minister draw the conclusion that it is a matter of unseemingly coincidence that the one follows the other.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the member another question? Does he know whether there has been only draft approval or has there been final approval and, in fact, registration of the planned subdivision?

Mr. Lewis: I am asking the minister whether there has been. The minister said that approval was granted. I assume that—

Mr. Singer: There are two or three steps.

Mr. Lewis: When the minister says approval was granted, I am assuming that he means all steps, that building can take place.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Could I say a word on this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Please do.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I have indicated before, the Gertler report is a report to the government. It does not mean to say that the government has to accept everything that is in the report. There are many areas of high priority that they recommended, but it does not necessarily mean to say that they also rank high priority for us. The great majority do. So I do not believe that it was reasonable for us, as soon as the report came out, that we should have gone and bought all the land. We just did not have the money available.

Mr. Lewis: The government had four years. Four years is reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And in this question, to which he is referring, I am sorry to disappoint the hon. members, because this is a very legitimate transaction.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure, yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A very legitimate transaction.

Mr. Lewis: Fine. Okay.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And as I mentioned, I replied to the member in the House and I gave him certain information. I would like to add to it to say this that the Caledon Estates, as he probably knows, is a development company which—

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a transaction, first of all.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —buys land for subdivision purposes.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And in this area in question, the company did buy various properties before the Gertler report was issued. Before that, they bought land.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): When?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also about this time, about the time of the public release of the Gertler report, but possibly without knowledge of the contents of the report since it was made public in 1969, the company was actually purchasing land in that area. The company did indeed pay $763 per acre in 1969 and their plans were to subdivide it.

The company did not approach the government. They did not approach us.

Mr. Lewis: No, the government approached them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are the ones who approached them and we said we want to buy this land.

Mr. Pitman: All of it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And they were very reluctant to sell to us.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Pitman: The rim of the escarpment, too?

Mr. Lewis: I understand that. Did the hon. minister ask to buy it all, as Gentler suggested?

Mr. Pitman: The rim and the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They were very reluctant. Again with the amount of money available, this was a choice area for our purposes. I think the member insinuated that the subdivision plans were held up.

Mr. Lewis: No, I did not say "held up"; but "were approved."

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Were approved.

Mr. Lewis: Were they approved?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, they were approved. However, they were approved but—

Mr. Lewis: One has nothing to do with the other.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —that area was not; and I use the word "frozen", which is probably not the right word; but on subdivision plans there had been applications, but there had been no approval.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: However, when we decided exactly the area we wanted—the choice area—

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and then we purchased it. Then I believe they obtained approval from The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Well that is—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to mention that the price of that land, Mr. Chairman, also included easements—substantial easements—along property—

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —that commanded very high value for mansion type—

Mr. Lewis: Buildings!

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And this is something also—

Mr. Lewis: Along the face and the rim of the escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is what we want, a lot of baronial mansions!

Mr. Lewis: A lot of mansions along the face and the rim of the escarpment, with easements for the proletariat to view the valley below.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, also we can walk along the property.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Nevertheless there is—

Mr. Lewis: That is very nice of you.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —this was included in the—

Mr. Lewis: That is certainly a legitimate transaction.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Lewis: Certainly legitimate all right!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Depending on your social values.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: So—

Mr. J. Renwick: You could build some look-outs for us poor people!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And also the price I believe was a fair price for land value in that area. Today if you would go and try to buy a lot in that area you would find that it commands a very high price.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is all a matter of one view of legitimacy, I guess. I am allowing the minister's words to make the case as much as possible in this instance.

I understand that they bought it for subdivision development. I understand that they were unable to receive approval, or at least, approval had not been granted. I understand that the government purchased 506 acres and then approval was granted by The Department of Municipal Affairs for what you describe as mansions, along the face and rim of the escarpment, although Gertler says the full acreage should have been purchased as top priority for public use.

The hon. minister's view of public use is "easements," so that people can reach the edge of the escarpment. Most of us who wander through the park will be looking up to the escarpment above.

Let me ask the minister another question, if I can remember precisely what it was that I wanted to ask. In the purchase of the land, am I correct in believing, as I think it accurate, that the department would have liked to acquire more of the land?

The department in fact wanted, in good faith and to its credit, all that Gertler had staked out. The minister himself has already indicated earlier this afternoon that he went back to Treasury Board to get a specific sum of money for this particular transaction. Obviously then he would have asked for whatever money the transaction reached, whatever specific sum it was. It seems reasonable, therefore, that you would have liked to buy as much of the acreage as you possibly could.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have two other areas under active consideration in that district.

Mr. Lewis: Right. But did the hon. minister not bid for more than the 506 acres from Caledon Mountain Estates? That is all they were prepared, reluctantly, to give the minister, but he wanted more as I understand it. The hon. minister would have liked the rim and the face and other parts of the escarpment. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, subject to the amount of funds available.

Mr. Lewis: But the hon. minister would have liked more than the 506 acres. I am right in saying that surely? Moment of great drama as the civil servants huddle.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, in all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not sure.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I am not sure, because—

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister recall from his civil servants how much was bid on? Can the minister produce documentation in

the House to show that he confined himself to the 506 acres, or did he in fact ask for all of that property, the 1,070 acres that Gertler had laid out as part of the park? Were you not, in fact, disappointed not to have the face and rim of the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But the property, Mr. Chairman, was negotiated by The Department of Public Works. This again was a choice area, the area that we wanted.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And again, with the availability of funds, the limitation on funds, this was the most that we could buy.

Mr. Lewis: You settled for that, but you admit that the company was reluctant to sell?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, very much so.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Therefore, one assumes that they were as reluctant to sell the face and the rim as they were to sell the valley. Is that not correct? But is it not also correct to say that the government would have wished to have it all and that the government ended up getting the valley only and that thereafter approval was given for construction on the face and the rim?

The minister has indicated that himself. I am saying he may call that a legitimate transaction, but that falls within my umbrella of what I called earlier questionable judgement. The trade-off is questionable. The priorities in social terms are questionable. Gertler makes the point a thousand times that access to the escarpment in all its priority areas should be totally in the public domain, not to mention what is happening to the Bruce Trail in the process of allowing this kind of development in the escarpment area.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is all very well for Professor Gertler to make those recommendations, but we have the responsibilities to find the funds available and we have, after all—

Mr. Deans: He is an expert.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —other priorities.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that. I can see the way the priorities work by looking at your accounts for the last two years. I can see how strongly the government feels about the escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was 40 per cent last year. Do you not agree that 40 per cent is a sizable amount?

Mr. Lewis: Well, if $750,000 is 40 per cent of whatever the total figure was, the total figure discredits you and your government. It is not a matter of the 40 per cent.

But, let me say, Mr. Chairman, something that I do not want to get into and did not get into when I originally asked the minister a question.

As a matter of fact, I did not even know it when I originally asked the minister the question.

You know, I could simply read from the front page of the Toronto Telegram today or read from the article which appears in the Ottawa Citizen today, but the point is made. I simply register that which others have revealed. There are a number of members on the board of directors of Caledon Mountain Estates who, in a sense, make the transaction somewhat of an unhappy one in the way in which the public views government transactions.

I urge the minister, when purchasing other properties in the escarpment, as he will doubtless one day do, to leave no unresolved questions in the public mind about some of these things which such transactions necessarily lead to. If you know what I mean? I mean the way you yourself casually threw in the word—I listened to you carefully 10 minutes ago—when you said that Caledon Mountain Estates has been acquiring property "possibly" without knowing the contents of the Gertler report. You used the word "possibly."

The Gertler report was allegedly a cabinet document from June, 1968 to October, 1969. Why should a private company possibly know the contents of the Gertler report? Why then—why not then—the apprehensions in the mind of people about the composition of Caledon Mountain Estates? It worries the public, Mr. Minister. One has to be extremely scrupulous in all these legitimate dealings and I am not suggesting anything other than the unfavourable publicity that attaches to it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, we are the ones who approached the company.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They did not want to sell. They were reluctant to sell.

Mr. Lewis: Right. I understand that, and I am indicating to you the sequence of events around approval of the building which followed. I am saying that it caused some general anxiety. The whole transaction caused some anxiety because, frankly, Mr. Chairman, there is no excuse for having paid an additional $300,000 of public money.

Frankly, getting to the core of it, those lands, those 506 acres, the selected parcels, should have been picked up by government from May to July, 1969, before the report was made public. They were free for purchase; you chose not to purchase them. You could have saved a great deal of money; you cost the public $300,000 additional expense and that, frankly, is unforgivable. It says a lot about your future land acquisition practices in the area.

Let me ask the minister another question, Mr. Chairman, about—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the member for Scarborough West if he is through with that one because I wanted some questions on that if he is through with that phase of it? The Caledon matter. If the member is on to another one—

Mr. Lewis: Do you mind if we come back to the Caledon matter? I do not mind if we come back to it at all but I just want to quickly cover certain other matters and leave it, Mr. Chairman.

The minister in the House latterly made much of the underwater park off Tobermory and felt very good about the provincial expansion there. Gertler makes much of the Tobermory area and the tremendous opportunities that may exist in the Tobermory area for development. Let me ask the minister, what about the islands off Tobermory? What happens to them as a recreational resource for this government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Which island, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. Lewis: Russell, Devil, Williscroft, Otter, North and South Otter, Echo, Cove Island.

Mr. J. Renwick: Flowerpot.

Mr. Lewis: No, not the Flowerpot Islands.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Flowerpot Island, Mr. Chairman, is a Georgian Bay island in the federal national park.

Mr. J. Renwick: What about the others?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The proposed boundaries would include a lot of the smaller islands and some of these islands are being considered. What I announced is a proposal. There have been a lot of studies made and there will have to be further studies to find out exactly; our boundaries are not yet defined. We have certain projected boundaries but it could well be that the final plan will be further revised.

Mr. Lewis: Some of the islands are being considered for purchase?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would think so.

Mr. Lewis: The minister thinks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would like to acquire some of the islands.

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not have any knowledge which islands the government would like to acquire?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not at this stage.

Mr. Lewis: Not at this stage.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We will be buying land on the mainland, a certain number of acres, to provide parking facilities and also to establish an interpretive centre that will give information on the geology, flora and the fauna of that area. This will be a limited amount, probably somewhere around 100 acres or so.

Mr. Lewis: The minister will know then of Tobermory Islands Development Limited, which is seeking approval for 102 closely spaced lots with a central airstrip on Russell Island, one of those which the minister would doubtless wish to purchase.

As all of these various approvals must now be sought from government, has the minister indicated or has he yet had brought before him for approval the subdividing of the island in that fashion?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Some of these islands, Mr. Chairman, will not interfere with the underwater park.

Mr. Lewis: No?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We want to preserve especially those areas where the sunken ships are located. As far as the islands are concerned, we would like to acquire some but not necessarily many.

Mr. Lewis: Right. So far as the minister knows, the seeking of subdivision approval

has not yet been commented on by this department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, and again, Mr. Chairman, I would not be aware of this. Approval for subdivision would come under The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: But as I understand it, other branches or authorities of government should also have an opportunity to comment on whether or not approval is desirable. Is the minister not involved in that process at all?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The subdivision plan would come to you as one having an interest.

Mr. Lewis: I mean, only The Department of Municipal Affairs? The Department of Lands and Forests is not involved?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: For approval of subdivisions for private lands? No, Mr. Chairman, we are not involved in our department for approval of subdivisions on private lands.

Mr. Lewis: Well, some of my colleagues who are better versed in this area than I am will be able to comment on it. I have the former Premier's (Mr. Robarts') discussion of regional development, the Niagara Escarpment portion, on March 10, 1967. He says:

> Mr. Speaker, just to round out this whole story, I would like to point out that the Cabinet committee on regional development is served by an advisory committee composed mainly of deputy ministers. That Cabinet committee has on it members of practically every department which would be involved in this particular project.

And he names them, and The Department of Lands and Forests is very prominent amongst those names.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, but—

Mr. Lewis: Let me ask you another question: Has not there emerged suddenly in the escarpment discussion rather recently something called a task force? Am I right in thinking that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, there is a task force, or an interdepartmental committee, that is looking into the question of controls on the Niagara Escarpment. This does not involve the island to my knowledge.

Mr. Lewis: No, but let me ask a question, because I want to tie the two together. This task force, as I understand it, is parallel to the secretariat suggested by Gertler; roughly, will it do the same kind of things?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not necessarily. The Gertler report recommended a secretariat; this matter was discussed at the Parks Integration Board and at one time we had sort of a subcommittee of civil servants that dealt with the various matters referred to in the Gertler report. Then recently—in the last month or so—there was a task force or interdepartmental committee, and this is looking particularly into this question of suitable controls on the escarpment.

Mr. Lewis: Suitable controls? When was this task force appointed? Can the minister give us a date?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Chairman, in the last month; it could be two months.

Mr. Lewis: Within the last month? Is the minister sure it was not about two or three weeks ago? It might have been, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My guess would be that it would be more than three weeks. My guess would be within the last month or six weeks.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Within the last month or six weeks—almost three years after the Gertler report came down, we finally got a task force.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, there have been a lot of controls under The Department of Municipal Affairs in the last year or two. For instance, one cannot sell land today in the province—this was introduced by the minister about a year ago; I am not familiar with the terms—unless it has—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Subdivision control was applied right across the province.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Singer: That only deals with part lot divisions.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I think the member for Downsview is right. The question I want to ask the minister is this: If Lands and Forests is prominent on the task force and it is involved in controls for the escarpment, how is it possible to say that Lands and Forests is not involved in the decisions on subdivision control? How, in God's name—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member was referring to the island.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am referring—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If he is referring to the islands, these are private lands on the islands. I do not believe they need our consent; I believe this is mainly a matter for Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: Despite the fact that it is considered an integral part of the escarpment use?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But if the member is referring to the land on the Niagara Escarpment, starting from Tobermory—yes, our department is very much involved.

Mr. Lewis: All right. May I ask a question? How many applications for approval have been accepted by government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On the Niagara Escarpment?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member will have to ask Municipal Affairs, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Is this department represented in the decision?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we have a person. I could get that information for the member. Surely he does not expect me to know how many subdivisions have been approved or refused?

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I would expect the minister to know. He is primarily responsible for the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —unless there have been a great many approved, which I rather doubt.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! May I point out to the hon. member for Scarborough West with respect that there are numerous other members wishing to join in the debate.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to seek some specifics on this and I—

Mr. Chairman: I will assure him I will not—

Mr. Lewis: All right, Mr. Chairman. Let me go to Kolapore provincial park or Park Kolapore, of which the department purchased —am I right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Which park?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): That is in the parks vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is right on the escarpment—the amount of money that was spent.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Cyprus lake?

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry. It is not pronounced Kolapore? How is it pronounced? The Kolapore Uplands—is that fair enough?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That will do.

Mr. Chairman: Is this acquisition of lands?

Mr. Lewis: We are on the first item.

Mr. Chairman: We are still on the escarpment?

Mr. Lewis: Yes! I am reading from the press release on the acquisition of escarpment lands. Can the minister indicate how much he paid for the 840 acres acquired in this Owen Sound-Collingwood area, and when the land was originally purchased and for how much, and therefore what the appreciation cost was per acre?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This land in question, Mr. Chairman, is not being acquired for park purposes. It is being acquired for fish and wildlife, and I am getting that information.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is getting that information? It is 840 acres, I understand, out of over 7,000 which Gertler advised should be acquired as top priority land. Can the minister indicate why he purchased only 840 acres out of over 7,000?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to correct the hon. member. I was under the impression that this area was not being acquired for parkland, but for fish and wildlife. But apparently it is. The core area of a major provincial park is the Kolapore Uplands which will offer a variety of recreational experiences including fishing, camping, hunting, hiking trails, viewing waterfalls and fissure caves. The acreage in this Owen Sound-Collingwood area is 840 acres and this includes a viewing point near Meaford, scenic Hogg's Falls at the head of the Beaver Valley, and this Kolapore area.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. I too read the press release. But how much did the minister pay for that, and when was the last transaction recorded involving that land prior to government purchase, and what is the difference in the sums paid as the minister indicated in the case of Caledon Mountain Estates?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member will get this information from The Department of Public Works. All these lands are purchased by Public Works.

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not have that information on hand?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not now, no!

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not have therefore the information on hand for the 800 acres in the Bruce Peninsula's significant shoreline at Cape Chin, the scenic lookout at Lion's Head, and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not have that? He does not have the figures available for Devil's Glen Provincial Park expanded by the acquisition of an additional 45 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Devil's Glen park. I have the number of acres but I do not have the price, Mr. Chairman. Again—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —we will have to obtain this from Public Works.

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not have the figures for a 200-acre nature reserve in the Mad River Valley?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. All I have here, Mr. Chairman, is the number of acres.

Mr. Lewis: Only the number of acres. The minister just has the press release?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon. No, I have more information than the press release. I have the acreage of all the areas that have been purchased. I do not have—

Mr. Lewis: All right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —the dollar value and this we will obtain from Public Works.

Mr. Lewis: Then, Mr. Chairman, I think given the experience of Caledon Mountain Estates, it is legitimate for us to ask how much the government paid per acre to those from whom this land was purchased, when the last land transaction occurred involving these purchases, what the appreciation is in cost to the government in that period of time, and whether any of the companies involved were seeking, in the process, subdivision approval for other parts of the escarpment area.

I think all of that should now become legitimately, public information. I am frankly surprised that the minister does not have it at his fingertips, because it is Lands and Forest which does, in effect, control the purchasing, even though for administrative purposes, the dollars are spent by Public Works.

Yes, we would appreciate if at some point the minister would give the answer and then table the documents.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to make one observation. I would be pleased to get that information for the hon. member, but I would like to say this to him that we do not control the purchasing and regardless, once a report like this comes out there is a lot of speculation. Human nature being what it is, you tell me how you can prevent speculation. People buy land knowing that it will appreciate in value.

So you tell me, if you were running the government, how you would do this, how would you make a report public and, at the same time, freeze prices?

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean freeze prices? We would have moved to acquire the land immediately. It seems to us that the amount—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You would have bought the land immediately?

Mr. Lewis: —the amount of money that was involved, $18 million, to preserve our heritage for generations is not an excessive sum of money for 55,000 acres. The government is spending, if it will allow the analogy, which others have made, $23 million on Ontario Place, which will have a great deal of public interest for a number of years, perhaps decades. We are talking about the singular, unique natural resource in southern Ontario. We are talking about several—what is it? 230 miles of—

Mr. Peacock: Ten million.

Mr. Lewis: —trail and escarpment and the government is reluctant to put out $18.5 million for 55,000 acres. The minister is asking me a question which, in this instance, I find easy to answer.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Because the member does not have the responsibility to raise that $18 million.

Mr. Lewis: We have a different sense of priorities about it. It is not a matter of

responsibility. The government can extravagantly spend money on various public works, and it can extravagantly spend unnecessary moneys on health care plans and in maladministration of OHSIP, and all other similar government programmes, and it can give away $40 million by way of forgivable loans—over $20 million to multinational corporations. But to find $18.5 million for 55,000 top-priority acres which people will enjoy for generations, then it has not the money. It has not got the money because it does not want to intrude on private, speculative, entrepreneurial capacities, because in the final analysis, the public is always secondary to the private interest, even when it involves one of the most important areas of recreational environment we have in the province. That is the real reason.

Mr. Pitman: We get the valley because they want the rim.

Mr. Lewis: We get the valley because they want the rim. That is a rather neat way that my colleague from Peterborough puts it.

Let me ask the minister one other question which has emerged and which I assume, perhaps incorrectly, that his department has some involvement in. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, Pickland-Mather of Cleveland, Ohio, owns 2,000 acres in St. Edmunds township, priority one, top acquisition land under the Gertler report, and is about to seek, and has already tendered feelers about whether or not quarrying operations can take place in that acreage. If I am not incorrect, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs some time ago—I do not think it is this minster—indicated on CFTO that the government might be interested in granting a permit for such an operation. That is in top priority A land. Now, can I ask the minister whether he has heard of Pickland-Mather holdings, the likely possibility of seeking, or probability of seeking a permit to quarry and what his position is as a member of the cabinet on whether or not that should be granted?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This property is next to our provincial parks.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This property is next to the Cyprus Lake Provincial Park.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. The minister is aware of the property?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, and The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs also has this matter under consideration.

Mr. Lewis: But does the minister not have an opinion on whether or not quarrying operations should be permitted under such circumstances? The Gertler report dealing with the Tobermory area says:

> All of Lindsay and St. Edmund's Township should be placed under land use controls. Owing to the unique and irreplaceable nature of these resources, and to the pressure for summer cottage development and the conflicting use in this area, all action in the Tobermory area is rated as priority one.

Is the minister prepared to give some kind of undertaking that quarrying operations will not take place in that area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The former Minister of Mines—

Mr. Lewis: What did he say?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): The member had better not repeat it. As Minister of Mines I made no such statement.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Then what is the situation now about this ownership? Has the minister any views on it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe that the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs has legislation that is being considered to deal with such matters.

Mr. Lewis: But you are not prepared to indicate what the position of the other—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well no, it is not under my department.

Mr. Lewis: Right. May I point out that Dow Chemical owns over 1,000 acres for a projected quarrying operation on Hope Bay just above Wiarton? This will require tunnelling into the escarpment and pulling out the limestone, I imagine, out into one of the coves which is mentioned as a top priority area in the Niagara Escarpment study. Has the possibility of permit granting in that area been brought to the minister's attention and does the minister have a position?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Chairman, this is another matter that relates to this proposed legislation by the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: All right. I am trying to document how strongly cabinet feels about preserving the Niagara Escarpment.

Has the minister heard of the following? The Sauble Valley Conservation Authority notes 11 reference plan lots on the crest of the Niagara Escarpment in Sarawak township. They were approved prior to subdivision control, so there is no obstacle to selling the lots for housing. The authority cannot afford to purchase, but if the purchase is made in private terms it is likely that access to the Bruce Trail through Sarawak township will be lost.

Has the minister any knowledge within his department about the need to acquire these properties which lie within the top priority area of the Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that this comes under the conservation authorities which, of course, are under The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Lewis: Right. And the conservation authorities have not the money to buy it. Are we then to assume that the department will simply let it go to private acquisition and we will lose that portion of the Bruce Trail and the escarpment? Does the conflicting jurisdiction make nonsense of the pretence of saving the escarpment, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There are two departments, Mr. Chairman, that are responsible for the escarpment, ours and The Department of Energy and Resources Management, and we work very closely together. They have a certain amount of funds available for this purpose and the conservation authorities have acquired over 4,000 acres during the last few years.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to push this much further. I think the point is essentially made. What is happening on the escarpment is pretty obvious.

There have been a large number of individual speculative transactions taking place, both during the time when the Gertler report was firmly in the hands of government and since it was released. Quite possibly there was a considerable range of speculative activity between November, 1969, and May, 1970, when the Premier's announcement on controls was first made.

In the process the government has abdicated totally its responsibility to preserve the Niagara Escarpment for future public use. It has purchased some land, but at absurdly inflated levels due to its own neglect and procrastination.

It has budgeted only $750,000 in the current fiscal year which puts the lie totally—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Do not forget the land bank.

Mr. Lewis: —to the suggestion—the minister may allude to the land bank and laugh self-consciously at himself—

Mr. Singer: Yesterday the minister could not tell us anything about that. Neither could the Treasurer or anybody else.

Mr. Lewis: —but he knows, as we know, that nary a penny of land bank money is likely to find its way into preservation of the escarpment. As it happens, there are projected quarrying operations which will violate all of what Gertler considered to be of importance and about which the government is behaving in the most casual fashion.

As a matter of fact, the quarry legislation is still temporary. It has not yet been made permanent by this government. It is subject to yet another review by another minister. The fact of the matter is that the government spent no money to speak of; it has acquired no land to speak of. The land it has acquired has been acquired in peculiar fashion. The government has paid appreciated values which never should have been a cost to the public.

The government is prepared to surrender the Niagara Escarpment to private use and abuse, and you do it all in the name of an alleged lack of funds and a devotion to free enterprise.

Mr. Minister, it has been carried too far. It lies on his shoulders as the minister primarily responsible to explain to the public of southern Ontario and to those of his constituents in the north who value land highly and deeply—it remains for him to explain.

How can one possibly defend such an obvious violation of public trust as has occurred in the three years—and I say three years—since the Gertler report was first submitted to cabinet?

We can discuss the details from now to doomsday but I think the specifices, the realities, the general principles, are now clear. It is a sorry mess that you superintend as the minister, and I have no doubt that as we spend a little more time on this aspect of the estimates, yet more that is unpalatable will emerge about the government's plans and intentions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Scarborough West has brought some very fascinating facts before the House and I share his concern about the lack of answers to come forth from the minister. My attention was particularly caught by the statements in the press today and further elaboration on them regarding the Caledon incident. I just do not understand, Mr. Chairman. As I now have the figures in mind it seems to me that the Caledon people had about 1,050 acres that the government thought were acres they should sometime acquire. Is that figure correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We bought 506 acres, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how many acres there were.

Mr. Singer: Yes, their total holding would appear to have been about double that—slightly in excess of double that. You bought that 505 acres for something in the neighbourhood of $15 an acre which in very round figures is double the price that they paid for it some 22 months before. Now, could I ask the minister—

Mr. Gaunt: It was 1,500.

Mr. Singer: Yes, 1,500, which is double the price that Caledon had paid for it 22 months before. Could I ask the minister whether or not there was available to him or to the task force or to the executive committee any independent land evaluation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated previously, the land negotiations are carried by The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Singer: I see.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I feel very confident that the price they paid for these lands is a fair price.

Mr. Singer: I see. Why does the minister feel confident? Did he have a chance to examine an independent evaluation or is he confident merely because it was another department of government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have a lot of confidence in the Department of Public Works because they have been doing land acquisitions for quite a number of years. They are very competent persons and they know that whatever they buy is public knowledge.

Mr. Singer: I see. It was sufficient at least for the Minister of Lands and Forests, whose budget moneys were being used, that if The Department of Public Works said the value was fair, neither he nor any of his officials made any more inquiries. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We were very interested in acquiring the 506 acres I mentioned earlier. They were a choice site; we asked Public Works to acquire it and negotiate. They did this over a period of time and I feel, again, that the price they negotiated is a fair price, keeping in mind the circumstances of this area.

Mr. Singer: That is what I am about to try to get at.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We went to the persons who held the land, the owners, and they were reluctant to sell. They did not want to sell and they wanted to use these lands to subdivide them for a highly-priced residential estate.

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister has emphasized the point I was going to get to eventually, but since he has emphasized it perhaps we will deal with it now. Has the minister never heard of expropriation procedures?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, but again, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness and with due respect, we are not the ones who—we requested the purchase of these lands.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If Public Works had felt that the price was too high, they would have gone to expropriation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get from this minister is this: If a substantial portion of the funds he had available in his budget for these purchases were going to be used for this purpose, did the minister or any of his staff make any more inquiries than he has told us about, in relation to the method of acquisition of these lands? Or did he leave it entirely up to Public Works as to the cost and the method?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we leave this entirely to Public Works.

Mr. Singer: You have no responsibility, then, for the acreage price? You have no responsibility as to the decision—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are the experts.

Mr. Singer: All right, they are the experts —as to the decision whether to acquire by negotiation or by expropriation? You have nothing to do with that?

Mr. Lewis: It is your money.

Mr. Singer: It is all up to The Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that if Public Works thought that the price was not a fair price they would have expropriated.

Mr. Singer: All right. I just want to get this abundantly clear because the Minister of Public Works is doing the same sort of thing downstairs and as soon as we are through here we are going downstairs to ask him.

Mr. Lewis: Right, in fact we are there now.

Mr. Singer: I would suspect that the Minister of Public Works is going to say it was all the fault of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Why do you not go downstairs?

Mr. Lewis: We are downstairs and we are asking these questions.

Mr. Singer: It is very interesting because you attempt to tell us about co-ordinating your efforts and one minister passes it off onto another minister. Since it comes out of your budget, it would have occurred to me at least, Mr. Chairman, it would have occured to me that you would have been concerned about the acreage price and the method of acquisition. But the minister says no and so that the record be abundantly clear, the minister says that it was all The Department of Public Works. Now, before we leave that, can the minister confirm that statement or deny it?

Did the minister not hear me? I will do it again, all right. Just before I leave that specific point I want to have it abundantly clear on the record that the decision as to the amount to be acquired, the per-acreage price, and whether or not you got it by negotiation or by expropriation—all those decisions were made by The Department of Public Works and neither the minister nor any of his officials had anything to do with that. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are the ones, Mr. Chairman, who inform them of the location and the amount of acreage to be purchased. However—

Mr. J. Renwick: And the amount of money they can spend?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: However, when it comes to the actual purchase, the price to be paid, this is left to The Department of Public Works. They negotiate and if they feel in their wisdom—

Mr. Singer: All right—

Mr. Pitman: Do you not tell them—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —that the price is much too high, they can recommend expropriation.

Mr. Singer: Then you tell them the location and the amount you want? Did you tell them how much money you had to spend?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They keep us informed of the results of the negotiations. They let us know.

Mr. Singer: I see. How did you describe the location to them? Have you got a memo in your files that would indicate what you told them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, I do not know—

Mr. Singer: Did you tell them how many acres you wanted out of the 1,050 owned by Caledon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our people work very closely with Public Works and they met indicating, to them that this is the area we would like to acquire.

Mr. Singer: All right. But the minister said just a moment ago, we tell them the location—and I presume somewhere, either orally or in writing, somebody has indicated to Public Works that we wanted the Caledon land and it was shown on a map, I presume. Now did somebody in writing or in some other way communicate to Public Works and say Caledon has 1,050 acres but we will accept 505?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I could find out, Mr. Chairman, I am not involved—

Mr. Singer: You must be involved because you were drawing the line yourself between what your department does and Public Works does. Now I want to know what instructions went from your department to Public Works

insofar as the amount of acres to be acquired is concerned. Could you tell me that? How many acres did you tell Public Works you wanted to get?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As recommended in the Gertler report for that area, we told Public Works the specific area that they purchased. This is the area that had the most scenic value, and this is the area that they negotiated.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but when you send somebody to negotiate—I deal with this sort of thing once in a while through my office—when somebody comes in and says, "I am putting in an offer," they give me some indication as to whether they are buying one acre or 100 acres and how much money they have to spend. Since it is your money you are controlling the purse strings, and since you are going to be the one who is responsible for this I would imagine you must have told Public Works, who is your agent in this, that we have X dollars to spend and we want to buy Y acres with this money. Now what I am trying to find out is what are X and Y! What did your officials tell the people in Public Works? How many dollars did you tell them to spend? How many acres did you tell them to acquire from Caledon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to send information on this matter to the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I think this debate is going to be going on well into the evening and probably tomorrow, and I would appreciate it if the minister could produce that information over the supper hour, because therefrom will follow a series of other questions.

Now let me deal with the second phase of this. It must have been known to your department that Caledon had 1,050 acres and not just 505—is that not correct? You had ownership charts and you knew of the land ownership in the area at the time you got 505 acres from Caledon, did you not? That is correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Could be!

Mr. Singer: All right. Now in the intra-government committee, did no one from Municipal Affairs tell you that Caledon has made application for a draft plan of subdivision? Did nobody tell you or any of your officials or even pass that information on to you?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we were aware of this.

Mr. Singer: You were aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Singer: All right. Were you told the date on which the first application was made and the date on which the T number was assigned to the application for draft plan of subdivision? You must have been? Well could the minister find that out and bring that answer back after the dinner hour?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we could look into this.

Mr. Singer: All right. Were you told, or would you know, or can you find out for me again, the date on which draft approval was given by your colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Do you know that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. We—

Mr. Singer: No. Can you ascertain that over the dinner hour? Are you aware that as in every step in an application for the registration of a subdivision, the property that is the subject of that application appreciates in value. Are you aware of that? From the time the minister indicates to the applicant the draft plan approval is going to be given, the property has shot up in value. Is the minister aware of that? No.

All right. Let us presume—and I think it is fair to presume from what we have heard this afternoon—that the draft plan approval was given after the time of the purchase by the government of the 505 acres. Is it not reasonable to assume that it was a quid pro quo and the two things were done altogether and all as a parcel? Is that not a reasonable conclusion, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I leave it up to you.

Mr. Singer: Well, was there any talk between the Caledon people and the government committees that the minister has told us about, about acquisition and approval? Do these talks go on at the same time? Does he know? No. Could he find that out for us? Are there minutes of the meetings?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say, Mr. Chairman, we will try and provide the hon. member with as much information as we have available.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think this is really about as far as I can go insofar as these questions are concerned. But what it appears to me is this, it seems a most unusual thing. Adding to the conclusions made by the hon. member for Scarborough West, but just dealing with the Caledon matter, it seems most unusal to me. Twenty-two months after the date, with limited funds, the government sets its priorities—and we will criticize those—and it goes into the market. I deals with people who own 1,050 acres and it buys half of them for double the price they paid 22 months before. At the same time, it gives them draft approval for a new plan of subdivision, which is land that the government indicates that it wants. And nobody over there says boo. The government cannot tell us at the moment that any evaluation was given by independent evaluators to the government, and it cannot tell us why there was no talk of expropriation or if there was any talk of expropriation.

I must ask the question, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, why it would appear that friends of the government get unusual and probably great preference over what anyone else in the Province of Ontario would be, in fact, entitled to expect. I just do not understand, Mr. Chairman, how this could go on in the orderly conduct of government business, how the government could pay double the price and allow the registration of a plan of subsdivision, because the minister must know with me, or at least he could have been advised by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or at deputy minister level. There could have been no doubt about it, that if the government wants to sit on a plan of subdivision, pending later decision it can sit for day and weeks and months and years, until final approval is given.

Mr. Paterson: They are doing it.

Mr. Singer: They do indeed or until the minister takes his pen in hand and scribbles it on the bottom of the document which eventually is registered in the registry office and allows the dealing with those lands. The minister knows this is done, or must know this is done all the time. How can the minister allow this thing to go on in the light of these circumstances? It just makes no sense to me.

Mr. Chairman, those are the questions that arise naturally from what we have read in the papers today and from the remarks of the member for Scarborough West and the minister's lack of answers. In the event, Mr. Chairman, there is no better explanation than that, then I must say that the public must come to the conclusion that the government has given undue, unfair and unexplained preference to people who are its friends. I hope there is an explanation and the situation is not as bad as it now looks.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to rehash anything which has been done before but it seems to me that there are three or four important dates, and I wanted to direct the minister's attention, just as a matter of recall, to the importance which the then Prime Minister gave to the matter of the Bruce Peninsula and the Niagara Escarpment when he made the announcement on March 10, 1967.

He said, at that time, and I want to emphasize the importance that he attached to it and the way he considered it was to be dealt with, because he said in his remarks, in part:

> I am happy to announce to-day a wide-ranging study of the Niagara Escarpment with a view to preserving its entire length from Queenston to Tobermory and Manitoulin Island as a recreational area for the people of Ontario.

I note the inclusion in his remarks of extending right through to Manitoulin Island.

> To accomplish this—

and I skip part of what he says,

> —I have referred the escarpment problem in its broadest sense, to the cabinet committee on regional development. This is precisely the kind of undertaking that was envisaged for this committee when Ontario's Design for Development was presented to the Legislature about one year ago. I have indicated to the committee, of which I happen to be the chairman, that this is an urgent matter meriting immediate attention.

He goes on, and then he finishes his remarks by saying:

> That cabinet committee has on it members of practically every department which would be involved in this particular project. My own department, of course, is involved, as well as The Department of Economics and Development; The Department of Municipal Affairs; The Department of Agriculture and Food; The Department of Lands and Forests; The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Energy and Resources Management. I feel that this committee is really quite competent to deal with the problem.

One of the questions that I want to ask the minister is: When was the last meeting of the cabinet committee on regional development for the purpose of discussing and co-ordinating matters with respect to the Niagara Escarpment and its acquisition for the purposes which were stated by the then Prime Minister shortly before the last provincial election?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is there such a committee functioning or has it functioned for the last two or three years?

Mr. Stokes: The minister's former deputy was a member.

Mr. J. Renwick: What the minister is saying is that the key minister charged with the responsibility, by the vote of funds of this Legislature, for the acquisition of the Niagara Escarpment in the various ways which have been set out in the reports that have come forward, is not a member of the cabinet committee on regional development?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. But I am the chairman of the Ontario Parks Integration Board, where these members participate very actively.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand that the Ontario Parks Integration Board is set out on a chart in the Gertler report showing that it has only a minor part to play. What we are saying is that the grand design for the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment—announced by the then Prime Minister prior to the election in 1967 to be a matter of urgent importance—for a cabinet committee on regional development consisting of the various ministers he referred to in that statement, has simply disintegrated and has not functioned.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These are the member's views.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am saying that the minister is not a part of it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not a member of the cabinet committee on policy.

Mr. Stokes: What about his department?

Mr. J. Renwick: I am not really worried about his department or anything else. I am simply saying that the cabinet committee on regional development was the one named by the Prime Minister to be the one that would take on the responsibility for overall planning.

Mr. Young: The man most responsible is not on the committee.

Mr. J. Renwick: Let us go to the question that the member for Downsview tried to get answered. I just want to try very briefly to find out the procedure that is followed when we vote money for this department for the purpose of acquisition of lands and the actual negotiation for the purchase of the lands is done by The Department of Public Works.

First of all, how did the minister arrive at the figure of $750,000 as the amount of money to be included in his budget last year and this year and how much land did he expect to acquire for that number of dollars? There must have been some indication of how he arrived at a number of dollars, or was it just a residual amount put in there for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The $750,000 is an amount that we in our department decide and, of course, is subject to the approval of Treasury Board.

Mr. J. Renwick: I do not think I will bother pursuing it, because obviously there is a vacuum between the money we vote for this department to acquire land and the connection with The Department of Public Works as to what land it is to acquire and how much of the $750,000 this minister decides after discussions with Public Works in advance if necessary—that can be spent for a particular piece of property. Surely he does not give them carte blanche to spend $750,000 to buy one piece of land when he had planned to buy a number of acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We indicate to them the location and the size, the number of acres we are interested in; it is up to The Department of Public Works to negotiate a fair price.

Mr. Young: The minister told them he wanted 506 acres here?

Mr. J. Renwick: Let me come to the minister's responses to the leader of this party on the Caledon Estates question.

I was concerned when the minister used the phrase that "surely it was a legitimate transaction". I want the minister to listen carefully, if he would, to the question I want to put to him. I take it that the minister was not saying that it was a legitimate transaction, that is, the negotiation and purchase by The Department of Public Works of the 503 acres in the valley—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Five hundred and six.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is that what we were referring to as "the legitimate transaction"?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: All our transactions are legitimate.

The 506 acres that were purchased and negotiated by the Ontario Department of Public Works, keeping in mind the various practices—that we are the ones who went to the owner, we wanted to buy this one, this was a choice site, and they were not interested in selling to us.

However, we wanted that site, and as for the price of this choice land, for subdivision purposes it would have commanded probably a much higher price if lots had been built on it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what bothered me about the minister's response was that the leader of this party did not question whether or not the isolated transaction of the purchase of the 503 acres in the valley was a legitimate transaction.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Use the right figures. Five hundred and six acres.

Mr. J. Renwick: Five hundred and six.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And it also included easements.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: That was not the problem. The minister's response of saying that it was a legitimate transaction was after the leader of this party had raised the question as to whether or not there was a trade-off on the question of the subdivision control and the granting of approval for development on the rim, and in the area surrounding the rim.

I think Hansard will record the reason the minister used the word legitimate is he was referring to the overall transaction.

My question to the minister is how much did he as the minister know about the transaction to decide whether it was or was not legitimate? Is the minister saying that the trade-off of the rim and the approval of the rim for residential development or other development by Caledon Estates was a legitimate trade-off for the purchase of the acreage in the valley? Is that what he is saying was legitimate? And if he is saying that, how much did he know about it, that he could make the statement that it was a legitimate transaction?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, there was no trade-off and what I have said and what I am saying is that the price paid was a fair price and it can be defended and you are just wasting your time by pursuing this further.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I will make the decision as to whether I am wasting my time or leave it to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Singer: Quite, they double their investment in 22 months and they get approval of a planned subdivision—

Mr. J. Renwick: I am just saying that anyone who reads Hansard will know that what the minister was talking about was that it was a legitimate transaction for this government to make the trade-off. Whether it was done overtly or it was done on the understanding that "if we buy the land in the valley you can have the rim for residential development" is not a matter which in negotiation amongst friends requires to be put on the record; it is just understood. Did the minister try to buy the land on the rim from Caledon estates? He said they were reluctant to sell any. Did he try to buy the land on the rim?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Did we try to buy the land on the rim?

Mr. J. Renwick: On the rim, yes.

Mr. Pitman: Did the original proposal include the rim?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to table that.

Mr. Singer: What did you tell The Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We told The Department of Public Works to go and buy the land.

Mr. Singer: How much?

Mr. Pitman: What part of the land?

Mr. Stokes: How much?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We indicated the location and the size we wanted and they did this.

Mr. Singer: Well, what size did you indicate?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have asked the minister a question—

Mr. Chairman: I have heard these same questions repeated and repeated, and there is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I am still talking. There is an end to the repetitions sooner or later, so please do not repeat the questions.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the question I asked has not been asked before. I simply asked whether or not the minister negotiated—

Mr. Chairman: I have heard it. I have been out for half an hour—

Mr. J. Renwick: —through The Department of—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I was out for half an hour and I come back and hear the same questions over and over again that I heard before I went out. There is a rule against too much repetition.

Mr. Lewis: The minister promised to tell us.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, did the minister endeavour to buy the land on the rim from Caledon estates?

Mr. Paterson: Or any portion of it?

Mr. J. Renwick: I take it that he did not. May I just turn to another aspect of it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that we did buy land from the Caledon estates on the rim on the east side.

Mr. J. Renwick: How much did you buy on the east side?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About 200 acres.

Mr. Young: In addition to this?

Mr. J. Renwick: About 200 acres in addition to the 506?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The 200 acres that were purchased on the east side are part of the 506 acres.

Mr. J. Renwick: A part of the 506 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Right. Let me go now to dates. The minister for some reason indicated that Caledon estates was acquiring land prior to October, 1969. That is prior to the date that the Gertler report was tabled by the then Prime Minister in the Legislature. Does he know whether or not most of the acquisitions of land were made after the then Prime Minister's original statement on March 10, 1967, and during the period up to October, 1969?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would not have that information.

Mr. Lewis: But it is easy to find out.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, you knew they were acquiring it before October, 1969. Why would the minister not know when they started to acquire it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Maybe Public Works—but we asked Public Works in the past year to acquire this land. I could not tell you how much land that Caledon purchased prior to that. It is a private company.

Mr. J. Renwick: All I am saying is the minister does not know when Caledon Estates acquired any of the land? Whether it was before October, 1969; after October 1969; before March 10, 1967; after March 10, 1967; before June 1968; or after June 1968?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Public Works legal department would have this information.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! It being now 6 of the—

Mr. J. Renwick: In other words you have no knowledge of when Caledon Estates acquired any property of any kind?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, that is right.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. J. Renwick: Then the part of your remarks—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! It being now 6 of the clock, I do leave the chair and we will resume at 8.

Mr. Lewis: Did you know the director of Caledon Mountain Estates?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 13, 1971

Quetico Provincial Park, statement by Mr. Davis 1511

Medic-Alert month, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 1511

Bail procedures, statement by Mr. Apps 1512

Statement on reported comments of federal Minister of Finance, Mr. McKeough 1513

New forensic sciences centre to be built in Toronto, statement by Mr. A. F. Lawrence 1514

Policy position on Quetico park extended to Algonquin park, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Stokes 1515

Difficulty faced by human resources committee in investigating education costs, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman 1516

Make-work employment programmes, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Lewis 1517

Land acquisition costs for Niagara Escarpment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 1518

Legislation to prevent rock festivals questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Downer 1520

Second report on Niagara fruit belts following original Gertler report, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1520

Posting bail instructions in Ontario jails, questions to Mr. Apps, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. J. Renwick 1521

Second report on Oshawa regional government, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. W. Newman 1522

Reserves to provide for difference in exchange values re German loan, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Shulman 1523

Final rate of OMERS for 1970, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Good 1524

Final cost of Port Dover lift bridge, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gaunt 1524

Former drug users engaged to communicate lessons from experiences, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Knight 1524

Delay in issuing charter to government employees' management organization, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Worton 1525

Supplying Mercer land for summer tent city for transient youths, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman 1525

Honouring memory of Dr. Ward Smith at opening of forensic science centre, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer 1525

Assistance for new mines and ban on studded tires, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Stokes 1525

Differences between OWRC and Ottawa medical officer of health, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. MacKenzie 1526

Presenting annual report, Department of Public Works, Mr. Auld 1526

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 1526

Resolution, standing natural and physical resources committee, Mr. Hamilton 1526

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading 1527

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1527

Recess, 6 o'clock 1561

No. 37



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 13, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(continued)

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow this brazen rescue of a cabinet minister in difficulty to take place without protesting on behalf of the House?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order. This is the business of the House and we have business to be done.

Mr. Lewis: We are in the middle of an estimate and the minister (Mr. Brunelle) promised us answers after the dinner hour.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: After the dinner hour, he was reporting to the House.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): You have all night.

Mr. Lewis: That is a pretty arbitrary way to run the House.

Mr. Randall: You have all next week.

Mr. Lewis: When you fellows get into trouble, you did not even tell him. Again he was not consulted.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You have to be kidding?

Clerk of the House: Fifth order; second reading, Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

I would like an explanation from the House leader why he is now rescinding a commitment which the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) made to this House, that answers to the questions in his estimates would be provided after the dinner hour? He obviously was not consulted thoroughly prior to the House leader's decision. We have parallel estimates taking place in committee where this kind of subject which we entered into before—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: —can be discussed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: Why is the House being manipulated in this fashion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member has not raised a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is just so brazen on the part of the—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, if that is not a point of order, then I will move that this House do now adjourn and let us divide on it. And let me make it abundantly clear that while the motion is not debatable we are dividing on this motion to show our entire disgust at the arbitrary and high-handed manner in which this House is being conducted.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we will support that motion because this is really an outrageous effort to muzzle debate in the House and the House leader knows it.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commerical Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The business before the House will be tax legislation, which is very important.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it was not so important that the House leader could not introduce it before, was it? How come he wants to do it now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is no argument!

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The business of the House must get on to the important matters. The hon. member will have full opportunity to return to the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: There is no debate taking place. The hon. minister had risen on what he suggested was a point of order, which it was not. There is no point of order. We have a motion before the House.

Mr. Lewis: Do not try to rescue him. And listen carefully too.

Mr. Speaker: I usually do.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure you do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The motion is that of Mr. Singer, who moves adjournment of the House. On a motion to adjourn it is not necessary for each member to rise in turn. The members will rise simultaneously.

The House divided on Mr. Singer's motion to adjourn, which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 27, the "nays" are 45.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

MINING TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order: If this is such pressing public business, as the House leader indicated, does the minister not have opening remarks on this bill tonight?

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: I thought that the minister would want to exercise his prerogative to speak at the beginning as well as the end since this is so urgent that it be discussed now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, as I appraise this statute it appears to me to contain only technical changes, changes in definition, and in no way, as I read it, does it affect the principles of The Mining Tax Act itself which, I have said on many occasions, is a very bad one.

I would say to the hon. minister, on assuming this new portfolio, that this summer if he has a month that he can set aside, perhaps he might find it a useful exercise of the time, over a period of a whole month, to get his officials to explain to him how The Mining Tax Act works, because surely if there is any residuary body of knowledge anywhere in the world about how this statute works it must reside in that branch of his department and nowhere else.

Now I should hastily add that so far as the regulations are concerned there are two human beings identified in the Sudbury basin who have some knowledge of the formulae, those very complicated and mythological and arbitrary formulae that are found in the regulations and those two people, so that their names will be enshrined in Hansard, are Patrick Murphy, the comptroller of the city of Sudbury, and his counterpart, Harold Bondett, the clerk of the Township of Falconbridge. No other persons have ever been discovered since the departure of Mr. McBain, who was the author. He and Wilfrid Spooner, cloaked in the shrouds of secrecy, got together in some post-midnight pursuit some 20 or more years ago, and concocted this arcane piece of legislation. But these are the regulations.

I turn to the statute. The statute is based upon mythology, absolute mythology, when it taxes ore at the minehead on a purely arbitrary basis. The assessors, I would venture to say without fear of contradiction, have not got the faintest idea of the value of the ore at the minehead, and particularly with International Nickel Company. I would also venture the belief without fear of contradiction that the assessors accept the figures of the company; that there is no real genuine effort on the part of anybody in that department to put a rational dollar value of the amount of that precious resource that comes out of the earth and is subject to taxation.

If you turn to the regulations, you will find that mythology, that arbitrary formula, is replete and carried throughout the statute.

The fact is—as Brady Lee shakes his head under the gallery to express his disagreement with myself, an elected member of the Legislature representing Sudbury, as I have for 12 years—12,000 votes, sir, the last time; that measures the right I have to speak here

in this place. That is the right I have, 12,000 votes!

Mr. Lewis: How many legions does the hon. member have?

Mr. Sopha: I say with assurance, that throughout the history of this legislation, the people of Ontario have never got near what they should get from that resource.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: Never have they been repaid. Leslie Frost stood in his place over there and said the justification for the mining tax was that the ores belonged to all the people of Ontario. That is the justification. They are the vested right of the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: Just try to take some of it.

Mr. Sopha: That monolithic Wall Street company, that comes in here by licence, waxes fat on profits at one time in its career at some $70 million or $80 million. Then it jumped to $120 million. Then it goes to $140, to $160 million and last year, $208 million to reach the very apex of reaping the benefit from a resource, put there by a bountiful providence, that belongs to all the people of the province.

We do not get our fair share of the take off the top. That is where ours should come, right off the top!

The justification, the moral right, the moral basis to put it on is to say that for the privilege of mining that precious resource you have to plough back an equitable and fair share into the public coffers of this province so that it may be used for the benefit of all the people and to provide those necessary services, benefits, the government must provide to its citizens.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is not speaking to the amendment before us.

Mr. Sopha: That is the basis. The former Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) asked me at one time over a cup of coffee: "What is the figure that we get for the best year?" For the best year the figure is something around $16 million. Sixteen million measly dollars that we get for the mining of all ores in the province. That is our part. He said: "How much do you think we should get?" The current Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) in an effusive, expansive moment when he let a lowly member of the opposition voice an opinion, asked: How much should we get? I said: "We should get not a nickel less than $50 million. We should start from there." I am always ready with a ballpark figure.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will speak to the amendment.

Mr. Sopha: This goes!

Look at section 1 (4) which defines output. That is the extraction of the ores. That is their production.

Mr. Lewis: That is not bad.

Mr. Sopha: That is what they do.

Mr. Lewis: I did not understand that section.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not really speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Sopha: I will explain it to you. Notice how it begins: "Output, when used in reference to a mine, means all mineral substances raised, taken or gained from any mine or land in Ontario."

I do not have to go any farther. That is the basis of the tax.

Mr. Speaker: Yes! That is quite far enough. It is not to the amendment.

Mr. Sopha: That is the basis of the tax. They call it ore mined at the minehead.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I think Mr. Speaker is sorry the hon. member asked.

Mr. Speaker: Not in the least; the hon. member is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Lewis: How many mines does Mr. Speaker have in Waterloo South?

An hon. member: Yes! That is a good question.

Mr. Speaker: Three.

Mr. Lewis: And he is familiar with the tax basis?

Mr. Speaker: I am familiar with the bill before us.

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Then the next section, of course we changed—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): What is this badinage?

Mr. Sopha: This is the new form of barracking, but I cannot complain much about it because it is the Speaker himself.

Mr. Nixon: There is nobody to appeal to really.

Mr. Sopha: Those are all the points I wanted to make, except to make this one that I have said in Sudbury. The member for Thunder Bay will hit the roof when I say it here, but it gains wide approval in Sudbury. That the whole basis has been used as a very unsubtle subterfuge to divide, deploy the wealth produced in Sudbury.

What figures does that reach? It is $500 million in a modest year. It has been used to deploy that wealth, the taxation from that wealth, across the whole of northern Ontario, some 57 mining municipalities. Sudbury has been the milch cow, and it is no accident the formula was devised in Kirkland Lake; that is no accident at all. Kirkland Lake and Timmins and the Tritown where I come from have looked upon Sudbury as the place that produces a vast amount of wealth and they should have a piece of the action, and they have got it over the years.

You talk about disparity between the provinces.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member is not speaking to the amendment—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, this goes to the very root—

Mr. Speaker: —represented by Bill 25.

Mr. Sopha: You are very rude.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask him to stick to the amendment only.

Mr. Sopha: Let me say this to you. This bill before the House is not worth the mention of a syllable unless I envelope in it these basic principles to which I advert, and that is the purpose, intent and scope, and the use of the whole concept of mining taxation in line with aid to municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may not do that and speak to the amendment before him. I would ask him to return to the amendment only.

Mr. Sopha: Well, as I said, the amendment is only a technical, a mechanical sort of thing that was dreamed up in some arcane recesses of that branch of The Department of Mines, and I talked about the iniquities that have persisted for some 60 years from which, sometimes in a depressed moment, I think we will never escape. We will only escape through a change of government to put this industry on the same basis as any other industry.

Indeed, I will sit down saying that they might change the name and the concept and call it a resource tax and tax it as a natural resource, and completely get away from that principle of tying it in to aid to municipalities as they do and as it has been used in the past, and to make this industry responsible for its civic obligations the same as any other industry—the furniture, the paint, grocery stores, breweries, you name it.

This archaic notion of treating this industry differently is—the minister will get up and protest of course, but just let me make this one last point. He will get up and protest and say The Mining Tax Act has nothing to do with municipal taxation and the mining revenue payments. Well, technically, that may be correct, but certainly in the minds of municipal politicians in northern Ontario for these past three decades the two have been inextricably intertwined. The two go together; it is a means of diffusing that special taxation from the mining industry among so-called mining municipalities. I want to use my opportunity here to say that I am against that in principle, I want to see an end to it and I want to see the mining industry put on the same basis as any other industry.

Now as I sit down I apologize by saying to you I know I have not been very relevant to the bill, but I have talked about important things, matters of important concern, and with the parting shot that this industry gets away with quite a bit, because this is not a very effective statute. I say to my friend from Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers), that fair and just amount which we should get from the exploitation of this valuable natural resource—and he nods his head in agreement.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He is satisfied with it.

Mr. Lewis: He will doubtless speak on it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, this in a way is this minister's baptism of fire and I hope he passes through the holy flame unannealed but with a singe here and there, because unlike his predecessor, who was obtuse in all these matter, this minister has displayed in the House a certain grudging social conscience in regard to the mining

industry in this province and the iniquitous way in which it has been allowed to escape from taxation.

I remember one occasion in the House when the former minister was trying to pass this thing—by the way, as a new minister, do not try to railroad your legislation; slip it through under our nose. You know, we are prepared for you, whatever corner you may try to slip around. That is not the way to conduct yourself with prestige.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will stay with the principle of the Act.

Mr. Lawlor: In any event, in previous legislation I remember the outline of 17 loopholes that the mining industry was able to resort to in its taxation schedules—everything from depletion allowances, three-year tax holidays, not paying any property taxes, the province's lower mining rates and the business that is mentioned in the course of the bill—although anything else which I have to say will not have any relevance whatsoever—the tax assessment, the tax assessors in the mines themselves.

Tax assessors are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. What kind of a deal is that? The legislation is surely threadbare and completely arcane and should be completely revamped. Smith botched it, you know, by trying to be clever, by trying to recommend new things and then when those new things could never penetrateWhite's armour, he was not adjusted to that kind of universe. He lives in a self-enclosed one of his own and therefore we were never able to get very far on that.

Turning to section 2, for instance, there is a false principle embodied in this legislation. The mining taxation is paid in to the minister —to this minister. Surely, of all revenue of the Province of Ontario, at least mining revenue ought to be paid into the Treasurer of Ontario.

The reason you perpetuate the system of assessment at minehead, the reason you assess —I think it a venal system and I will put it to you as venal, the way in which the assessments are done through the mining assessors and the way in which they operate.

Read the Smith report on sections as to what they have to say about reports of 1924 and 1919, coming down through the centuries as to the venality, to the inefficiency, to the loaded discretions imposed upon mining assessors in the legislation until the thing is taken out of your hands with respect to assessment and reposed in the hands to which at least quasi objecta, people who can stand back from the situation.

You are too much in bed with the fellows. It is impossible for you to take an arm's length role, and you coddle the situation by perpetuating "payable to this minister." That is the chief fault in the legislation and I think goes pretty deep when you see the implications of why that is perpetuated. I say it ought not to be.

There is one other matter I would like to bring to the minister's attention and it has to do with section 7. This is where you levy a lien on the property, on a mining property: "All taxes, double taxes, added percentages, penalties and costs payable under this Act . . ." There shall be a lien in priority to any other citizen. That is not too bad, except is it fair to say, "whether the right or title of such person"—that is an ordinary citizen of this province—"has accrued before or accrues after the attaching of such liens . . ."?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. member is speaking to the Act itself, not to the amendment. The amendment has to do with only certain words on the seventh line, pertaining to the gas well.

Mr. Lawlor: Well I petition the Speaker to bear with me for two seconds. I am almost finished anyway. I brought that to the minister's attention. It is in effect retroactive legislation. You are depriving people of rights that they have accrued to them. If the Crown comes in late, then he exonerates all his people in the course of this section. I think it is fairly high-handed and even arbitrary. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to the bill before the minister replies? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to say something about this bill, Mr. Speaker. If I understand it, the principle of this bill affords an application of a new formula which allegedly will bring in $400,000 more by way of mine revenue payments to the municipalities in the next year.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): The member is wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Am I not speaking on the—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, the hon. member is way off base.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am—

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Sit down and he will explain it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am not going to quarrel over the figures—I will not go into the figures—but the purpose of this bill on balance was to provide enough revenue by manipulation of formulae and manipulation of definitions as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) said in the McIntyre Community Centre in Schumacher on Friday April 30, "to increase the overall revenue to the various mining municipalities."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make three or four specific points. Firstly, the Minister of Municipal Affairs in directing himself to this bill has—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The hon. member is completely off the bill.

Mr. Lewis: That may be.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is not the bill at all.

Mr. Lewis: All right.

Hon. Mr. White: He is talking about a different bill. One he made up.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: A different bill entirely.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not talking about one I made up. I do not think that could operate without the application of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: I think we must deal only with the amendment as set forth in Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act—

Mr. Lewis: All right, I will reserve my comments.

Mr. Speaker: —and those amendments are clearly set forth in the explanation. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I think we might just make the one point on the repeal of part 2 of the bill dealing with natural gas. I notice that the proposal is to repeal in total the tax levied by part 2 and not to substitute any other equivalent tax for it.

I take it to mean therefore that the government has decided, in the light of the Smith committee report, as reported in volume 3 of the Ontario committee on taxation at page 370, that the amount collected under the tax is so relatively small that there is no point in adopting the Smith committee recommendation, which was:

> In accordance with the general principles that we have developed for the taxation of mines, the tax on production of natural gas be changed to a uniform flat rate, profits-based tax equivalent to 12 per cent of the economic rent accruing to the producer.

I take it that the government has opted, because of the low revenue yield of such a tax, not to provide an alternative tax.

I assume also that the government, Mr. Speaker, has taken the word of the Smith committee, that the tax, even though unchallenged, is in fact unconstitutional. I am rather surprised that a tax which stood on the statue books for such a length of time should now be repealed unless someone is prepared to challenge it.

I would like to know from the minister whether or not the tax has been challenged or whether he knew that it was going to be challenged because it would seem to me that one can engage in a study of these constitutional questions and come to one conclusion and find that a court might very well, for one reason or another, in all the circumstances, uphold the tax.

I think the customary way would have been to leave such a long-standing tax, even though its revenue-producing capacity was small, to leave it on the statute books and wait for a challenge before just simply deciding to repeal it.

I would appreciate it, when the minister comments, whether he would update for us the yield of the tax in the latest year which is available to the minister, because the Smith committee's report is simply that it was $41,000 at March 31, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, may I just comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury? I certainly do not approve of his attack on Mr. Brady Lee, who in my opinion is a man who is highly respected—

Mr. Sopha: Well, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —not only in the mining industry but in government also.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order?

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order.

The point of order is that there must be some sufferance, custom and usage by which the senior civil servants occupy those seats behind and to your right. Certainly in the dozen years that I have been here they have been coming, and they must come by sufferance. We are the people who are here as a right. We take our seat as the result of the operation of the democratic process and the stewardship imposed at the ballot box.

Hon. Mr. White: What is the point of order?

Mr. Nixon: Just listen to him.

Mr. Sopha: I say that it is extremely improper for a civil servant to sit at the sufferance of the House as a guest, with a licence given by the Speaker to sit behind there and to indicate in any manner, by facial expression, by gesture, by vigorous shaking of his head, as happens in this case, his disapproval or indeed his approval of anything said by any member of the House when speaking. I drew attention at the very time—as the record will show—I drew attention that Mr. Brady Lee at the time I was speaking—

Hon. Mr. White: The member should attack his minister; he cannot defend himself. That is not parliamentary system.

Mr. Sopha: —indicated his disagreement with my remarks. I thought it perfectly proper to draw the attention of the House—

Hon. Mr. White: The member should attack the minister.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of University Affairs was not even here when I was talking about him. Does he want me to stop and deal with him?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not mind at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Sopha: This minister was not even here.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I think the hon. member has made his point of order.

Mr. Sopha: He was at the Albany Club.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I think the hon. member for Sudbury has made his point, has made his explanation quite sufficiently.

Mr. Sopha: I had not completed.

Mr. Speaker: Well would he mind telling me what the point of order is then? I was quite prepared to listen to his remarks, but I would like to know the point of order.

Mr. Sopha: Well that is a thinly-veiled sarcasm.

Mr. Speaker: Well it may be. I would like to know the point of order?

Mr. Sopha: I was drawing attention to my objection to the gesticulation by Brady Lee behind your throne and to the right—

Mr. Speaker: I heard that quite clearly and so did the House. There is no point in repeating it.

Mr. Sopha: —and I do not hesitate to do so. I was saying to you as our protector, that sitting as members of this House we do not have to tolerate it. I do not have to tolerate it. And I am entitled to draw attention to it as I did.

Mr. Speaker: I was going along with the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: If they do not like what we say they sit there and keep a placid countenance about it.

Mr. Speaker: I agree with the hon. member. He has made his point.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not even know Brady Lee because he is not shaking his head.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, it is a well established parliamentary tradition that a minister is responsible for the advice, actions and behaviour of his civil servants. If a civil servant did something in this room that the member thinks is inappropriate that attack should be directed at the minister and not at the civil servant who is defenceless against the political attack.

Now my hon. friend has been in politics long enough, and is a student of history deep enough that he knows this to be the case. He has diverged from his own general principles and from this parliamentary practice in a momentary pique, and I think he owes an apology to the House.

Mr. Lewis: I say we impeach Brady Lee. I will settle for nothing less.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I certainly do not agree with the hon. member for Sudbury's remarks. Brady Lee in my opinion is one of the experts in the mining field. He is highly respected in the

mining industry, and he has had years and years of experience, much more than the hon. member for Sudbury, in the mining field.

Mr. Lawlor: I would suggest he drop that and get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He deserves the respect of this House.

Mr. Sopha: He never deserved much from Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He deserves the respect of this House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and I think the member's attack was uncalled for.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the hon. member for Sudbury's remarks before, many times in this House. I would hope that he would spend some time in his next speech—when the mining tax is opened up for further amendments—if he would spend some time discussing the amounts of money expended by the mining industry in exploration. I think he has failed miserably in pointing his finger at this particular field of expenditure.

Mr. Lawlor: It is all tax deductible.

Mr. Sopha: They wrote it all off.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would also bring to his attention that the estimated mining tax for this year is not $16 million, we estimate it to be in the neighbourhod of some $23 million.

Mr. Speaker: I should point out to the hon. minister that he need not reply to the comments of the hon. members which were out of order. He need only comment to the remarks applicable to the amendment before us.

Hon. Mr. White: That leaves the minister mute. All of their comments were out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: The mining tax would be a swindle.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member for Lakeshore: I found his remarks very interesting, very humorous, and I think he has a very legal mind—

Mr. Lawlor: I do that to hide my bitterness.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and he has a tremendous amount of ability, but I would say to him that if he would spend more time in the north in the mining fields he would be a little more knowledgeable in that area than he is today.

Mr. Ferrier: Some of us spend time in the north.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Now the leader of the NDP, of course, was completely off base. He was not even talking about the bill in question before us, and it shows the amount of homework he has done.

Mr. Sopha: The minister would do better—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Now, the only gentleman that was really on the ball—and I certainly want to commend him for it—is the member for Riverdale—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is really splitting our party.

Mr. J. Renwick: He splits us down the centre.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and he got to the point. He asked a number of questions about the tax. I would like to answer those.

It is a relatively small tax that we have been deriving from the oil industry—

Mr. Stokes: If the minister was on the ball he would get a lot more than $23 million out of the mining industry.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: $60,000 to $70,000 a year—

Mr. Lawlor: We knew what he said. We did not think it important.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and I notice he made some comment about the challenges to this particular Act. I would say to him that we were served notice that this particular tax would be challenged in the courts. The senior Crown counsel examined our entire Act and we found it to be ultra vires of the province, and this is the reason the tax has been repealed.

Mr. Lawlor: Why does the minister not substitute the other tax that Smith talked about?

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 25. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. J. Renwick: To the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the Whole House. Does the hon. minister agree?

Agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in Committee of the Whole House; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the Chair.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1971.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act. When we rose we were dealing with an amendment by Mr. Deans. It was an amendment to section 1 of this bill, which amended 4(*a*) of the Act, subsection 1(*a*). The amendment was that after the word "equipment" in the second line, the words "manufactured within Canada" be added. Any further remarks on this particular amendment?

If not, all those in favour of Mr. Dean's amendment then will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Sounds like the "ayes" have it this time.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Come on, Mr. Chairman. What is going on in this House tonight? You know what that division meant. The "ayes" won.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The "ayes" won. No question about that.

Mr. Chairman: I have not even ruled on it. In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

Either we stop this farce of calling for the "ayes" and "nays" and simply call for the vote always for the government, or you call it the way it happens. Now do not make a farce of the House by suggesting that the one minister whose bill it is, who is the only one who made any noise—

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Oh no, he was not.

Mr. J. Renwick: —from that side of the House, can compare in volume to the mellifluous sounds which emanate from this party.

Mr. Chairman, the "nays" had that vote! —sorry, the "ayes" had that vote!

Let us have the vote on the basis of the way it was.

Mr. Lewis: On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I am not going to take long; I am going to be serious about it. You are supposed to be an impartial Chairman of this House. You are turning yourself into a tool of the government party when it is absolutely obvious to everyone in the Legislature what occurred in that instance. You could at least do us the courtesy of honouring what you yourself heard. If not, then do not engage in this nonsense. Count the people who are in the House, notice that there is a majority on the opposition side and then have the bells ring, if they have five here to stand up—they have only six in their benches.

Mr. Chairman: If the Chairman might just explain, in the rules and procedures, or in the custom as we have laid down, the Chairman or Speaker, as the case may be, is entitled to rule according to the probability in which the vote will go.

Mr. J. Renwick: Let us drop the nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: We would like to have a vote called.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Mr. J. Renwick: What kind of democracy is that?

An hon. member: Stop the damn nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: One voice, and plaintive at that!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Very firm!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

All those in favour of Mr. Deans' amendment will please rise.

All those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 29, the "nays", 46.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and subsection 1(*a*) carried.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments on this section?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On section 1?

Mr. Singer: Oh no, not section 1.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore. Is this on section 1?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Yes, Mr. Chairman; section 1, subsection 2.

Mr. Chairman: Subsection 1?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 1.

Mr. Singer: I want subsection 4(*a*) of the Act.

Mr. Lawlor: No, not an amendment to it

Mr. Singer: On page two.

Mr. Lewis: What is the member for Downsview on?

Mr. Singer: I am—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Singer: Well, what is he on?

Mr. Lawlor: I am on section 1, subsection 2.

Mr. Singer: That is the one I want.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): While they are making up their minds, is the deduction allowed?

Mr. Singer: Yes, for one entitled deduction is allowed.

Mr. Lawlor: I was here first.

Mr. Chairman: Right, the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I was standing up all through the vote.

Mr. Singer: The member has the floor. Go ahead.

Mr. Lawlor: On this section on the deduction, I would like to know just how the minister pretends to be able to give some determination to this section. In other words, what does it mean and how is he going to carry it out effectively? The last three lines, after you allow your deduction, and state the basis upon which you are doing so—"which shall be used by the corporation," the machinery they are buying and equipment which the firm is buying—read "which shall be used by the corporation solely in Ontario prior to the first day of April, 1973, for the purpose of earning income."

I think that is so vague as to verge on the vacuous. It goes this far; would the minister not agree, Mr. Chairman, that this is maybe capital equipment? It may be equipment that is worked into the fabric of the plant, like bricks and mortar. Even if it were capital equipment under any designation—say under income tax, under corporate income tax or in any other way, and designated and assessed and deemed to be capital in the general run of things, according to definitions as distinguished between income and capital in the personal income tax Act—even if it were this, under the definition or under the kind of wording that we have before us, if it was bought for the purpose of earning income, on whose judgement would it nevertheless be to have the full benefit of the five per cent reduction of tax?

That is the problem—on whose judgement, just on whose judgement is it going to be? Is it on the subjective judgement of the firm which makes its application to the member and makes a deposition of some kind saying, "We subjectively believe this is going in some remote way to have some effect upon the income earning capacities of this firm"?

I think practically anything they do must in some remote way have some impact upon their earning potential. Does the minister not agree? Or is it that he has some kind of role to play in this thing and that he does not sit like a stucken in his office bowing his head every time an application comes before him? Is it that he has some kind of criteria, admittedly at the back of his head—

Mr. Sopha: What was that word again?

Mr. Lawlor: Stucken. S-t-u-c-k-e-n, I believe. My father used to call me it all the time. He would never dare call me an ignoramus, but it was always stucken. I thought this word was very common. However, I do not want the minister to be a stucken. And I am saying—

An hon. member: Suppose we adjourn now until we—

Mr. Lawlor: If the hon. member does not use the greater Webster dictionary, he ought not to listen to my speeches. How does he expect, with a minuscule volume like that in his hand, to get anywhere with the English tongue? Come on, put it away, I say to the member for Sudbury; it does not do him credit.

Has the minister any objective criteria on which to determine the benefits he is conferring on industry by way of a tax deduction, tax credits? Has the minister any kind of objective criteria to make a determination? And if he has, he should be cognizant that they should be embodied in regulation.

The minister cannot store up in his subjective consciousness the meaning of his own legislation; it must be above board and laid out fully before the public. Yet there is nothing in this section that says, "upon the terms and conditions as set forth in regulation so-and-so"—nothing like that. And the minister's tendency of recent years—particularly in taxation statues, which have to be construed strictly—has been to so seek to set up his specifically articulated terms upon which a person does or does not fall within the category of taxation, thereby not inviting evasions, not inviting the play with the public purse that this kind of section in my opinion brings about.

I leave it in the hands of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do not think there is any great concern that the member has to feel in regard to this section because it will be extremely clear to him on the issuance of the regulations, and I think his mind will be completely at ease.

I believe also that I said the other evening, in relationship to some similar question, that I was giving him a little hint that we are trying our best to stay quite parallel to the federal situation, and I think it will be done very clearly. Immediately it is passed I will see you have a copy of the regulations.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not think we would.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It will be done.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, when we debated second reading on this bill the point was made, and I think a most valid point was made, that we should be very concerned about trying to provide jobs. That seemed to be the theme of the budget.

The variety of headlines and the self-kudos that the Premier (Mr. Davis) applied to himself and which the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) applied, seemed to indicate that they had licked the whole unemployment problem. The keynote, the base, of this wonderful budget is this bill. By giving away $125 million, as facts now appear, you are perhaps going to encourage new purchases of something in the amount of maybe $250 million. So you are gambling by giving away $1 for $2.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that gamble might be worth something if, in fact, there was some inherent intention that this move was going to provide jobs—and jobs for people who are here in Canada and who have not got them. But look as I may through the Act I just have not been able to find any criteria that set out that very important test.

I wonder why the minister has not bothered to say something about providing new jobs. Or does he care about that? Or does his leader care about that? Or does the Treasurer care about that? Is not the objective, Mr. Chairman, simply to provide this gift to the corporate friends of government?

Why do they not apply the tests that the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) applies? Even when he talks about his modest, perhaps sometimes, fund of $7.5 million, he says: "I am going to make sure that new jobs are going to be supplied." And when the hon. member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) was the minister he talked about the number of jobs he was going to supply by his forgivable loans. At least they went through the motions, which is more than this bill even tries to do.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I am not going to labour the point. The point is quite obvious. I am just simply going to move this amendment. I therefore move that subsection (2) of section 4(*a*) of section 1 be amended by adding at the end thereof the words, "provided that the purchase of the said machinery shall result in the supply of new and additional jobs for Canadian residents, by the said corporation."

Now, by way of addendum to my previous remarks, I would think that the minister would be the first to support the sentiment expressed in that amendment. Because if the words of his leader or the words of the Treasurer mean anything at all, this must be the main objective of this statute.

Without an amendment, or without words similar to that, then the government is shown up for what it is, being phoney about this and

designing themselves only to favour their corporate friends.

So I would ask the minister to very carefully consider this most important feature of this bill and to support this eminently sensible amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer moves that subsection (2) of section 4(*a*) of the Act, which is section 1 of the bill, be amended by adding at the end thereof the words:

> provided that the purchase of the said machinery shall result in the supply of new and additional jobs for Canadian residents by the said corporation.

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Downsview is, of course, exactly identical in intent, although not in wording, to the amendment that I moved two or three days ago.

The purpose of the moving of the original amendment was, of course, to guarantee that the effect of the legislation would improve the unemployment situation in Canada. The hon. member for Downsview has moved an amendment which, in substance, will do exactly the same thing, and we support it.

There is no question that if we in the Ontario Legislature want to alleviate unemployment—and today's paper shows once again that it is rising—if we want to take steps to alleviate it then we have to, by way of legislative action, improve this particular bill.

It is a very small step, and whatever benefit may accrue to the residents of Ontario and to Canada may well be very limited. But the truth of the matter is that if we in the Legislature of Ontario are not prepared to take even the small steps, then how can we expect others to take what are most obviously the greater moves towards improving the unemployment situation?

It has been said throughout this country, by so many different people, that the acquiring of machinery can in many ways not only affect detrimentally the employment situation, but can so determine the investment picture across nations that they will in fact invest their moneys in machinery and plant rather than in employment opportunities. This is the kind of bill that Eric Kierans, the former minister in charge of such things as communications and an expert in the field of economics, stated quite clearly on the day he resigned from the federal government was the wrong approach to combating unemployment in Canada.

This is the kind of legislation that Eric Kierans resigned over, and I am sure that the member for Downsview would agree with me that this kind of legislation can only encourage corporations to invest in plant rather than in employment.

I feel it is necessary that we in this Legislature take a positive step, small though it may be, toward two things. One, toward ensuring that the steps we are taking are guaranteeing that there will be an improvement in the employment situation in Canada and Ontario. Second, a step toward guaranteeing that the manufacturing processes as they apply to the machine tool industry are shored up and in many ways enhanced by the legislative processes of this particular province.

We have seen in Canada over the last number of years the machine tool industry suffering tremendously at the hands of the foreign machine tool manufacturers. The cry has gone out on any number of occasions that there is a great need, in Ontario particularly because of its manufacturing base but in Canada in general, for some legislation that would guarantee that the machine tool industry would have an edge, that it would be able to expand to meet the ever-increasing need. In many ways they have tried, but there has not been any positive move by government that would enable them to move into the fore in providing the kind of stable machine tool industry that is necessary.

Now employment in this area requires that the employment be in most instances in the industry that manufactures the machinery. There is no point in kidding ourselves. Modern technology has shown that the manufacture of machinery inevitably results in fewer jobs, that we are now able to produce machines that will make the actual manpower redundant, that we will not require the same numbers of persons on the assembly line and in the processes of making the machinery operate as we previously required.

If we are going to benefit from this kind of legislation we must surely benefit only from the manufacturing of the machinery. I suggest to the minister, as I did in the earlier debates, that if we are serious about making sure that this reflects in an improvement in the unemployment situation, then it makes reasonable good sense if nothing else to try to ensure by the statute that all of the benefits accrue to people in Canada.

We are not in the business of guaranteeing that the Japanese manufacturers make more money. We are not in the business of guaranteeing that the American manufacturers make more money, or the Swedish or the British. Surely our sole purpose is to guarantee by our legislative actions that the people of Canada benefit. And if we continue to allow the kinds of measures that are implied by the legislation we have before us, we inevitably end up in a situation where we are encouraging the purchase of more machinery, the end result of which will be a reduction in the number of employees in many situations. It seems to me to make abundant good sense that we should attempt by whatever measure is necessary to ensure that Canadians benefit from this legislation.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): He said what the hon. member for Downsview already said. It is now out of order.

Mr. Chairman: We are getting repetitious.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member for Wentworth is talking abundant good sense.

Mr. Deans: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, since you have chosen to raise your voice at 10:26, that it seems to me that on an amendment the second speaker surely is entitled to state the position of the party, surely it makes sense that the second speaker to any amendment is entitled to state clearly the reasons why his party will or will not support—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! There is no question of that. All this is in repetition.

Mr. Deans: Well, this is fine. I ask you then to bear with me, because I have felt very strongly about this for some considerable time. I moved an amendment to try to change it, and I now want to state the reasons why I support the amendment that has been moved by the member for Downsview, because it is an amendment that in essence states clearly what I moved previously.

It does not make any sense for us to make tax concessions, the result of which will be improved employment opportunities in countries other than Canada and to ignore what is the obvious fact of life, that the purchase of new machinery due to technological change generally speaking means a reduction in the total work force.

I suggest to the minister that this kind of amendment makes sense; that if we can say we are prepared to permit certain tax exemptions to corporations that are prepared to purchase machinery which will result in additional employment, then we should all be prepared to support it. And if companies are not prepared to go out into the marketplace and to seek Canadian manufacturers, if they are not prepared in the second part to guarantee that there will be additional employment, and if the Canadian manufacturers are not to be given the benefit of all of the possible exemptions that can be granted by this Legislature, then I feel we are failing in the task that we set out to do.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that you rule on whether the amendment is in order or not? I feel that it does in fact contravene the principle of the bill as, with all deference, I thought the other one had as well.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think it changes the principle of the bill, so I would say the amendment has been in order and the discussion will remain.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let us have the question.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Those in favour of Mr. Singer's amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost and subsection 2 carried.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 26 reported.

Hon Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 26, The Corporations Tax Act.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I should inform the members that tomorrow we hope to have the Lieutenant Governor give assent to those bills which are awaiting the advent and then continue with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests. If they are concluded, they will be followed by the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House leader if he now knows when the government will call the debate on the report from the standing natural and physical resources committee on The Department of Energy and Resources Management estimates?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that now, but I may be able to give the answer tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 13, 1971

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1567

Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bernier, second reading 1568

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported 1575

Third reading 1579

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 1580

No. 38

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, May 14, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY MAY 14, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Desbarats and Bruce Mines in the Algoma district, and from the Vradenberg Public School at Agincourt, who are hosting students from Dawson Creek, British Columbia. In the west gallery are students from the Park Street School of Orillia, who are hosting students from Moosonee Education Centre; also from the West Preparatory School of Toronto, the Salvation Army Language Centre of Toronto, and the Blakelock High School of Oakville.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of members of the House a letter which I have received from the chairman of the Liquor Licence Board addressed to me. It reads:

> I would bring to your attention some changes in policy with regard to extension of lounge and dining lounge licences to outdoor areas.
>
> Many requests have been made to the board to allow the service of alcoholic beverages on patios, balconies, etc., which are immediately adjacent to establishments already licensed. All of these areas would be on private property or on public property where the proper authority has been granted by the council of the municipality. It is the plan to have these areas located so that they in no way inconvenience the public at large and will have a divider—for example, potted plants or bushes—around the licensed area. This would be a temporary extension for the period from May until October.
>
> Plans of 18 such areas have been received and approved by the board. Seven of these are in Toronto and the remaining 11 are situated over the whole of the province.
>
> It is not the board's philosophy to increase the use of alcoholic beverages, but to allow those who wish to have a drink with their meals at a dining lounge or those who wish to have a drink at a lounge to do so in the open. Close observation will be kept by the board's inspectors and all regulations that refer to enclosed premises will apply.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I am pleased to announce that the Quinte Regional Detention Centre will be officially opened tomorrow at Napanee. As hon. members will be aware, this is the first centre of its kind in The Department of Correctional Services' programme for the replacement of outdated local jails with modern regional facilities.

The Quinte Regional Detention Centre will replace existing old jails in Belleville, Kingston, Napanee and Picton, which were built in 1838, 1855, 1865 and 1834 respectively.

As the hon. members will know, it is the department's announced intention to build one new regional detention centre and to plan one each year until all the archaic jails in the province are replaced. This intention was announced in 1968 following the assumption by the province of responsibility for the operation of local jails and their replacement. To date, we are on schedule with this programme. The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Detention Centre is well under construction—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That means we will have to wait 20 years in Owen Sound.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Thirty.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): You cannot have bars and jails, both.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —and tenders have been called for the Niagara Regional Detention Centre which will replace the old jails in St. Catharines and Welland.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the next regional detention centre to be planned will be one to replace the old jails in London and St. Thomas. Planning will begin immediately for this facility.

The completion of these four modern regional detention centres will result in the closing of nine of the existing old jails in the province. This announcement leaves three areas on the priority list for replacement. They are: Halton-Peel, Hamilton and Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

QUETICO PARK POLICY

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests who, I presume, will be carrying out the Premier's (Mr. Davis) announced policy in relation to Quetico Park. Should it not be and is it, the further consideration of government that Quetico Park should be declared a wilderness area in light of the very advanced pronouncement that was made yesterday?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to send to the hon. member a copy of the statement that the Prime Minister made in the House whereby he said that he was accepting the recommenadtions of the Quetico advisory committee: first, that there be no further commercial logging; second, that the industries in the area—specifically the Sapawe saw mill at Sapawe—be continued. Those are the recommendations that the Premier outlined yesterday.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the minister, I think, might have been aware that I had heard the statement and was familiar with it. I was trying to ascertain from the minister if the government is prepared to go further and take the next logical step of declaring Quetico Park to be a wilderness area.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, may I refer to the Premier's statement that the report of the advisory committee would be submitted later this year, that they wanted this decision in order to properly plan the park. I know how anxious the hon. member is, but we have a lot of wilderness areas and, again, I would be glad to send him locations if this is what he seeks.

Mr. Singer: We have great difficulty getting any answers from this minister. Can I ask the Attorney General a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Sargent: Ask him some easy ones.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): There will be more difficulty here.

ABOLITION OF GRAND JURIES

Mr. Singer: In light of the recommendation of the York county grand jury to His Honour Judge Martin, the senior judge of the county court in the county of York, that grand juries be done away with, has the Attorney General given any further consideration to the suggestion to this effect that has been put forth in this House on many occasions?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, there have been a number of such suggestions. Some are reports from the York county grand jury and a couple of other grand juries, but they also always add in many other very worthwhile recommendations and suggestions, and indications of where government action or government facilities should be improved.

All I can say is, obviously, when a grand jury comes along recommending that grand juries be abolished, that in a way would indicate the worthwhileness of the recommendation.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, is the minister going to do anything about that recommendation?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, government policy will be announced in due course.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In the fullness of time.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is right.

Mr. Singer: I have some other questions for ministers who are not here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, a question of the provincial Treasurer, in light both of his present post and his previous post: How many applications for subdivision approval along the Niagara Escarpment are still pending before the appropriate cabinet committee?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I am afraid I could not give that information off the top of my head. I think it might more appropriately come from the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker; since it occurred during the

period when this minister was still Minister of Municipal Affairs, how many other applications for subdivision approval did he grant, other than to Caledon Mountain Estates, along the escarpment area? Does he recall?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No; I could not give that information off the top of my head. There would be some. It would vary from municipality to municipality, depending on the status or otherwise of its official plan. I think the minister could give that information.

LAND BANK PURCHASES ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: By way of another question of the same minister, Mr. Speaker, the minister's colleague from Lands and Forests yesterday indicated to the House a hope that a proportion of the money from the $20 million land bank would go to acquire lands on the escarpment. Does the provincial Treasurer have any specific idea as to the amounts he will appropriate within the $20 million for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The provincial Treasurer is having some difficulty. I think it would be fair to say that suggestions made by—I will not even mention the suggestions made by the hon. members opposite—just my own colleagues, as to how the $20 million might be allocated add up to a great deal more than $20 million, as he might suspect. No; we have not made that determination yet.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, how then can it still be a matter of government policy to acquire the escarpment, when at the end of the four-year Gertler period, Treasurer will have set aside something less than 20 per cent of the required amount of money for priority land and have bought something less than 15 per cent of priority land?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think what one must remember is that the government does have an on-going programme through The Department of Lands and Forests, or rather more directly through The Department of Public Works, and through the conservation authorities to acquire land in the escarpment. The government also has a number of other priorities.

The member obviously has a great—as he has indicated a number of times in the House—enthusiasm toward what was a very fine report—Mr. Gertler's report. I think it is also fair to say that the government weighs that report, along with recommendations which we receive from a number of other people. For example, the money which was spent in that same area within the last month and a half in purchasing Fifty Mile Point which probably is of great benefit—we hope will be of great benefit—to the people of Hamilton and environment through a particular conservation authority. Just because Mr. Gertler or, for that matter my colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests, feels that it is a very high priority—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): And the former Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And the former Prime Minister—that is right. We all have our priorities and we try to put them in balance and serve the best interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, when was the cabinet decision made to abandon the Gertler report and with it the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Never. Never.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, never.

Mr. Lewis: There must have been a decision.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) can and have indicated to this House the seriousness of the government in preserving as much of the escarpment as is practically possible. We have taken steps through two departments—

Mr. Lewis: No, believe me.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —through two departments to purchase lands through the conservation authorities, through out own Department of Lands and Forests and through the Department of Municipal Affairs to control the remaining land, with some respect, I might say, for the rights of the municipalities and the landowners involved. That particular facet, the NDP has never been noted for, I might say, but we happened to take into consideration the views of the municipalities and the private property holders who own that land. That is some concern to us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But to say that we have abandoned the Gertler report, is just more of the nonsense which the member is trying to put in front of the people of Ontario as some sort of a policy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question of the minister—

An hon. member: It does not take much. It does not take much.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Remember Wintermeyer?

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of supplementary question of the provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Randall: He started the same thing.

Mr. Singer: Look what happened to the member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. J. Renwick: By way of supplementary question of the provincial Treasurer, is there still a cabinet committee on regional development and, if so, who are the chairman and the members of it and when has that committee met to consider the Niagara Escarpment acquisition?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, none of the member's business.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: The Treasurer has just muffed it there. He really muffed it there.

Mr. Pitman (Peterborough): That is a good line. That is a very good line.

Mr. J. Renwick: There is no such committee.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, since in 1971 it is none of the opposition's business to know, why in 1967 under a different Premier (Mr. Robarts) and a rather more progressive group was it our right to know the composition of that cabinet committee, who chaired it, what its meetings would concern and from time to time to hear intermittent reports? When did the minister change the policy which was previously part of this House, indeed for the last four years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was undoubtedly a courtesy which the Prime Minister of the day felt obliged to or felt constrained to give to the House. It might be that this Prime Minister will or that this minister will, but not on Friday morning.

Mr. Singer: Not on Friday mornings.

Mr. Lewis: It is a new wave all right.

Mr. J. Renwick: We have got two of them. We have got the new Treasurer and the new Attorney General now and no right to know.

Mr. Pitman: We thought you had lost.

Mr. J. Renwick: No right to know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Randall: We are the government and will make the decisions.

Mr. Lewis: Quiet.

Mr. J. Renwick: We might as well adjourn.

HOUSING CONFERENCE REFUSED FUNDS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Development—a rather different question, Mr. Speaker? Why has the Ontario government refused to share in the funding of the National Housing Conference, sponsored by the Canadian Council for Social Development for tenants of public housing, scheduled from May 22 to May 24 when the majority of Canadian provinces are participating?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of this. I had not the slightest idea that they have so refused.

Mr. Shulman: Like everything else in the minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I will find out and I will advise the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: Are matters of major grants for a conference which is about to be held—I guess in a week or so—not brought to the minister's attention directly through his department?

Mr. Singer: Not on Friday mornings.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member knows of course that to some extent there is a certain amount of autonomy given to the Ontario Housing Corporation. For them to ask the minister for permission to engage in any meeting or conference, or for that matter, bother the minister with the details of all the operations of that corporation, would engage the attention of the minister every moment of every day, and this is only one corporation for which my department or I have to answer.

I presume that in most cases, or in all cases where there is an expenditure of funds involved, that the funds have been approved for the purchase of the Ontario Housing Corporation. I know nothing about this conferference. Obviously, there are some things of which I am apprised because I think it is important enough for me to be apprised of it, or I find out about it.

The hon. member has asked me about this particular conference. I am interested in knowing about it. I will inquire from the housing corporation.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. minister is now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can only know about 90 per cent of the things OHC does, not 100 per cent at any given moment.

Mr. Shulman: The minister does not know 90 per cent of the things asked in the House.

Mr. Lewis: We appreciate the minister's grasp of his department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will do my best to find out. I will give the House the information.

NO FUNDS FOR HOUSING CONFERENCE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary: After The Department of Trade and Development had turned down the request to fund this conference and it was passed on to the citizenship branch of his department, why did his department indicate that no such money was available for such conferences?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The conference did not meet the requirements of our criteria for the disposition of grants from within our programme.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: When did it become the policy of The Department of the Provincial Secretary to discriminate against grants to support conferences for public housing tenants?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there was no such change and there has been no discrimination.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Mr. Speaker—sorry.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Is it true that the Provincial Secretary's department has been providing an office for a tenants' group and supplying funds for the payment of and assisting those of another tenants' group to attend such a conference and participate in it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, we have I believe, with our grants programme, assisted tenants' groups at the local level, but to my knowledge there has been no funding of any attendance at any conferences on the national scale.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Is it true that the Provincial Secretary's department has in fact been providing office space and other assistance to a tenants' group which appears to have found the favour of the department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know what the innuendo is, Mr. Speaker, in "found favour with the department." I cannot recall any specific tenants' group that the hon. member may be referring to. Perhaps he might give me the specific name.

I do know this, that in our programme of community development we have assisted tenants' groups at the local grass-roots level, but not participation on a provincial or national scale. That is not the purpose of our community development programme.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: What is the criteria the minister has for determining whether the participation is at the local grass-roots level?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to give the details of this during the consideration of the estimates of the department.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, now that the Premier has been fully informed by his courteous provincial Treasurer, may I ask

him whether there is still a cabinet committee on regional development? Who chairs that cabinet committee, and when was the last time that the cabinet committee considered the priorities on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ad hoc committees in cabinet; there are cabinet committees that are structured on an on-going basis. What cabinet discusses, the makeup of the committees and what dates we refer to certain matters, of course, are confidential to members of cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, when did a committee on regional development in Ontario become ad hoc?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the member will listen very carefully, I did not say that the regional development committee was an ad hoc committee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask by way of supplementary, is the regional development committee an on-going committee of cabinet chaired as it was by the Premier's predecessor? Who now chairs that committee and has that committee recently discussed the acquisition of land on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member, even it it were my inclination to do so, those items on the agenda at the last meeting of the committee on regional development. I will of course be endeavouring to find this out. But as I point out Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the Premier know who the chairman is?

Mr. Lewis: Does the Prime Minister recall who the chairman is?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the membership and those matters discussed by cabinet are confidential to cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: A closed cabinet.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is a closed cabinet, The member is right, exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does that come as any surprise?

Mr. J. Renwick: —is the cabinet committee on regional development, in fact, in existence in accordance with the announcement made by the former Prime Minister in 1966, when he announced the policy of the then government about the design for regional development in the Province of Ontario, named the cabinet committee, named their responsibilities, and indicated to the province that this was a top priority committee of cabinet? Is there any such cabinet committee in existence today or has it disappeared?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes there is a committee in existence by that name.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: Is it the cabinet committee that the former Prime Minister announced at the time that he made the announcement in 1966 about the design for regional development? If so, what is now the composition of the ministers who compose that committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the composition of the committee, of course, is something that is a matter of policy. I am not prepared to give it to the hon. member this morning.

Mr. Pitman: Was it changed?

Mr. Lewis: What is this secrecy the Premier is imposing on the public? How do we ask ministers questions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a question of secrecy at all. It is very difficult to say whether or not the responsibilities of the committee that presently exists are identical with those that existed some two and half years ago. Committee functions change; the areas of interest and responsibility are altered. I think any question by the hon. member must recognize that.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Premier does not even know whether it exists.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have now been sufficient supplementaries, a reasonable number of supplementaries in accordance with the standing orders. Has the hon. member for Scarborough West further questions?

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, through the Speaker: How many approvals for subdivision development along the Niagara Escarpment are now pending before his department?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have to ascertain that because it is a large area. I could not give the member the answer this morning. I will ascertain it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister recall having approved during his tenure as minister any applications for subdivision approval along the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, not in reference to the escarpment; it is a large area and I cannot recall that. As a matter of fact, I noted the story in the morning paper about Caledon Mountain Estates and I have been checking on that. There is not any, but I am checking further.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary Mr. Speaker: If the minister cannot recall any along the escarpment approved while he is minister, is he now saying—I am sorry I did not catch that—is he now saying that he has looked for approval of subdivision development for Caledon Mountain Estates and has not found it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The last I have been able to find is a draft approval in 1965 and a final approval on that in 1966. There are other applications but they have not been draft approved.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: How does that correspond with the assertion of the Minister of Lands and Forests in the House yesterday that approval had followed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what was said by my colleague in reference to that particular matter, but I think you have to understand what particular area are we dealing with. I referred to lands that might be near the Forks of the Credit. The escarpment is a very large area. I have my staff looking at the matter at the present time and this is the information I have been able to ascertain this morning.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: In view of the seriousness of the problems that were raised during the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, would the minister undertake to be available when these discussions continue so that accurate information can be brought before this House and the public, rather than the very vague and unsatisfactory answers given to us yesterday by the Minister of Lands and Forests?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I will be bringing my estimates before this House. I am not sure what was said yesterday. I will be getting Hansard to read it and obtain the information. If there are specific points that the members wish to ask me questions on I will be glad to obtain the information and provide it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary: If the minister would review yesterday afternoon's Hansard, let me ask if he would not agree—or if he has not already reviewed it, when he reviews it—would he agree to be present in the House to bring the continuation of the estimates of the Minister of Lands and Forests with his files and with accurate information so that we can find out what really happened in this matter?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we do not deal with two departments' estimates at one point of time, and certainly I have never known of questioning two ministers at one point in these matters. But if there is specific information that is required I will be happy to provide it to my colleague or in answer to questions in the House.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, will the minister provide us, not later than on Monday next, with a full statement of the subdivision approvals which have been granted since October, 1969, the date on which the Gertler report was tabled in this House, with respect to the land recommended in the Gertler report to be acquired by the province for public purposes?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give that undertaking in reference to Monday because that is a very large area. We have two days between, which is the weekend, and I think it would be a complex matter, and a difficult matter, to obtain the information in that short period of time. If you want to put it on the order paper we will deal with it.

Mr. Speaker: Once again there has been a reasonable number of supplementaries in accordance with the standing orders. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

CODING ON CONSUMER GOODS

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the consumers of Ontario, a couple of questions of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs regarding the coding of perishables: For instance, Kodak film should not be used after a certain date—June, 1972? In view of the fact that all suppliers for the food chains use—say on their cans of salmon—a code that the public cannot read, would the minister let me know what is happening so far as Ontario people are concerned, why we cannot have all these suppliers of perishables say, "Not to be used after a certain date"?

Second, on the same thing, why are the large food chains—the big three in Toronto—telling the suppliers across Canada that they cannot have a cents-off programme? I suggest that the minister should consider that this is not in the interest of the consumers. There are many hundreds of millions of dollars being—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now making a speech. He is not asking a question.

Mr. Sargent: In other words, Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell me why he allows the food chains to work against the interest of the consumers in the interest of the suppliers, and say, "You cannot have a cents-off programme in merchandising?"

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first question, as to the dating of products and the use of the products within certain dates, this is the subject of a conference now arranged with the federal department, headed by the hon. Mr. Basford. This conference is to take place on May 25, 26 and 27. There are certain areas of jurisdiction with respect to control of goods, marketing and so on, which are both provincial and federal; some are purely federal and some are within our jurisdiction.

All the provinces, I believe, are meeting with the department at Ottawa. We are going to be there; I myself will be there on those days pursuing those matters in that conference. We hope to arrive at some policy that can be implemented to control not only the matter that the hon. member raised but a goodly number of others.

With respect to the sale of products by merchandisers, as to the price at which they want to sell them, we have no price controls. If they have arrangements with chains or associated stores and say, "This is the price you must charge for our product," we have no legislation to say at what price they must sell.

I think if such legislation were to be considered wise, that probably would be a federal matter. It may be one of the subjects we will discuss at Ottawa. But I do not think it is wise perhaps at the moment to say to the individual merchant that if he puts his goods out on consignment or otherwise for sale, he cannot tell the person with whom he makes the arrangements the price at which they can be sold. This is a matter of wide policy; it is a matter I know that has received some consideration, but we have no legislation at the moment.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, very briefly: I would respectfully suggest to the minister that in Ontario, which he should be concerned about—

Mr. Speaker: Question, question!

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister look into the fact that there is a cartel operating in the case whereby big operators can make a deal with the suppliers that they will not allow a cents-off programme, which relates to hundreds of millions of dollars to the consumers? Would the minister look into that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to adopt the hon. member's words of looking into the matter—we are looking into that. But the area of control with respect to combinations of trade people is federal, and as you know there have been prosecutions and investigations in that area. We are concerned with it; we drew it to the attention of the federal government on numerous occasions and it will be one of the subjects we will be discussing further.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

WEAPONS LICENCES TO PERSONS WITH RECORDS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Has his department done a study to determine how many of the 15,000 persons in Ontario who are

licensed to carry concealed weapons have a criminal record?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No such report has reached me. I will make inquiries though, and find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

MEETING WITH OHC WINDSOR TENANTS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. In view of the minister's recent announcement that tenants in certain Ontario Housing projects would be permitted to buy their homes and in light of the fact that those living in the Bridgeview subdivision in the city of Windsor consider the prices not in line, being a little exorbitant, would the minister consider meeting with the group from the Bridgeview subdivision in an attempt to iron out their difficulties with the department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a group, a delegation from which is coming in to see me, I believe, on Monday or Tuesday. In any case, there is a group coming from Windsor, and I think it is on this matter. This meeting has already been arranged.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

DANGEROUS TYPES OF FIREWORKS

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs in respect to the disposal of toys which I brought to the attention of the House earlier this week: In view of the fact that E. J. Fraser, the chief inspector of explosives for The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—the federal department, that is—has said that 90 per cent of the samples tested exceeded the maximum permissible bursting charge, and some of them having as high as four times that permissible bursting charge; and in view of the fact that these have been banned as far as importation into Canada is concerned, also in view of the fact that the federal government has seen fit to allow the stock on hand to be sold to the children of Canada rather than than be prohibited or sent back, is there anything this minister can do to see to it that the children of Ontario might not purchase the residue of these toys now in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the same member who raised the question earlier this week when I was not in the House, and I have prepared quite a full answer, which I thought might be coming forward today, on the question that he previously asked.

These items—I have forgotten the name; Party Poppers—we have the information with respect to them. The hon. member knows they are now banned for import into Canada as of, I believe, February 21, so that none have come in since that date this year.

It is true that they were required to be of a certain grade and meet certain standards, particularly with respect to the amount of explosive within them. It was found that many of them were exceeding that standard. So the whole business of Party Poppers, or that type of thing has been banned by the federal department, which controls the import and none have come into Canada since February 21.

It is a fact that some of these items are on the shelves of merchants throughout the country, having been distributed prior to the ban on their importation. It is also a fact that our legislation gives the municipalities—they come within the definition of firecrackers—the right to ban their sale completely, so there is at least that authority or power within the municipality if there is any concern, that they could ban them.

We have been looking at the matter to see what further we could do by way of warning, but at the moment I am not prepared to propose in this situation that we need special provincial legislation to deal with those that are left on the shelves. They are not really a serious danger. Most of them are designed to throw out streamers of coloured paper from a container at a party and I do not think there has been any really serious incident connected with them. But the municipalities have the power to prevent the sale of them if they see fit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a supplementary?

Mr. Young: Yes, a supplementary then: The hon. minister is not contemplating any action at the present time to warn parents of the danger?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not say that. I recognize the hon. member's question from, I believe, Monday or Tuesday. I have been concerning myself with getting information from the fire marshal, from the federal government, from areas where these things have been in use. That information is being collated, and, as I say I thought I might have it all here today.

Whether I would recommend legislation to my colleagues in government I am not prepared to say I would not at the moment, but I did not think from what I know so far that the situation was one that called for special legislation. I will have a further answer for the hon. member perhaps early next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

SERVICES FOR HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Deacon: I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Has the minister an answer to my question of two or three weeks ago regarding the plans for a major expansion of wholesale water and sewage services in his new housing programme? I am reminded of this by the recent turndown by the Ontario Water Resources Commission—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Deacon: —expansion plan in the greater Toronto area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the question having been asked. Was it asked of me directly?

Mr. Deacon: The minister took notice of it two weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, there is a backlog of a number of questions waiting for me at head office. I think they have been there for about a week.

Mr. Sargent: That means the minister is in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have had a lot of work to do. I will do my best to get the answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in a position at this time to give us any indication of the persons who have been invited to participate in his conference for foreign investments toward the end of June? And has he given consideration to inviting the persons who were formerly members of the task force on the structure of Canadian industry, such as Mr. Melville Watkins, Mr. Abraham Rotstein and Mr. Parry, for example?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be in a position to announce the names of those participating some time early next week. I am only going by memory. I do not recall Mr. Watkins as being one of those who has been asked.

Mr. J. Renwick: I thought so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: How about Mr. Laxer?

Mr. Lewis: I guess there are times when we share things in common. We have not invited him either.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Have you not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Would the Attorney General—is he concerned about the threatened—

Mr. Randall: Inviting Watkins is like putting a ferret in a henhouse.

THREATENED STRIKE BY TORONTO POLICE

Mr. Sargent: If the member for Don Mills wants to be in the front row put him down there, we do not mind.

Is the Attorney General concerned about the threat of Constable Sid Brown, the president of Metro police, with regard to a threatened strike of the Toronto police, with regard to the decision of Mr. Justice Lacourcière in St. Catharines last week?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I had dinner with Mr. Brown and many of his colleagues just last night and I am not concerned about that at all.

Mr. Sargent: In other words the minister is on top of the current action?

Mr. J. Renwick: Did the minister have a good dinner?

Mr. Sargent: The minister takes his threat lightly, does he?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My colleague points out that I am not on top of it, I am in the middle of it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the minister does not regard his threat as serious?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is this a supplementary question?

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary question: The Attorney General does not regard his threat as serious?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I do not regard an alleged threat by the police forces of this province that they would go on strike as being too serious a threat. I think the members of the police forces in this province take too seriously and too highly their responsibility to the public in regard of the protection of life, limb and property, to seriously consider that very extreme step.

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary: Is the minister working jointly with The Department of Municipal Affairs to rectify this situation?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Does the member mean the general question of police salaries?

Mr. Sargent: The benefits.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And benefits—that is a matter that certainly we are giving day-to-day consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

INQUEST INTO WOMAN'S DEATH

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: In view of the considerable unhappiness in Bronte and Oakville about the refusal of the coroner's office to hold an inquest into the death of Mrs. Betty Pesch, has the Attorney General considered overruling this decision, particularly in light of the recent editoral in Oakville?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The name does not ring a bell. Would the hon. member like to speak to me after the question period and give me the details of it? I am not too sure whether that one has crossed my desk or not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford.

BREAK AND ENTRY INCREASES IN SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): A question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General: Has the minister or his department been made aware of the increase of break and entry infractions in southwestern Ontario, and a supplementary—I guess I had better wait, had I not?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Speaker: Now the supplementary.

Mr. Innes: If not, would he concern himself with it and ascertain whether some of the so-called gangs go from one area to the other?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT FOR SILICOSIS SUFFERERS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs:

Has the minister taken the necessary steps to implement the reciprocal agreement with other provinces covering silicosis exposure so that persons involved can obtain compensation regardless of where they were formerly employed?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe my officials have been working on this. I will get further information and report back to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

PARKING AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker.

What is the reason for the foul-up in the parking situation at Ontario Place, and what steps are you taking to rectify the mess?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the foul-up that the hon. member has referred to, is only in the columns of the newspapers.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the minister not ask the member for Don Mills about that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no foul-up at all.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister suggesting the police and the TTC do not know what they are talking about when they say there is no accommodation for parking at Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not suggesting that at all. I do not know that they have said that. There may be some misunderstanding as to what the arrangements for parking are. There are reasons for the arrangement of some 300 cars in Ontario Place; that is essentially for the employees who are working there and for the parking of buses which are going to be constantly bringing in tours of children from across the province. There is ample parking on the other side of the highway and considerably more parking than will be necessary, having regard for the fact that the CNE has 300,000 visitors on certain days during the exhibition and we do not expect any more than about 50,000 on any one day.

Mr. Shulman: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister—

Mr. Sargent: Causing a disservice there.

Mr. Shulman: Can the minister assure us that the monster traffic jam which is being predicted for next week will not occur?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot assure him of that at all, Mr. Speaker. We hope that it will be a tremendous success so that we will be faced with more traffic problems than we anticipate at the moment. If we are, we will meet those problems.

We are constantly in conference with the officials and with the police of Metro Toronto. As a matter of fact, we have a meeting, I think this coming Monday, or Tuesday, in which we are going to co-ordinate some other matters which have arisen in the last few days.

We do not anticipate any unusual problems at all, having regard for the number of people, and we are sure everyone will be accommodated. It may be that the crowds may not be as large as we hope they will be, in view of the fact that certain people are constantly talking about the traffic problem. That in itself may scare a lot of people away.

Mr. Lewis: Is it true that the minister will be standing in the road directing traffic? Is this his job?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

RESORT LIQUOR LICENCES

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary, and I would like to deal with him very firmly but kindly on this question.

Mr. B. Newman: Get ready.

Mr. Sargent: Now, with regard to the issuing of licences for resorts in my area—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is firmly?

Mr. Sargent: —liquor licences. Time is getting short. What is going on? How many are you issuing in regard to my area?

And second, regarding that statement today, how do 18 applications come in to the Provincial Secretary in advance of government policy? How does he work these things, when 18 people can anticipate government policy and come in? He has them in his hand right now.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): They read the legislation.

Mr. Randall: Is the member for Grey-Bruce still confused?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the hon. member has dealt with me kindly, because that is exactly the way I am going to treat him. The hon. member is rather confused.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): I thought the member said he was going to treat the minister kindly? That is not very kind.

Mr. Randall: What else is new?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Not another two.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The two items—

Mr. Sargent: I have only got one question. I have got to get it in here.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The two items are completely different. For some time we have been discussing in this House and outside, the matter of drinking out in the open; that is, under the blue sky.

Mr. Sargent: Answer the first question on the resort areas.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is in reference to that that I made the statement this morning. That is what is known more commonly as the sidewalk type of drinking.

Now I did not indicate specifically the word sidewalk. We referred to patios and open-air spaces adjacent to presently licensed premises. That is one thing.

The licensing of resorts is a completely separate matter. These are new things and presently no licences have been issued, but the board is hearing applications during the course of their special meetings.

As everywhere else, the applicants are heard and the local people have the opportunity of expressing their objections, or otherwise. After those hearings have been held, then the board as it usually does will make the relevant decisions.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the provincial Secretary do me a favour? Why can he not tell me how many he is going to process from my area? Also, are they going to be given this year so that they can operate this year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do the member a favour.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member, that question cannot be answered at this time because the board has, I think, completed the hearings in respect of the applications and in due course they will be processed. We hope in time—

Mr. Sargent: The minister told me the same thing a month ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I am wondering, does the minister intend to amend the legislation with respect to entertainers under 21 who perform in licensed premises?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the question of the employment of entertainers is part of the overall question of the employment of people under 21 in licensed premises. They are forbidden to do so and it is part and parcel of the much larger concept of the drinking age which is part of the larger problem of the age of majority. It is in that concept that the matter will be dealt with.

Mr. Pitman: How can they drink when they are playing?

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary: The matter is being reviewed at the present moment?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the items which is under consideration. In due course I expect to make a broader statement with respect to the review that this government contemplates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, I am sorry.

Mr. Innes: When could we expect a statement on this—a firm statement?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my closing words, I look forward to having an opportunity of making a definitive statement respecting the review that this government will be undertaking.

Mr. Innes: When?

Mr. Speaker: I regret that the time has now expired for the oral question period.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Oh, give the lady her question.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think I shall be sufficiently flexible to give the hon. lady member an opportunity. I invite her to ask the question.

INCOME REQUIRED OF CONDOMINIUM PURCHASERS

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is of the Minister of Trade and Development.

What is the family income required in order to be a purchaser of the condominium one- and two-bedroom apartments at Chapel Glen, and what are the overall monthly carrying charges?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to take that as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the report of the Algonquin advisory committee, along with a minority report.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. members that I have now received a report prepared by the advisory committee on Algonquin Park.

Although, as I mentioned, I have only received this report—in fact I received it no more than a day ago and have not yet had an opportunity to give it careful scrutiny or indeed to ask my senior staff to report to me regarding its implications—I am prepared to make it available to the hon. members of this House. Copies will be distributed in a few minutes.

I wish to emphasize further, Mr. Speaker, that it is an advisory committee's report, made to me as Minister of Lands and Forests, and it is not to be regarded with respect to the present or future management of Algonquin Park. I am sure, however, that its contents have been well thought out by this important advisory committee, and I will indeed pay close attention to it with respect to the recommendations regarding government policy on this important recreational area of Ontario.

Also at this time I would like to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to the hon. Leslie Frost, the chairman of the committee, for the very hard work that he and his able committee members have done in addressing themselves to this complex problem and advising me on policy matters with respect to Algonquin Park.

I also wish to point out that appended to this advisory committee report is a minority report on one section, which I am also tabling at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

NOISE POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, The Noise Pollution Control Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Act is to establish a means of regulating, controlling and prohibiting excessive noise in the surrounding environment.

Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the order of the day will be the 13th order. I had indicated on adjournment yesterday that I thought the Lieutenant Governor might be ready to give assent to certain legislation at 11 o'clock this morning. He will arrive, I expect, in the next half hour or so. We shall then interrupt our order of business. The 13th order.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

On vote 1103:

Mr. Chairman: We were discussing item 1 generally when we rose last. The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Thank you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I had the floor at 6 o'clock last night. The government interrupted the business at 8 o'clock last night. I was in the midst of asking the minister a series of questions, the continuity of which will be destroyed if the Chairman insists on not permitting the completion of that range of questions.

Mr. Chairman: I do not recognize that as a valid point of order of the hon. member. It is a new session today and the member for Downsview caught my eye first, so we will carry on from there. The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the discussion we had yesterday, I have had the chance to review Hansard and I hoped that the minister would have brought with him a number of answers. However, since the question period, he may have them. During the question period, it appeared from the remarks of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) that

it was none of our business what cabinet committees had met and who comprised them. What they said and what decisions were made were matters of secret government consideration.

It appeared from the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he really had not all of the information but he would try to get it for us in due course and that it was unusual that one minister should interfere in another's estimates. I do not think anyone had suggested Mr. Chairman that it would be interference. We wanted some elucidation. But it would seem to me that there is something less than a desire on the part of government to co-operate in connection with these matters.

I think for instance to sum up some of the questions I put yesterday we should have the positive answer from the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld)—I do not know which one of them knows these things. But it was known to government.

I think the game that is continually played around here has now reached the point of becoming nauseating where one says "I do not know what the other one is doing." Downstairs the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) says, "I take my instructions from the Minister of Lands and Forests," and upstairs the Minister of Lands and Forests says, "I do not know what the Minister of Public Works does." The government is running out of time on this kind of excuse, and the public is no longer going to buy it.

I think we deserve specific answers to this kind of question. For instance, at the time of the application of Caledon Estates Limited to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval of a plan of subdivision on the balance of their holdings which were identified yesterday by this minister, by the Minister of Lands and Forests as 1,050 acres, was the Minister of Municipal Affairs—and when I say the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I do not necessarily mean the present incumbent; I mean him or any of his predecessors—was the Minister of Municipal Affairs or any of his officials aware of the Gertler report? Were they aware of the announced policy made by the then Premier, the member for London North (Mr. Robarts) of the desire of government to acquire the whole of the Niagara Escarpment and if so, why then did they give, as was indicated by the Minister of Lands and Forests, draft approval and apparently finally subsequent approval to the registration of this plan of subdivision after the Minister of Lands and Forests through his agent, the Minister of Public Works, had acquired 506 acres of the Caledon land at double the price it had been purchased for by Caledon 22 months before?

That kind of thing has to come and it should come in this debate, and it should not come as a result of half-answers from this minister, promises from the now Minister of Municipal Affairs that he is going to look into it but he is not quite sure, and great doubt from the Minister of Public Works. I think it should be tied up in a bundle. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be able to tell us, following consultation with the Minister of Lands and Forests, that should have taken place between 6 o'clock last night and now, the date of application of Caledon for their plan of subdivision and its coincidence with the agreed-upon negotiations and the final terms of sale. What is the key number of the plan? That would give us some idea as to time. What was the date of draft approval? What was the date of final approval? That is one set of questions.

I think that somebody in the ministry at this stage should be able to tell us, insofar as the purchase was concerned, whether or not there were any independent evaluations of the 506 acres of land that was purchased, what they were, who made them and in what amounts they were. And if the government did not seek independent evaluation as it did in the case of certain Peterborough land purchases, then why did it not?

Yesterday, in discussing the estimates of Public Works, the minister went on at some length to say that in view of the possible involvement of a former member of this House in certain dealings in Peterborough, he wanted to make sure everything was fine and he went out and got three or four independent land evaluations. Well, that is fine.

This indicates that in that case at least the government was being careful. Were they being as careful in this case? Were there any independent land evaluations obtained prior to the final signing of the offer with Caledon to purchase their land at $1,500 an acre? If there were no independent evaluations were there written departmental evaluations? And if there were written departmental evaluations, who in fact made them? What dates were they made on? On what factual basis were they set up? Were they in fact acted upon when this negotiated offer was agreed upon?

I question the five per cent land insofar as the registration of this planned subdivision. I know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, because of his very substantial experience on the council of the borough of North York, knows all about five per cent land and recognizes that it is a very good weapon with which to bargain with potential subdividers and that it is quite easy to acquire from potential subdividers. In lieu of the five per cent that they are compelled to give under The Planning Act, great numbers of acres of valley land on which subdividers cannot build, to what extent, if any, did public ownership benefit from the five per cent land that came with the registration of this plan of subdivision?

I think answers should be given about expropriation, Mr. Chairman, because I just do not understand the continued references yesterday by the minister, who kept on saying: "Do not forget, they did not want to sell. We went to them and that is why the price was higher." The price was higher because the government helped to make it higher. Every step along the way increased the value of the land. And if they were apparently going to be held up by being asked double the price that the land had been purchased at 22 months earlier, why then did they not consider expropriation?

If there was any intention on the government's part to acquire the land that was later subdivided, why did it not expropriate that land? There is no inherent right in anyone owning land in Ontario, Mr. Chairman, to have that land subdivided. It is not one of the features of the Bill of Rights that we have in Canada or in Ontario. We use land in accordance with our statutes and in accordance with government policy. Why did the government not expropriate that land that is now part of the plan of subdivision, prior to it having been given approval?

I do not know. I gathered this morning from some of the comments made by the Treasurer and by the Premier, that whatever minutes there were might have been taken by the so-called cabinet committee, or by the task force. I cannot get straight in my mind all the various emanations of the cabinet to deal with matters of this kind and to coordinate them. I gather that if there are any minutes kept of these proceedings that it is none of our business. But I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a very important part of our business that we begin to find out what, in fact, did take place.

I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that even this government would not be so loose in its business practices that, when the Minister of Lands and Forests, or The Department of Lands and Forests, gives certain instructions to The Department of Public Works re the acquisition of land, there would not be some written minute of those instructions. I think we should have produced to us that written minute, because the minister was unable to answer us yesterday, as to what those instructions were. Those instructions surely would contain, Mr. Chairman, a record of the amount that the department had available in money to purchase the land, a specific designation of the land to be acquired and an indication to The Department of Public Works as to how many acres The Department of Lands and Forests wanted. I say again, Mr. Chairman, that the vague answers given by the minister are just not good enough.

Those are the questions that were asked yesterday. I think there are a few that I have added as I thought about this since the debate adjourned yesterday. I am not at all satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the method of dealing with these estimates is going to bring forth these very important answers. It is my very strong feeling that the only way we are going to get down to the bottom of what happened is to have this matter investigated by a committee of this House. It would be my suggestion, and I hope that the government will take this very seriously, that the whole matter of dealing with Caledon Mountain Estates now be referred to standing committee No. 1 —I have forgotten its formal title. That is the one that deals with legal matters and private bills and that sort of thing, so that committee can have before it not only—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Legal administration.

Mr. Singer: —legal administration, the hon. member says, the standing committee on legal administration—so that committee can have before it, not only the Ministers of Lands and Forests and Public Works and Municipal Affairs, but the civil servants of those departments who are familiar with these matters and, as well and if necessary, the power to bring before it representatives of the Caledon company so that we can get the full story.

This is not a matter that can be lightly passed off as being none of our business or of which we are only going to get bits and pieces of information. That, Mr. Chairman,

is the only way in which we are going to get down to the bottom of this story.

I have discussed with the Clerk the method I might use in bringing this matter before the House in the form of a motion at this time. He advises me that the procedure will not allow me to draft a motion to this effect. However, I am going to move, at this point, the standard motion indicating our lack of satisfaction in the government's handling of this matter, particularly in the minister's inability to explain all of these things.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Is the hon. member not going to give me an opportunity to reply?

Mr. Singer: I want to put the motion now, and if the minister can convince me I may withdraw it later.

I will move, Mr. Chairman, that item 1 of vote 1103 be reduced by the sum of $15,000. That is the amount of the minister's statutory additional allotment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Has the hon. member ever thought of going to Hollywood?

Mr. Singer: I am waiting. Perhaps the minister could get me a contract or a bid.

But I am very serious, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick: John Wayne is still around.

Mr. Singer: —I think in order to put this whole matter together we have got to have the kind of inquiry I have indicated. I think there has to be something very formal before the House, and the Clerk advises me this is the only form in which I can bring a motion, relating particularly to these estimates, and so I let that motion sit.

And I am equally serious, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister believes he has the answers and he is prepared to get into it and answer us more fully than he has to date, I will withdraw the motion—if the minister comes up with the explanation necessary, or if the government will, of its own, allow the standing committee to carry on the type of investigation that I referred to.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the member allow me to give information for which he asked yesterday, as did the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis). After this information has been given then he can decide, in his wisdom, whether he wishes to proceed.

Mr. Singer: The motion will sit; then I will decide.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like an opportunity to say a few words on the many things that were posed to me yesterday. First I would say, with reference to the application for approval of a subdivision in the Forks of the Credit area, I was in error. This was not approved.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there has been no approval for subdivisions in this area since May, 1966. This application was made to The Department of Municipal Affairs in 1963. The file number of this approved subdivision for the Caledon Mountain Estates is T15590. This application was made on February 26, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, there are several things that were brought out yesterday I would like to mention. I have some of this information here which will, I hope, help clarify some of the matters that were brought up.

First, my staff had studied the Gertler report, thoroughly examined the ground and had prepared several alternatives and development plans, and I submitted these to the Ontario Parks Integration Board on July 30, 1970. The Ontario Parks Integration Board agreed that there should be consideration given to the acquisition of all of the 1,070 acres recommended in the Gertler report.

On staff advice that the Caledon Mountain Estates organization owned the major block of land, the board instructed The Ontario Department of Public Works to commence negotiations to acquire the land owned by that company lying within the area recommended by the Gertler report and to report their findings to the board, including the possibility of including easements to accommodate the Bruce Trail where necessary. Extensive negotiations were carried on between the staff of The Department of Public Works and Caledon Mountain Estates.

At this time I wish to clearly state that The Department of Public Works is recognized as the only body responsible to negotiate on such purchases and that therefore there was not at any time a meeting relative to land acquisition between my staff and Caledon Mountain Estates.

The Department of Public Works made a full investigation and appraisal of land values, as is usual prior to negotiation. In doing so, The Department of Public Works learned that a considerable portion of the 506 acres had been acquired at $1,000 per acre and could be subdivided for building

lots of estate type homes. They also learned at that time that the Caledon Mountain Estates were selling subdivided building lots at prices from $22,000 to $28,000 for each parcel of from three to eight acres.

The purchase price recommended by The Department of Public Works, after negotiations, was considered to be entirely reasonable under the real estate conditions existing in the area, therefore expropriation was not considered. I would also like to add, Mr. Chairman, that adjacent land without the advantage of the river has recently been selling for over $2,000 per acre.

In view of these prices for land located above the escarpment, the decision was reached that that type of land should not be acquired at a cost influenced by such prices. Therefore negotiations were continued, which led to the acquisition of a total of 506 acres. This 506 acres was acquired at the price quoted yesterday in the House. And, Mr. Chairman, in addition, the price we paid of $1,450 per acre included an agreement to include a clause in subdivision deeds which would prevent any building or tree-cutting on the western slope and rim of the escarpment from a distance of approximately one and a quarter miles. This would protect the scenic values as related to the area proposed for subdivision on the upper flat without full purchase of the parcel.

Also this same price included the deeding of a right-of-way to accommodate the Bruce Trail for a distance of one and a half miles which is a strip outside of the actual 506 acres. Knowing the cost of acquiring the above values, including the 506 acres, further negotiations were suspended for other property in the area.

It is planned a further land acquisition will take place to protect additional sections of the Forks of the Credit area as recommended by the Gertler report and this has been assigned high priority for the current fiscal year. Mr. Chairman, again, I say that The Department of Public Works negotiated a very fair price. I would like to mention also that this company, Caledon Mountain Estates, is a public corporation. The shareholders paid $5.40 per share at the time of issue which was about two years ago and today, Mr. Chairman, those shares are down to about $3 which is $2.40 less than they were two years ago.

The investors, far from making a profit, have really incurred a sizable loss in this sale. Again, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that Public Works negotiated—they are the experts in this—a very fair price and the answer as to why they did not expropriate is, it was not necessary. They got several things. They got the 506 acres of choice land. They got an easement for the Bruce Trail. They got it in the agreement that no trees shall be cut on the western side.

These are all things which are included and, Mr. Chairman, a lot of that land purchased by this firm was farm land; therefore the prices that were paid by the Ontario Department of Public Works are fair prices.

The hon. member for Scarborough West asked me a few questions. He wanted to know the number of acres and the price paid in certain areas. These are property purchases other than in the Niagara Escarpment.

The Mad River Valley—200 acres were purchased during the fiscal year 1970-1971. This is all during the fiscal year 1970-1971—$58,500.

Devil's Glen—44 acres at $21,000;

Cape Chin—800 acres at $21,000;

Lion's Head—three acres at $3,900;

Owen Sound-Collingwood—and this includes the Kalapore, Uplands, Hogg's Falls and Meaford Lookout—840 acres at $262,875.

Information on previous transactions involving these properties is not now available but is being sought by The Department of Public Works.

I would also like to mention that, in connection with these and in connection with the Forks of the Credit, the Minister of The Department of Public Works last night downstairs in committee gave a full statement. Their books are open and everything has been dealt with on a very fair and equitable basis.

The hon. member for Scarborough West also inquired about land purchased on the escarpment from June, 1968, to October, 1969. There were 8,903 acres purchased at $1,154,532 and from October, 1969, to the present time, 3,122 acres at a price of $1,747,595.

Again I would like to remind the hon. members—

Mr. Lewis: That is by both conservation authorities and yourself, I take it? I take it that is the total?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is a purchase on behalf of Lands and Forests. The conservation authority's lands are in addition.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Can the minister explain to me why he thinks it was a reasonable price to pay double what land had been purchased for 22 months before? Why was that reasonable?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first of all this is very choice land. Presently they are paying more than $2,000 per acre for adjacent land. They are paying between $22,000 to $28,000 for lots of three to five acres—and the member knows this.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are also—sit down, I am speaking.

Also included in that price were those other matters that I mentioned—the easement, about one and a half miles of easement for the Bruce Trail—this is worth something. Also included were those additional things such as that no trees should be cut and other restrictions. So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that if the hon. member makes his own inquiries he will waste his time because that is a very fair price. He should try to sweep some other rug; he will not find anything under that one.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the minister has not convinced me. I just do not believe that this very choice land, if it was so choice, would have been half the price 22 months before the government moved in. That is number one—I just cannot understand it. Does the minister have any written evaluation, either from independent evaluators or from government officials, that indicate their opinion as to the per-acre value of this land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again I would say the Ontario Department of Public Works have been in this business of purchasing land for years. They are experts, and they certainly negotiated a very fair price.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this is why we keep on going around in circles. Are there in existence any written evaluations, either from independent evaluators or evaluators in The Department of Public Works, showing what their opinion was of the value of this land at the time the government purchased it? It is very simple and can you answer it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is very simple—ask the Ontario Department of Public Works. We do not negotiate lands, they do.

Mr. Singer: Well that is why, Mr. Chairman, I made the suggestion—well, the Premier is here; maybe he will allow it to happen—that this whole matter go before the legal and administrative committee so we can get all three departments together, all three ministers together, all three sets of civil servants together, so we can really find out what is going on. Because it is not enough to have the minister stand up and say that it is very fair but he cannot tell us why because he does not know.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member must be very dense. I have told him the reasons why, and I would also say that as far as we are concerned—and the Minister of Public Works told me this again—their books are open and they would be pleased to meet with the member any time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of dealing with the ministers one at a time. This is a joint government effort.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Bring your friends.

Mr. Singer: The only way we are going to get down to the bottom of it is to bring them all together at the same time, face to face, so that we can get a concrete answer to a concrete question.

Now the minister cannot tell me whether there was any written evaluation, either independent or from within the department, where a competent person says: "In my opinion—and I have had lots of experience in evaluating land—this land is worth X dollars." That is number one.

Number two: I have asked the minister—and has not answered me at all—how much land The Department of Public Works was instructed to purchase or to try to purchase. There was 1,070 acres and for some reason he ended up with 505.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I indicated that in my statement—that the amount was 1,070 acres.

Mr. Singer: That is right. Now, were they instructed to buy 1,070 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Then, why did the minister buy only 500?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I also told the member yesterday that we have two other areas under consideration. Does he not listen when we speak?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Not too often.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the minister instructed The Department of Works to buy on his department's behalf 1,070 acres and it came back with 505, then obviously it was not carrying out his instructions.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, yes, they are. They have two others under consideration.

Mr. Singer: Then, what were the minister's instructions? Has he got the written minute of his instructions so we can see them, because I, frankly, cannot understand what he is trying to say. If he tells his agent to go and buy 1,000 acres and he comes back with 500, he has not done what the minister has told him. How many acres did the minister tell him to buy?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Je leur ai dit, Monsieur le Président, d'acheter un certain montant d'acres.

Mr. Singer: English translation, please.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Singer: I am not quite finished yet. All right, if he wants to get it, he can get in. We will be back to it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I understand and, of course, we accept the statement of the minister that there has been no final approval given to any plan of subdivision control on the remaining acreage held by Caledon Mountain Estates Limited. I understand that acreage, on the calculations so far as we could make, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of another 500 acres. I understand also from the minister's statement yesterday that of the 500 acres, some 200 acres were on the east side of the rim and the 300 acres were in the valley.

Now having regard to the fact that the minister stated that there is no final approval for subdivision in the remaining acreage, is it now the intention, or are negotiations under way through the Parks Integration Board, to acquire the remaining lands held in that area by Caledon Mountain Estates Limited?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, there are two other areas that we have asked Public Works to acquire and they are negotiating.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is it part of the remaining estate's property, of Caledon Mountain Estates, that is under negotiation for purchase?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The two areas under consideration are not owned by Caledon Estates. They are in the area but outside of it.

Mr. J. Renwick: If, as I understand it, the remaining property of Caledon Estates Limited lies within the 55,000 acres to be acquired completely by the government, why is the minister not then engaged in acquiring the remaining property from that company?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Some of the land—the member keeps referring to the Gertler report. As much as we think that Mr. Gertler is a very able and very knowledgeable person, we have purchased land that is not recommended in the Gertler report that we thought had high priority. So we are not bound, as I indicated earlier, by everything that he says. It is a guideline.

Mr. Singer: The minister is bound by what he tells The Department of Public Works.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand it, if the minister says he is not bound by the Gertler report. I think we all understand that. All I am asking is, does the property that remains in the hands of Caledon Mountain Estates lie within the area recommended by the Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Only in part.

Mr. J. Renwick: Only in part?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, in part.

Mr. J. Renwick: So there is a portion of what remains that does not lie within the area recommended by the Gertler report. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then, would the minister let me deal with the question of the negotiation procedure that he followed? I understand there was no direct contact between officials of his department and Caledon Mountain Estates Limited. The minister said so.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes; that is right. We negotiate directly, Public Works with Caledon Estates people.

Mr. J. Renwick: Right. Public Works negotiates on direction from the Parks Integration Board and the minister is the chairman of the Parks Integration Board. All right, now, from the time that the instructions were given by the Parks Integration Board to acquire

this property from Caledon Mountain Estates, I assume there was a reasonable amount of information exchanged by Public Works about the course of their negotiations with the Parks Integration Board and the minister would be knowledgeable about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes; these matters come to our attention on the Parks Integration Board. We instruct Public Works and then they report back to us on the results of their negotiations. This goes back and forth, it is the normal procedure.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is it not correct that The Department of Public Works does not in fact, in the final instance, make an offer for the property unless the price they are going to offer for it has been approved by the Parks Integration Board of which the minister is the chairman?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We instruct Public Works to negotiate at a price that can be acceptable—a recommended price. Public Works, in their negotiations, as I said earlier, and I would like to repeat, they are experts in this field and they assess the land in the adjacent areas. Sometimes they hire independent assessors depending on circumstances, and in this case here, I would like to repeat again we feel this was a fair price.

Mr. J. Renwick: I want to use this as an instance to find out exactly what the responsibility is between the minister as chairman of the Parks Integration Board, and that board and The Department of Public Works. I would like to know whether or not The Department of Public Works came back to the Parks Integration Board and said, "We can get this land for this price, this is what we propose to offer" and if this minister as chairman of the Parks Integration Board, then approved of the offer which was made.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, we approved.

Mr. J. Renwick: And The Department of Public Works would not on its own initiative have done anything contrary to the decision of the Parks Integration Board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, everything was done with the approval of the Parks Integration Board.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right, so that the responsibility for the price which is paid for lands that are being acquired by The Department of Public Works falls on the Parks Integration Board and it falls on the minister as chairman of that board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, to a considerable degree. Then, of course there is another important body called Treasury Board which also has to give its consent. So there are many safeguards all along the road.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the Lieutenant Governor is waiting to give assent to certain bills.

Mr. J. Renwick: First I am interrupted—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, can the Lieutenant Governor not sit in his boudoir for an hour and 10 minutes till we get through this? I am tired of these interruptions.

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Lewis: What is this that every time we get into a debate the leader of the House has the prerogative to change it? Can the Lieutenant Governor not have a morning coffee while we continue the discussion?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet and I would make this statement, that I think the hon. member knows full well he can return to these estimates time and time again. I announced yesterday there was certain legislation that it was important we get through this House. The Lieutenant Governor awaits to give assent. It will take but a moment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain

bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Act, 1968.

Bill 5, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill 26, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill 36, An Act to amend The Expropriations Act, 1968-1969.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the 13th order.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(continued)

On vote 1103:

Mr. Chairman: Page 194. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to get it clear for future purposes that the basic responsibility, so far as the government is concerned, rests with the Minister of Lands and Forests as chairman of the Parks Integration Board and, in that capacity, to finally give the approval for the price which will be paid for lands being acquired by The Department of Public Works.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, some of these members are either hard of hearing or they do not want to hear.

Again, whatever we approve at Parks Integration Board is subject to a senior level—Treasury Board. They have the final say.

Mr. J. Renwick: In this particular case then, I assume the Treasury Board approved the recommendation of the Parks Integration Board for the price which would be paid. Therefore, the responsibility for the purchase is shared by the whole of the government.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, it was a fair price.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is always a matter of judgement. This may be a fair price this year. It certainly would not have been a fair price two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I have said this on many occasions. You can go to many parts of this province and especially in southern Ontario where land has escalated considerably in the last few years. Again, you can buy land today in many areas and in two or three years from now the price will have risen considerably. This is not unusual—that land escalates in price.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would certainly recommend to the government and certainly recommend to this minister that he propose to the government that they get, if necessary, some backup legislation, giving authority to the Parks Integration Board or to The Department of Public Works, if it is necessary, to acquire, pursuant to The Expropriations Act, land which is necessary for the preservation of the escarpment.

I make that recommendation that it not be used continuously for that purpose, but be used when it is necessary to do so. Because, Mr. Chairman, the minister will be well aware of the fact that once notice of intention to expropriate was given for any part of the lands the government felt should be acquired, it would stabilize the price of land in the area and would do a great deal to de-escalate the continuing escalation in the price of land which will take place over the next few years.

Would the minister give consideration to taking that kind of authority, if he does not already have it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I certainly would be pleased to consider it, but I would also like to say to the hon. member that expropriation is not always the final answer, in the sense that often expropriation prices are sometimes higher than prices that could have been negotiated.

Mr. J. Renwick: That may well be. All I am simply saying is that in the techniques

and methods which the government has at its disposal for acquiring the property on the Niagara Escarpment, it should not eliminate from its arsenal of possible methods the use of the expropriation procedure.

If the government, in fact, gives it the authority that we were led to believe was being given to it when the original statement was made about that priority, and if that is the case, there is an overriding public interest which would justify the wise and discriminate use of the expropriation procedure to acquire that property.

That, basically, is what we are talking about and what we are—our basic disappointment in the government comes because we believed that what was said in March, 1967, following upon the Throne Speech of the member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) as he was that spring, about the Niagara Escarpment—we believed that the government meant to say, "For the purpose of the public of the Province of Ontario we are going to acquire a substantial part of the Niagara Escarpment and we are going to maintain it as a top priority."

Now that is in the public interest. That public interest, in my judgement, is far superior to the public interest which is used by other bodies to which this government has granted authority to expropriate. That public interest can override many other instances on which the expropriation procedure is used.

I emphasize that what I am saying is not a blanket use of The Expropriations Act but a wise and selective use of the powers contained in that Act for the purpose of protecting the public interest and the Niagara Escarpment. Mr. Chairman, the minister gets irritated by the constant questions but the reason for the questions is the downgrading by this government of the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is the whole point of this debate.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, you are wrong. You are wrong.

Mr. Lewis: I am almost sorry we have been side-tracked into this Caledon estate stuff.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You did it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying, and I am saying this to the Minister of Lands and Forests—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am listening.

Mr. J. Renwick: —will he read the statement made by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in 1966 with respect to the design for regional development in the Province of Ontario which, if my memory serves me correctly, was first announced at the Inn on the Park, then repeated in this Legislature where, at that point, he indicated that a top priority of his government was regional development and where he named the ministers that would form the cabinet committee on regional development. I would ask the minister then to read a year later, in March, 1967—the minister nods and says he has read it and re-read it, I assume—the statement of the then Prime Minister where he said that this was precisely the kind of reason why there was a cabinet committee on regional development, that it had top priority, that a study was being instituted and that the matter was then going to be dealt with as top priority policy of the government.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying that if you relate the context of those remarks and the policy enunciated by the government prior to the last election about the Niagara Escarpment and you look now today—and I am quite prepared to concede that the Gertler report is a first-class guide, but that the government is naturally not bound by every word that is in it, but it is a first-class guide, and gives a very clear indication of what should be accomplished in the Niagara Escarpment—then we simply say that the performance of the policy enunciated in 1967 about the priority of the acquisition of the Niagara Escarpment pales beyond measure. It just really does not exist.

I want now to try to see if we cannot clarify some of the figures. I realize it is difficult to get the kind of information that will allow the comparisons, but the minister is familiar with the Gertler report, and perhaps he will bear with me. I agree with the Prime Minister as he then was when he tabled the report in 1969 and indicated that the government was not going to be totally bound. We have never ever said that it was to be totally bound, but that if it is not going to be bound in the face of such an excellent report, it has got to have very good reasons for it, because it is a superb report.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Has the member read what the former Prime Minister said in 1967? Also what he said in October, 1969?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes I have read it, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He said:

> I should make it clear that its release does not imply government acceptance of the recommendations that decisions regarding implementation will have to be taken in the light of a wide range of factors and in concert with considerations of other programme priorities of the province.

Much as we place Niagara Escarpment as a very high priority, may I remind the hon. member that there are other parts of this province that also feel that they command a high priority, and as a responsible government we have an obligation to supply beachland and various areas—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Where?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and parkland, and not only that.

Mr. J. Renwick: The minister is not doing very much about that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are doing this.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): It is Ontario.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, all I am simply saying is that 1969 was midway between the elections. Therefore, the procedure of downgrading the acquisition of the Niagara Escarpment set in about that time, because you must remember when the then Prime Minister—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. J. Renwick: —tabled that report, the government had already had it in its hands for one year, for a whole one-year period.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Forty per cent of our budget last year was on the Niagara Escarpment. Forty per cent.

Mr. J. Renwick: Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is his department.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister has given $600,000. That is just great.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And that happens to be 75 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. So we have got $1.5 million budgeted this year and the government has to buy $18 million worth of lands.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Do not forget the land bank.

Mr. Lewis: The land bank, yes.

An hon. member: We have heard that before somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the term "arsenal" fit with the medal you are wearing?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes. We are trying to maintain the peace.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member used the word "arsenal."

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Relating to his powers?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes. Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to get back to the figures. I would like to relate the figures which the minister has given to the divisions made in the Gertler report. The Gertler report indicates—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The Premier has tried every diversionary tactic available. He has run out.

Mr. J. Renwick: —in the first priority, that is to be acquired within a period of four years, in the Niagara Peninsula 7,830 acres, and then goes through each of the six areas and comes up with 41,150 acres. Would the minister break this down for us and indicate to what extent they have acquired land in those regions in reference to the figures set by the Gertler report? For example, as I understand it, the Mad River and the Devil's Glen property is under the heading Hockley Valley-Devil's Glen. The Cape Chin area I assume is in the Georgian Bay area, and the Lion's Head, of course, I think is up in the Bruce Peninsula. Could he relate these acquisitions within those six divisions? The six divisions are Niagara Peninsula, Dundas Valley, Mount Nemo, Caledon Mountain, Hockley Valley-Devil's Glen, Georgian Bay and Bruce Peninsula.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to make this information available to the member, but not today.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is it possible to just give us the total figures? What is the total acreage that you have acquired in the whole of the Niagara Escarpment at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I said this yesterday, the total acreage acquired for The Department of Lands and Forests was 16,319 acres—

Mr. J. Renwick: No. No.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —by The Department of Energy and Resources Management, specifically the conservation authority's 4,125 acres, making a total of 20,444 acres.

Mr. J. Renwick: That has been acquired since the tabling of the Gertler report?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Some yes and some prior.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. J. Renwick: How much has been acquired since the tabling of the Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I gave that this morning to the member for Scarborough West. I will repeat it if you want.

Mr. J. Renwick: Please repeat it; I would want.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: From June, 1968, to October, 1969, 8,908 acres; from October, 1969, to the present time 3,122 acres.

Mr. J. Renwick: So we are talking about roughly 12,000 acres that have been acquired since the tabling of the Gertler report. The recommendation—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Plus, do not forget the 4,000—

Mr. Lewis: Plus 4,000 since the tabling of the report from the conservation authorities.

Mr. J. Renwick: So there is a total of 16,000 acres. In the first priority area there was to be some 41,150 acres of the total 90,000 to be acquired and the estimated expenditure presumably, if you had followed the Gertler report, would have been in the neighbourhood of $13 million or $14 million for those lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This was a guideline. We are not bound by the Gertler report.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand that—that the implication of the foregoing programme will require the following average annual expenditure, first priority period—$6,296,000 for four years.

The minister talks about a two-year period. I assume therefore we are talking about something between $12 and $15 million. How much has the minister's department spent during that period of what was projected to be some $12 to $15 million required to go on with the scheme?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will get that information for the member, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is it $2 million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About $2.5 million.

Mr. J. Renwick: About $2.5 million.

Mr. Lewis: That does not even correspond with the figures the minister gave us a few minutes ago, for heaven's sake.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls has the floor.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this argument with interest. It takes me back to a debate of this House when the hon. Wilfrid Spooner was the Minister of Lands and Forests and we had a man here from Wentworth, I believe, at that time, R. C. Edwards, who was debating this very question of the escarpment.

He was then speaking to the hon. Mr. Frost, the Prime Minister of that day, and I am going to quote a portion of the Prime Minister's remark on page 1604, of February 28, 1961; that takes us back long before the Gertler report. The Prime Minister said at that time:

> I was in Niagara Falls some time ago, and I mentioned to the people the possibility of perhaps developing a scenic road along the escarpment. As for anyone ever making an approach to me, I have no recollection of anybody coming to see me about it. I did not mention it myself; it seemed to me to be a possibility.
>
> As a matter of fact I did mention to the Niagara Parks Commission, and to the hon. Minister of Labour, the possibility of looking at existing roads overlooking the plains and on top of the escarpment, to see if there were any way of connecting up existing roads in that area.
>
> Now, as I say, I mentioned this in Niagara Falls several months ago, perhaps a year ago, but I have not the faintest recollection of any deputation coming to me.

Because I was acquainted with the escarpment at that time I too got into the debate, and I am going to read a small portion from

that same day, February 28, 1961, from my comments, in which I made reference to a brochure:

> This particular book was completed in 1958, and it was submitted to this government for consideration with many fine pictures and a lovely big map showing the escarpment from Hamilton and into Lincoln country—a green belt from Hamilton to Queenston.

So it appears that the hon. Prime Minister for that day, a man I had a lot of respect for, prior to his statement of that day in 1961 did have some knowledge of a delegation he said he did not recollect; it did not prove that the brochure did not get to him.

I have before me a brochure indicating the representation of Wentworth, Lincoln and Welland counties, the tri-county committee. The chairman of that committee at that time was the mayor of Hamilton, Lloyd D. Jackson, the very prominent mayor of Hamilton, you will recall—the Hamilton Suburban Roads Commission was represented by a man by the name of Fletcher and a man by the name of Green, a commissioner; the county of Wentworth, by gentlemen by the names of Sams, Thomas and Bell—as a matter of fact, Joseph R. Sams was a warden of that county at that time; the county of Lincoln had Reeve Cole, Delby J. Bucknall, who is now mayor in that area, Walter E. Theobald, the mayor of Niagara-on-the-Lake presently, and Edward Sokolowski, the engineer for the county at that time, who has since passed away.

The county of Welland was represented on that committee by one Paul Pietz, who is presently on the Welland city council; Melvin L. Swart, who is very active politically in that area at the present day; Francis Goldring, who is the chairman of the conservation committee of that area; I too was a member representing the county of Welland; and Wilfred Smith, the engineer of the county of Welland.

This brochure was made up exceptionally well and I made reference to the fact in that day—back in 1961 mind you, this brochure was made up in 1958—a committee of prominent people of that area wanted the escarpment to be bought up at that time and could have been bought up a lot cheaper. The committee at that time had movies taken by an amateur showing the route it would take. It was so well prepared that they felt at that time they should submit this to the government. I will read a portion of the committee's approach to the Prime Minister, the hon. Mr. Frost and his cabinet.

> The tri-county committee beseeches the Hon. Leslie Frost, Premier of the Province of Ontario, and his cabinet respectfully yet urgently to immediately initiate the necessary action to establish as a provincial park the lands outlined on the appended map to be administered and developed by The Department of Lands and Forests or such department or commission as the hon. Leslie Frost and his cabinet may in their wisdom deem advisable.

The brochure was not only well printed but in each area of importance they have a coloured picture and they describe the situation very well. I will read some of the portions of this brochure to bring the record up to date.

This has been a project I became very interested in since I sat on the parks commission from 1951 to 1956 in Niagara Falls. I felt parks and the escarpment should be developed, whether it was by Mr. Frost, the Premier of that day or whether it was the committee of the three counties. They were all looking at the same thing, hoping that the government of that day would purchase these lands. Here it is now, from 1958 to 1971.

The reason I put this on the record is because I am going to have some questions of the minister to find out how much of the lands were acquired along the escarpment from Queenston to Hamilton.

It says here:

> The Niagara Escarpment . . . a symphony of rugged grandeur, broad vistas, historic lore, primitive beauty.
>
> The Niagara Escarpment from the Niagara River to the city of Hamilton. Towers 300 feet of rugged grandeur flanked by broad vistas of river and lake, peaceful farmlands and modern industry. Is steeped in history—Queenston Heights and General Brock, Beaver Dam and Laura Secord, Stoney Creek and Billy Greene. Contains wooded dells and rocky ravines—in distance a few moments removed from immediate hurrying highways in quietude and seclusion a century removed and largely unknown.

"Rugged and wooded grandeur"—beautiful pictures of the escarpment—"Devil's Punchbowl"— Now, that is a historic spot on that particular route. "Fifteen-mile Creek Ravine Rockway—one of many."

There was page after page of wonderful information for this government to have taken into consideration at that time. Balls Falls Ravine—here is where the minister can boast of a lovely little park in that area. That was

purchased and opened by the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Simonett) some two years ago. That small portion was purchased; a small piece of many, many acres of land that should have been bought up long before this because the government would have obtained it at a better price.

"Twenty-mile Creek. Many feet below the top of the trees; in the foreground lies the bottom of the ravine," within sight of Lake Ontario. "The escarpment westerly from 40-mile Creek, Grimsby. Surpassed by the Laurentians and Adirondacks in extent and area; unsurpassed in beauty." "Flanked by lake and peaceful farmlands, Grimsby."

"Escarpment easterly from 40-mile Creek, Grimsby; 40-mile Creek Ravine in the foreground." Here is a lovely picture of the Niagara River below the escarpment at Queenston from Brock's Monument. "Historic and unspoiled gateway to Canada for thousands of American visitors." It goes on and on. "Brock's Monument," "Queenston Heights," "Niagara Parks Commission." St. John's—the portion of land that many of the people had been pushing to be purchased in the Eppingham Valley near Fonthill.

Mr. Haggerty: Great historic value.

Mr. Bukator: Nothing has been done about that. "Felker's Falls Ravine within the city of Hamilton, yet secluded and largely unknown." That is true. I have been there with my family when they were small children, they are all gone and married and left us, so that is how long ago that happened to be.

"Wooded dells" and "quiet trails," it says, and they are beautiful, the very thing you are talking about, from Queenston to Tobermory. After Tobermory to South Bay mouth on the Manitoulin Island.

Let me get a little more on the record so that you will know, as I said before, this particular information was submitted to this government back in 1958. I have a map before me of the green belt and I will not take much more of your time except I will read some of the reference or the legend.

Starting at Queenston to Merritton to Thorold to St. Catharines to Rockway, Balls Falls, Grimsby and Stoney Creek, Devil's Punch Bowl and Felker's Falls, and that is now within the limits of Hamilton. From Queenston to Hamilton, laid out beautifully with all the detail that is required.

Let we show you what they did. They talked about it at that time and nothing has changed except some of these lands have been purchased by land developers and the price will be exorbitant, no doubt. You will have to bypass some of these areas.

Proposed park area, proposed drive and parkway, parking, provincial highways, county roads—it gives you the legend to the whole situation—township roads, proposed trails along the way and then we talk about the acreage of parks. There should have been purchased 16,500 acres from Queenston to Hamilton; miles of park drive, 50; parking areas, they say only 15 acres and I think that is small; miles of trail, 100 miles.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party said that we have been discussing one particular problem of a major project that could have been purchased long ago. For two days I have listened about a small area that might have been a land deal by some politician and this government, but I do not buy that until we have the facts. I would like to know why this government has not moved with the information they had long before this?

I say, while we are on the subject of parks they mentioned the Mafia in this House not too long ago and, Mr. Chairman, I am not too far off the beaten path—there are 28 acres of land sitting above the falls at the moment that the parks commission should have purchased. If the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) is right and if there is a possibility of racketeers and thugs buying that lovely land along the river, I would like to be able to get the same concession from this Prime Minister as I did from Mr. Frost.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Have you been around that long?

Mr. Singer: Nearly as long as the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Bukator: When I discussed this problem in the presence of Mr. Frost he said, "Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my good, hon. friend"—you see he was good to me at that time—"from Niagara Falls and he has made some very good suggestions and as a preliminary I would be very glad to meet him, if he would come around with those maps and the information and have a chat with me."

I said at that time that it was remarkable he should invite me when the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) was a member on that side of the House, he was going to speak to me or speak to both of us. We met in the Prime Minister's office and we

did talk about this very project. Since that time, only last year, the parks commission purchased 144 acres of land which they should have bought years ago.

Now there is one small portion, and I appeal directly to this Prime Minister, of 28 acres adjoining the parks land, the portion that they purchased for parking purposes, that may get in the hands of the wrong people. I would recommend or suggest to the Prime Minister, if I may, that he get the parks commission to immediately expropriate these lands and if there happens to be such a thing as racketeers and thugs and Mafia looking at that land, let the park own it and complete the whole circuit. I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Prime Minister, this should be purchased and purchased immediately before we have another something to wrestle with that we will not be too pleased with in that area.

Getting back to the Minister of Lands and Forests, how much of the land between Queenston, except Balls Falls that I am acquainted with, has been purchased over the period of these many years? I named the different areas. You may take this as notice; I would like it on paper. I would like to know how much progress has been made, because Lord knows there are some of us here who have been talking about this since way back before 1958. We helped compile that report and get this information before this government, before it was submitted in 1958. You have been dragging your feet. It is about time we had some results while we can still get some of the land before they build on it. That escarpment is beautiful all along Lake Ontario. It is far enough removed from the Queen Elizabeth Way to still have wilderness in places where your children and their children can come and enjoy the beauty of nature.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to make that information available to the member. It is a very scenic area and we have purchased 600 acres.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! May I just interrupt at this point at the indulgence of the House while the hon. Minister of Mines introduces a group in the gallery.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a very distinguished group of young northerners in the Speaker's gallery. I know that all the hon. members will want to recognize and welcome them. They are the intermediate and junior northwestern Ontario St. John Ambulance district champions from Dryden, Ontario, some 1,200 miles away. This group are defending their provincial title that they have captured on four previous occasions. Their trip is sponsored totally at their own expense and I know that all the members will join me in extending to them a very warm welcome and every success tomorrow in defending their title.

Mr. Chairman: A request of the hon. minister, did you—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if that question has been answered.

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure. Has the minister completed his answer? I interrupted him.

Mr. Lewis: He said 600 acres, I think.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South was on his feet. He is still on 1103.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to pursue the matter of the announcement made in 1968 of the provincial park land west of Point Abino. Now, the minister—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I do not wish to impede this, Mr. Chairman, but we quite specifically at the opening of this 1103 set out the escarpment area's discussions, reserving parks for the third vote.

Mr. Chairman: It has been pretty mixed, I think we will have to admit, because there was a lot of overlapping.

Mr. Lewis: All right, fine. It is up to you.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I could continue here. This deals with the expropriation plan of parts of lots 34 and 35, broken front concession on Lake Erie and part of the water line in front of lot 35. This was filed, I believe, in 1969. The owners in the area received notice of expropriation and to this day nothing has been done. I know that The Department of Public Works have taken option on certain lands within the area of this proposed park and I found out that they have dropped those options. We are coming back to the discussion today dealing with the Niagara Escarpment—that this land will increase in value. There is no doubt that speculators are in the forefront in this particular park site right at the present time and it is possible that the costs no doubt will triple.

There was also an announcement made in January, 1971, on the proposal of purchasing

mini-parks in the former township of Bertie. I think it consisted of some 27 properties on Lake Erie. Perhaps I could say the value of this property would run approximately to $2 million. Some of these homes cannot be purchased for, perhaps, less than $150,000 and some could go as high as $250,000. In talking to Mr. Bentley, I believe it is, from The Department of Public Works, informing me about the proposed purchase of these two sites on Lake Erie, he told that the cost to purchase this park of 300 acres at Point Abino was too costly. I said, "Too costly? Impossible. Not when you are going out and talking about buying this land, beautiful homes on Lake Erie, with no parking facilities, at a price of approximately $2 million."

That parcel of land lying west of Point Abino, Mr. Chairman, can no doubt be bought for a reasonable price. I believe the offer at one time was about $135,000, and the 100-acre farm that is involved in this purchase could not be bought for less than $75,000 to $80,000 at the present time. There is the question of 1,700 feet of lakefront property for a sum, I guess, of about $60,000 unless there is no value placed on this property. I would have to question your appraisals on the purchase of this land.

I am sure the minister is aware that at Lake Erie last year there was an increase of two million persons who visited the present provincial parks at Lake Erie. Dr. Jackson has come out with a report, a study, completed in 1969 dealing with the Niagara Peninsula, the economic aspects of the east Lake Erie shoreline. He covered it in quite some detail, and one of the things that he suggested was the government take immediate action to purchase that park site.

Now, Mr. Minister, this is going on for three years and nothing has been done. As I mentioned before, land speculators are in the area right now taking up options that this department has dropped. I would like to know when you are going to get on to the business of purchasing this park site. It is another matter, as the hon. member for Niagara Falls said—you get these reports; they can hang fire, in your office, or in the wastepaper basket for some 10 years and you do nothing.

My colleague from Welland comes out and makes an announcement in 1968 and says The Department of Lands and Forests are going to purchase this for a park site. You have done nothing. Just what stage are you at in the final purchasing stages of this property, if any?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I know the hon. member is very interested in the park plan in that area. With reference to the proposed park near Point Abino, this matter is still under active consideration by our department and the Ontario Department of Public Works. I believe about two years ago we had sent notices of expropriation, and the negotiations are being carried on. The hon. member lives across the street from that area so he is familiar with the many problems involved. There are private cottages.

Mr. Haggerty: Not too many. Two, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There are a certain number, somewhere between 15 to 20. There is a question of access also.

Mr. Haggerty: The minister is not taking in that land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: So when we are dealing with private areas, residential areas. I, for one, also feel that I am not too happy it has taken such along time, but we are still pursuing it and we still intend to develop that as a provincial park.

The member for Welland South referred to the mini-parks. This is another area that we are considering establishing, especially in those areas where there is a 66 foot road allowance leading to the beaches. The areas adjacent to the road allowance lend themselves to being used as parks, and we are concentrating on those areas that have no buildings.

Mr. Haggerty: I am afraid that on these proposed mini-parks, there are nothing but homes—beautiful homes—and there are no parking facilities.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have selected eight or nine areas and out of that number, quite true, there are some that have some very—

Mr. Haggerty: Elaborate homes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: High-priced cottages. Some are permanent residences. However, we decided not to concentrate on those areas, where there are virtually no buildings. The hon. member indicated one to me, and we are pursuing this.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes; I am glad that the minister is doing that. I will not mention the name since I am afraid there are land speculators who will get into it, but it is available, and it could be tied in with this other 300 acres of land. As far as the 300 acres

of land is concerned, there is a road allowance, that leads directly to the beach. It is on an open-road allowance, but it is there, and it can be used. But is the minister going to continue with it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Haggerty: Could he tell me any definite date when he feels that this will be settled?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think the hon. member will appreciate that it is very difficult to give a definite date when one is negotiating. One cannot give a definite date, but we realize the importance of having parkland in that area and we are proceeding in all due haste.

Mr. Lewis: I do not want to take more than a very few minutes to deal with three points, by way of summary, as some of the new information has emerged: Firstly, with Caledon Mountain Estates and similar land purchases; secondly, with the actual total land acquisition on the escarpment, and, thirdly, a matter which in my own eccentric way is to me personal and, that is, that I was deliberately misled by the Prime Minister in this House about the second Gertler report and that I am really a little mystified by that. I will deal with it in a moment but, I guess, perhaps it simply demonstrates again the basic anxiety that the government feels about the escarpment in order for the Premier himself to have to resort to such behaviour.

Mr. Chairman, first, about Caledon Mountain Estates. Let me try to put it into perspective, if I could, with the Minister of Lands and Forests. I first asked a question about Caledon Mountain Estates, I guess it was back in the middle of April. The minister was kind enough to offer a reply very shortly thereafter which corroborated the essential contention made, that a profit of over $300,000 had been secured and enjoyed by those who had purchased the land in the summer months of 1969.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That a $300,000 profit had been made is the member's assessment, but that is not the accurate figure.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): How much profit has been made?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A very small profit when the shares were selling for $5.50 and today they are selling for $3.40.

Mr. Lewis: What has the value of the market got to do with it? They purchased the land for $726 an acre in 1969; they sold it to the department for $1,450 an acre on February 8, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member is not talking about the same land.

Mr. Lewis: That is a profit of over $300,000—yes, we are talking about the exact similar parcel. The figures were given by the Minister of Public Works last night.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: And they paid $1,000 an acre for it.

Mr. Lewis: They paid $1,000 an acre only for 145 acres. Will the minister kindly give accurate information on occasion? They paid $440 for 44 acres. They paid $700 for 218 acres. They paid $1,000 for 145 acres, and they paid $763 for 98 acres. And that was the equivalent of the parcel which the minister subsequently bought for $1450 an acre in February, 1971.

Those facts, Mr. Chairman, are indisputable, and I am not particularly interested in a raging debate about them. They were corroborated by the minister almost a month ago in Hansard, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) last night in committee and again today. So this business that 145 of the 500 were at $1,000 an acre suddenly seems to condone or excuse or explain the entire transaction.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, as the minister saw, I dealt rather carefully with the political implications of the sale. I tell him frankly I am always uncomfortable in those areas personally because the absence of decisive evidence was apparent and it is a little difficult at times to make assumptions in the absence of any such evidence.

Sure, the board of Caledon Mountain Estates is graced by a number of amiable Tories from Senator Willis to people who style themselves Tories in the Canadian Who's Who. That is fine.

Do you want to know what my own impression is, Mr. Chairman? The government would have negotiated exactly the same deal whether there were Liberals on the board or people who were apolitical on the board. The government was interested in making the transaction, it was easier to make because it saw its friends across the table from it, but it went ahead and did it anyway.

I am not at all sure in my own mind that much can be made of the particular assumption that because the Tories were on the board it was easier to conduct—

Mr. Sargent: It does not hurt though.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I tell the member this government deals that way with private entrepreneurs of whatever stripe. It may indeed one day be dealing with those vast corporate holdings on which New Democrats predominate on the board. Some of them are familiar with it and it may try to deal in similar fashion, but it will find it a little more awkward.

Mr. Chairman, that being the case, we come to the second aspect of this which now this morning, I find rather interesting. That is the revelation that no subdivision approval has been granted to this company so that trade-off of which we spoke yesterday may not be true today.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There was no trade-off.

Mr. Lewis: Just a moment. But the Minister of Municipal Affairs now informs us that there are at least two subdivision approvals pending in the Caledon area, two applications are before him. There are two applications before the minister from the Caledon area, am I wrong in asserting that?

Hon. D. H. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There are applications, yes.

Mr. Lewis: All right. There are applications before the minister for the Caledon area and I assume that the fruits of the transaction have yet perhaps to be realized. Maybe because of this debate, they will never be realized.

I suppose the lots which are being sold from between $22,000 and $28,000 an acre in land not yet approved for subdivision are being sold—what? With the condition of subsequent approval? Is that the way the lots are sold? The minister does not know?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, they cannot be sold.

Mr. Lewis: What does he mean: "They cannot be sold"? The Minister of Lands and Forests said that lots are being sold by Caledon Mountain Estates for $22,000 to $28,000 for a three to eight-acre lot, if memory serves me.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Also at a high price.

Mr. Lewis: And those were at a high price.

Mr. Singer: These must be on a plan of subdivision.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I said they were sold in that adjacent area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the adjacent area, lots are being sold, and also the average price per acre is over $2,000.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am going to ask the indulgence of the minister and the Chair. Would the minister revert to his statement, which he read at the beginning of this vote, and just read us those couple of paragraphs again so I can get it straight in my own mind as to why he introduced it at all, if it was not Caledon Mountain Estates?

Mr. Singer: That is the way I heard it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I said:

> They also learned at that time that Caledon Mountain Estates was selling subdivided building lots at prices of from $22,000 to $28,000 for each parcel from three to eight acres.

Mr. Lewis. Right. So my hearing is not that bad, I take it?

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Lewis: I am still able to hear what you said an hour ago even if it is difficult for the minister to recollect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that being the case, I assume that those purchases are being made on a condition of subsequent subdivision approval? I cannot imagine what else possesses affluent individual citizens who want to build mansions. Yesterday they were building mansions on subdivisions that have yet to be approved today. The minister's imagination is even more hyperbolic than my own.

Mr. Chairman, if they are bought on condition of subdivision approval then I suppose that Caledon Mountain Estates is waiting breathlessly for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to render his decision. Well, what conclusion can one come to? Is the Minister of Municipal Affairs prepared to say at this time, in the midst of this debate, whether or not he will approve that subdivision submission?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They have to get normal approval. Those applications have to be circulated among the people in the various

branches or agencies. They have to get those kinds of approval, then be referred to the municipality. They get the draft approval and then referred to the municipality—

Mr. Lewis: Who does it go to when you say it has to be submitted to all these various—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Lands and Forests, a number of departments—

Mr. Lewis: Lands and Forests? Oh?

Hon. Mr. Bales: A number of departments.

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Highways.

Mr. Lewis: Then you apparently do have something to do with subdivision approval this morning although you did not have yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, I said to the hon. member last night that our department is involved when it comes to subdivision approval. I do not believe our department is involved on the islands north of Tobermory.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Have you looked at the Caledon Mountain Estates' request for subdivision approval? Have you yourself decided what your department's position is on that? We are in your estimates. What position has your department taken on the submission for subdivision approval from Caledon Mountain Estates?

Mr. Singer: A very good question.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, these matters are looked into by our officials and I have the utmost confidence in them.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Are they being looked into now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like the member to give me a specified instance where something has been done that he feels should not have been approved.

Mr. Lewis: I am asking the minister a question that has obviously been before him. How could it be otherwise? The minister purchased 505 acres on instruction from his department.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: He knew of the rest of their holdings. He knew what they were up to. He knew that they were selling lots. He knew, therefore, that they had a subdivision approval before him. It came through his department. What was his department's decision? What did he say, as a minister, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs about Caledon Mountain Estates' request?

Surely there is someone among this triumvirate in front of the minister who knows. It just did not disappear. It was in his department as recently as February 8, 1971. He approved the sale so it has been in discussion within living memory, Mr. Minister. What was his view of the transaction, the proposed transaction?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not prepared to give my views.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not prepared to say, is that it? He is waiting for what it was that he did say.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, I would like to repeat what I said earlier, Mr. Chairman; personally, I am not involved in this matter of approval of subdivision. This is mainly a matter that comes under the administration of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the approval of subdivisions. Should there be a matter—

Mr. Stokes: The minister just said he consults with cabinet colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —that affects our department, yes, we would be consulted.

Mr. Young: The minister would be consulted on subdivision plans?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have not been consulted on this matter.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has not been consulted on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not personally.

Mr. Lewis: All right. We can just go back and forth forever. Only the Premier is now sitting between you to arbitrate the confusion.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Lewis: That is why he is there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect if the Minister of Lands and Forests had to sit on all the applications for subdivisions, there are not enough hours in a day and there would be no other work done.

Mr. Pitman: The minister did sit.

Mr. Lewis: Let us not pretend that this is just one of his normal run-of-the-mill, everyday applications for subdivision. He is engaged with these people in a major public purchase and they want subdivision control. They want subdivision rights on the remainder of land which falls within the priority area of the Gertler report. This is not the minister's average, every-day-in-the-Legislature subdivision control application or request. This is something that the minister must surely know of.

I will ask him a different way. If it did not come to his notice personally it must surely have come to his department. What did his departmental officials recommend to the Minister of Municipal Affairs about this subdivision request?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Chairman, this matter was not brought to my attention personally.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know who these gentlemen are in front of you. They are doubtless estimable. They know what is going on in the minister's department around acquisition of escarpment lands or they would not be handing the minister notes. Would the minister kindly find out and tell the House what was recommended to The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Mr. Singer: The minister will not find out. What does shaking his head mean?

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister saying? Is he saying that he is simply not going to inform the House?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am just telling you what I have said three times. I will repeat it four times—that I was not personally involved and I am not personally involved in these applications of subdivisions.

Mr. Singer: How can the minister not be involved?

Mr. Young: It is his department.

Mr. Lewis: That may be a critical weakness on the part of the minister, that major areas of potential public concern pass by without his ever even seeing them. This is a critical matter. This is a serious matter because if Lands and Forests had, in fact, indicated its approval of the request for subdivision on the part of Caledon Mountain Estates it says rather more than some would wish to believe about the nature of the original transaction.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I indicated this morning there has been no approval given for subdivisions.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, but there is an application.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Certainly, there are 5,000 applications.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are many applications, hundreds of applications. A further complicating factor is that they have been held up because of the Toornto-centred region plan.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate the fact that that is all settled.

Mr. Singer: Are not the approvals issued from the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, it is.

Mr Lewis: I am sure it is. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how the Minister of Lands and Forests—

Mr. Singer: I will bet The Department of Lands and Forests has its initials on it, too, as it now sits in the minister's office.

Mr. Lewis: It probably sits on the minister's desk—

Mr. Singer: Sure. With Lands and Forests' approval.

Mr. Lewis: —with a little sign on it saying: "Do not touch. Inflammatory material," to be discussed after the estimates of Lands and Forests have been completed.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You and the hon. member for Downsview should go to Hollywood.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I know you want to get us contracts in Hollywood, etc. You have been pretty well pulled together overnight, have you not, screwing your courage to the sticking posts a little more vigorously this morning than yesterday. Someone must have come to the minister and said "Come on, fight back." He is not doing badly, not doing badly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know you are disappointed, are you not?

Mr. Lewis: But you are still not providing any answers, although more voluble defences.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answers are there.

Mr. Chairman: The whole debate is becoming repetitious.

Mr. Lewis: No, the debate on the vote is not becoming repetitious!

Mr. Chairman: It is extremely repetitious.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, with respect, that is your opinion, sir. We have sat here since yesterday on this question.

Mr. Chairman: And I am telling you you are going to be stuck with my opinion. I am going to rule on it.

Mr. Lewis: You may live with your opinion with pleasure.

Mr. Chairman: It is against the rules.

Mr. Lewis: Every time we ask a question we get a different answer. How can it be repetitious?

Mr. Chairman: It is very repetitious.

Mr. Lewis: Now the minister refuses to tell us whether or not the subdivision request has been passed by his department.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I did not refuse, Mr. Chairman. I said it was not brought to my attention.

Mr. Lewis: Then I very strongly urge the minister at 1 o'clock—he has got the weekend—to pull those civil servants in before him this afternoon—and find out what has happened to that subdivision request, and exactly what recommendation went to the Minister of Municipal Affairs from his department.

Mr. Singer: Has the minister never heard of the theory of responsibility—cabinet responsibility?

Mr. Lewis: Then the minister can come to us on Monday and tell us what has been decided. Mr. Chairman, the essential point we have tried to make throughout—and I know that it must, because of its news value, necessarily get muddied by questions of conflict of interest and favouritism, and so on—is that by the minister's neglect and by his delay he is paying vastly inflated amounts of money for lands which he knew he should have purchased three years ago. It is public money which he is squandering. That is the basic principle of all this, when we cut through the individual stuff.

Look at what came out this morning. The one little piece of information that came from Public Works this morning involved a 100-acre subparcel of land at Meaford, purchased by The Department of Public Works very recently for $5,000 and purchased by the vendor in 1966 for $1,000. As we get the corresponding figures for the most recent transaction of all those other parcels, exclusive of Caledon, to which the minister has referred in the House and by press release, we are going to find that in almost every instance we are paying between 50 per cent and 150 per cent more than we should have paid had the transactions, and the acquisition of land taken place when government knew it should have taken place and, in most cases, it had the information of the Gertler report in front of it.

That is the basic proposition we are putting to the government as a party, the basic reason for raising the entire escarpment area. It is a fact, by thinking of it this way, that the minister intends to honour most of the Gertler report, and there have been suggestions over there that he will, even though he disagrees with parts of it. Gertler asked the government to spend $31.5 million in 1968 over four years for 90,000 acres of A and B category lands, and the purchases the government has so far made show 100 per cent increase or better because of the delay.

Does the minister realize what he is talking about? He is talking about a government expenditure of more than $30 million of public funds because of land speculation and appreciation over which he could have exercised control and did not exercise control. Maybe he can throw away over $30 million of the public purse, simply because of delay and procrastination and neglect, but there are others in this House who do not abide it. That is what he as a minister has officiated over and is presently doing.

Let me ask the minister a question because I want him to document it by Monday. I ask from material gathered—I am not able to give the source, but the specifics will indicate its authenticity—some information on Kolapore Park, again in the escarpment area. The minister announced that the core of the park, some 840 acres had been acquired in this recent annual acquisition, but the other 7,000 acres, or nearly 7,000 acres, which Gertler recommended should be acquired have not yet been purchased.

Let me tell the minister something and ask him to corroborate or, indeed, to refute these simple propositions.

1. Park lot 7, concession 10, Collingwood township, 50 acres, offered by a realtor to Public Works in the winter of 1970-1971 for $5,500 and turned down. Department of

Public Works is now dealing with the new owner, offering at least $7,500.

2. Park lot 7, concession 12, owned by X—I will not read his name into the record—a large scenic outcrop of escarpment south of Duncan, optioned by Public Works, but the option expired on exercise. The land reverted to the owner who now wishes to retain it for a higher bid.

3. Park lot 7, concession 9, owned by Y, particularly referred to in the Gertler report. Owner offered it through our office, which in this document means a legitimate office through which transactions could be offered, like a conservation authority or realtor, but there was no approach, no response from government. It is now being sold privately.

4. Lot 7, concession 10, steep cliffs, imposing view, wide valley. A doctor bought these cliffs in 1970 for $23,000, although a target area in the Gertler report.

5. Lot 10, 10 acres. A 70-year-old farmer wishing to retire, could not establish contact with The Department of Public Works, now sold privately.

Now all of these in just one area of Kolapore Park are recent efforts to involve government either directly through Public Works, Department and Lands and Forests or through the conservation authorities, in the acquisition of escarpment land. In each case, for perverse social priorities, the moneys have not been available from the government, and that is why this minister is costing the people of the Province of Ontario over $30 million now. If we wait another two to four years it will cost the people of Ontario an additional $60 million, and it will accelerate as land appreciates; of that this minister has no interest, and with that this government is totally unconcerned, the Premier included, because the priority position of the escarpment for this government has disintegrated.

That is nowhere more evident—just to come back to the figures which the minister gave this morning; and they are an effort again to tie the debate to what seems to us to be the primarily social concern about all of this, regardless of this minister's incompetence around individual transactions—I do not mean that in a personally demeaning way; I mean the government is incompetent in simple transactions.

All of the Tory entrepreneurs with their business expertise cannot negotiate a simple transaction competently, and when we ask them in the House the next day what was sold on which day and to whom, where are the records of the appraisals, are subdivisions in that area subject to approval, have they got the prices on the original transactions, they are scurrying around instead of having it at their fingertips. That is the way public business is publicly conducted in an appropriate fashion. It does not happen with this government. The government is in a shambles in this area.

I can understand the frustration of the member for Downsview, although I think the minister's amiable salary should be cut for other reasons, not simply for Caledon Mountain Estates, about which he probably did not even know until somebody told him after the transaction was completed.

I want to put these propositions to the minister, Mr. Chairman: He indicated that 12,000 acres of land had been acquired within A and B priority of Gertler since June, 1968. He then said that in order to give it a more voluptuous sense, the conservation authorities had acquired 4,000 acres. So it is a total of 16,000 acres.

What he should have acquired was 90,000 acres within the general expenditure range—55,000 of the A priority and 35,000 of the B priority within which these figures fall.

And as I do my arithmetic, 16,000 of 90,000 is 17.7 per cent—after three years, 17.7 per cent! What of the other 83 per cent of all escarpment land which the government committed itself to as a top priority, which the Minister of Energy and Resources Management said just last week is what he is committed to buying up?

For the other 83 per cent you have budgeted $750,000 and the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has budgeted $600,000 which, with the additional 25 per cent will be $800,000. So you have got $1.5 million in total in the next year for the conservation authorities and your department to purchase 83 per cent of what Gertler recommended.

It is absolute nonsense. It is absurd. This minister knows it, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management knows it and the Premier knows it. They have emasculated the Gertler report. They have betrayed the purposes of that report. They have no intention of retrieving the escarpment for public use, and all that we have before us by way of identifiable data demonstrates that.

Even if the minister looked at the dollars, he would find that he has spent something like 10 to 15 per cent of the moneys which Gertler recommended—and the value of those

dollars has depreciated considerably because of the inflated land value.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about the controls on the escarpment?

Mr. Lewis: What about the controls on the escarpment? What about the transactions which occurred before the control?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You cannot subdivide; you cannot sell.

Mr. Lewis: We will wait to hear. And the minister asks an interesting question. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I suppose, at the beginning of next week will stand in his place and say how many subdivisions have been approved by the government, how many have not been approved, how many are pending and then and then alone will we learn whether the subdivision control has meant anything.

Of that we have no knowledge because no one knows. What we do have knowledge of is your good faith in purchasing and that demonstrates the general attitude of the government which is "the escarpment be damned." It is as simple as that.

For some of us on this side of the House, without being overly virtuous about it, the escarpment is a pretty important part of southern Ontario. Sure there are other important parts of the province. We do not regard it as mutually exclusive but we do think that vastly more should have been done and that you should be serious about this and that you do not cavalierly dismiss a whole unique resource as you are doing.

Let me refer, Mr. Chairman, to the last point I wanted to make which is: When we dealt with the original recommendation in the Gertler report, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister and circuitously to the Premier, we only dealt with one part of that report.

In the frame of reference of that report the request was made by the government to delineate in addition the area of the Niagara region which should be reserved for agricultural purposes; to determine the present land use of the fruit belt area in the Niagara region, particularly with a view to establishing the extent of the non-agricultural development in the area.

Then on May 30, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister of Lands and Forests—April 30 I am sorry—the following question: Was there a second report dealing with any aspect of the Niagara Escarpment or the Niagara Peninsula which came from Professor Gertler or via Professor Gertler after the original Gertler report? The Minister of Lands and Forests said to me: "I am not aware of any such document."

Since then I have learned that he was not aware of the budget; that he was not aware of the subdivision control and he was not aware of one item and another. I would not have asked him the question—I did not mean to embarrass him with it.

Mr. Chairman, I then asked the Premier, very carefully, the following:

> Mr. Speaker a question of the Premier: Is the Premier aware of any further substantive document on the Niagara Escarpment or Niagara Peninsula that came by way of Professor Gertler beyond the original document?

Now that could not be more clear. On April 14 the Premier wrote a letter to the president of the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, discussing the Niagara fruit belt report, which came by way of Professor Gertler, saying that it was an internal document and he did not intend to table it. He said to me with that ingenuous air, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not aware of it in the last couple of months." He wrote the letter two weeks earlier. "I shall see if there has been any further material supplied by—"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member asked me about a second Gertler report.

Mr. Lewis: No, I did not. You heard the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard the question and I know the intent of the report. The report to which the hon. member is referring is a report related to the Niagara fruit belt, which was done by a study group containing basically civil servants from this government, which was—

Mr. J. Renwick: So was the original report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Fine. But in my terminology, in the terminology that has been used here for the last two or three years, the Gertler report was the basic report for the total escarpment. We also had a report on the extractive industries—

Mr. Lewis: Sure, you tabled that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which was not unrelated to it. This was done, if memory serves me correctly, by three professors from Waterloo. I think the Niagara fruit belt report had some input, at least, from Professor Kruger, but I am only going by memory. I was not

involved in this very directly at all, so that there was no attempt on my part whatsoever to evade the hon. member's question. I recognize the Gertler report as being the basic document which has been the basis of discussion here. I do not see a second Gertler report, which was the intent, I think, of the hon. member's question.

Mr. Lewis: No. My question was very clear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you want to say there is a report, no question about it, as it related to the extractive industry and to the Niagara fruit belt. No argument about this.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Well, I think that you were coyly toying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not toying at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: —with our sensibilities!

Hon. Mr. Davis: To be very frank about it, at that point I had not completely read the Niagara fruit belt report.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you had not read it? Have you now read the Niagara fruit belt report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am in the process.

Mr. Lewis: You are in the process of reading it? You may learn, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that Professor Kruger did not write the Niagara fruit belt report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that he did write it. I said that I understood—

Mr. Lewis: You thought.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —there was some input with respect to some work that Professor Kruger had done. Now the hon. member knows that Professor Kruger did not have any influence on any material that went into this report? That is fine. I am told that he did.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Well, so be it, and I know how precise you are in language—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know what difference it makes.

Mr. Lewis: —and nuance in this House. I suspect, looking at it, that we would learn that Professor Gertler has a great deal to do with the Niagara fruit belt report, even by way of writing; that he was assisted by others who are now involved in various consulting firms, one in the city of Toronto; that the Niagara fruit belt report contains the most accurate and well-documented assessment of environmental and developmental problems in the entire Niagara fruit belt area; that it does not make very many recommendations, but that those it does make have not been acted on in any single instance by this government; and that in fact the Niagara fruit belt document is in its way every bit as important as the original Gertler report; and that in fact, Mr. Chairman, the reason we are not going to see it is because like the Gertler report, the original document this one too will be seen as having won the disinterest, almost the contempt of the government, because you do not intend to act on any of these areas.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is utter nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: Well you know, your actions speak for you. Your actions speak eloquently for you and we documented I think—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Take a walk along the Bruce Trail.

Mr. Lewis: —pretty fully in this debate, what you are prepared to do about the escarpment and the fruit belt, and that amounts to everything which is negligible. I must say that the Premier know exactly what he was about. He was trying to delay the emergence of yet another dimension of this problem as long as possible. Well, that is absurd.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are trying to delay what?

Mr. Lewis: You just put it on the table. You know you stand up and say, "Yes, there was another report"—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is your opinion.

Mr. Lewis: —"No, I will not release it for ABC." But in fact, you should release it because all of this material should be in the public sector.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You have got a suspicious mind.

Mr. Lewis: All of it, Mr. Chairman. We in this House should know every aspect of that Niagara fruit belt report because the future of an entire region is contingent on implementing its recommendations. May I ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, if he will come back on Monday with some further specifics of the various questions we have asked him, so that we can pursue this discussion in the broader context of the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be here all next week.

Mr. Lewis: But you will be back on Monday with answers to those questions about whether or not the subdivision approval—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am here every Monday.

Mr. Lewis: —went through your department, and just what you said about it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It is now 1 o'clock and there is no discussion after 1.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister nodding his head to that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be here on Monday.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister going to give us the answers on the subjects which provoked him?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): He will be here on Monday, he said.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, might we ask the hon. House leader if we are going to continue with the debates on estimates?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We will continue with The Department of Lands and Forests, followed by The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 14, 1971

Policy re extension of lounge and dining lounge licences to outdoor areas, statement by Mr. Yaremko 1583

Opening of Quinte regional detention centre, statement by Mr. Apps 1583

Quetico Park declared a wilderness area, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Singer 1584

Suggestion that grand juries be done away with, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer 1584

Applications for subdivision approval pending before cabinet committee, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis 1584

Amount appropriated from $20 million for land bank purchases on escarpment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. J. Renwick 1585

Ontario refusing to share in funding of National Housing Conference, questions to Mr. Grossman and Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Deacon 1586

Cabinet committee on regional development, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. J. Renwick 1587

Approvals for subdivision development along escarpment now pending before department, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. J. Renwick 1589

Coding on consumer goods and cents-off programme, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 1590

How many persons licensed to carry concealed weapons have criminal records, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman 1590

Meeting with OHC tenants from Bridgeview subdivision in Windsor, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. B. Newman 1591

Children prevented from purchasing dangerous explosive toys, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Young 1591

Plans for wholesale water and sewage services in new Metro housing programme, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Deacon 1592

Persons invited to participate in foreign investment conference, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. J. Renwick 1592

Metro police threat to strike over decision of Mr. Justice Lacourcière, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sargent 1592

Overruling decision of coroner's office not to hold inquest, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman 1593

Increase in break and entry infractions in southwestern Ontario, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Innes 1593

Implementing reciprocal agreement with other provinces re silicosis exposure, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Haggerty 1593

Foul-up in parking situation at Ontario Place, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 1593

Issuing of liquor licences for resorts in Grey-Bruce area, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Gaunt 1594

Family income required to be purchaser of condominium apartments at Chapel Glen, question to Mr. Grossman, Mrs. M. Renwick 1595

Presenting report, Algonquin advisory committee, Mr. Brunelle 1596

Noise Pollution Control Act, 1971, bill intituled, Mr. Burr, first reading 1596

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1596

Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 1603

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1604

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1620

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 39

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 17, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1971.

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon in our galleries we have many visitors. In Mr. Speaker's gallery we have members of the Windsor-Walkerville Ladies Liberal Association and of the North York YWCA in Toronto; in the east gallery, students from Thomas L. Kennedy Secondary School in Mississauga, and St. Joseph's School of Nursing in North Bay; in the west gallery, from Frontenac Public School, Burlington, and Dryden High School in Dryden.

Later this afternoon we will have visitors from Base Borden Collegiate Institute in Borden, and from Tweedsmuir Public School in Hamilton. This evening, the Ninth Humber Cub Pack of Etobicoke will be with us.

This afternoon, we also have in Mr. Speaker's gallery a group of parliamentary interns from Ottawa who are visiting Ontario and ascertaining how the parliamentary system operates in this jurisdiction. I am sure that we are very pleased to have them with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling a document which outlines this government's policy for extended care facilities and home care arrangements in Ontario.

The principles enunciated in this document follow the announcement by my colleague, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), that starting next April 1, Ontario will expand its health care insurance programme to cover nursing homes and home care services.

In support of the policies outlined in this document, I would like to emphasize that they have been adopted with a view to providing a totally co-ordinated system of health facilities throughout the province. The integration of nursing homes into our present system of hospitals and other facilities will relieve the demand for beds in active treatment hospitals and provide for a level of health care which is, at the moment, a gap in the benefit programme in Ontario.

This programme of extended care facilities will reduce requirements for active treatment beds in our general hospitals by approximately one bed per 1,000 of population. This objective will take several years to achieve. It will result in considerable savings in the capital and operating costs for active treatment in our general hospital system.

Coupled with the integration of nursing homes into the health care delivery system, we intend to further reduce the need for beds by developing our community home care programme throughout Ontario. The development of the home care programme will alleviate the need for institutional care. The increased cost of the home care programme in the next few years will be more than offset by a reduction in the need for beds in either active treatment hospitals or nursing homes themselves.

The integration of nursing homes and the expansion of the home care programme over the next four or five years will provide a co-ordinated pattern of treatment which will be more effective and economical than our present arrangements.

The development of extended care facilities will, henceforth, be based on demonstrated need. In other words, there will be controlled development of nursing homes in the future, based on the needs of the province as a whole and of particular geographic areas within the province.

There are about 3.5 beds per 1,000 of population providing a nursing home level of care in Ontario. We consider this ratio is adequate to serve the people of the province and we will use it as a guideline in assessing the need for this level of care for various parts of the province.

In those sections of the province which fall short of this ratio, we will be approving additional facilities to provide for additional beds in nursing homes.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this government has adopted the policy that these programmes should be available to all residents of the province who are members in good standing in the provincial health insurance programme, provided that

they have been residents of Ontario for at least 12 months prior to admission to an extended care facility. This policy will overcome the possible influx of people from outside Ontario seeking admission to our extended care facilities, with the resultant cost to the Ontario taxpayer.

In the months ahead of us, all nursing homes in the province will be visited by members of my staff who will be responsible for checking the level of care being provided and accounting procedures in these homes to ensure the successful integration of nursing homes into the health insurance programme. Payments to nursing homes will be on the basis of an approved budget which will allow a reasonable return for capital investment as well as operating costs.

Mr. Speaker, this government believes the policies, which I have just enunciated and those which are outlined in more detail in the document you have before you, will go a long way toward providing a more effective and economic pattern of treatment services for the people of Ontario.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of my colleague, the Minister of Health, I would like to make a brief statement on the involvement of my department in this government's policy on extended care facilities.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are 164 homes for the aged in Ontario, operated under municipal and charitable auspices in partnership with the province. Over the years, the care needs of the residents of these homes have been changing. Accordingly, there is a significant number of elderly people in these homes who require and, indeed, receive care equivalent to that defined by the Minister of Health as extended care. Persons in a home for the aged, identified as requiring extended care under the criteria we have established, will be covered under the new insurance programme as of April 1, 1972.

The continued development of such homes under public auspices with capital grants-in-aid from the province will also continue. In the same manner as extended care homes, such development will be based, Mr. Speaker, on demonstrated need. The relationship of homes for the aged with all extended care facilities will be continuously evaluated to prevent the overlapping of responsibility and service.

Nonetheless, the role of public and charitable homes will be important and will be maintained in a balanced ratio. Together with The Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, my staff will be visiting all our homes for the aged in the next few months to assess various levels of care and to determine the beds to be included under the new insurance programme.

Ontario intends, Mr. Speaker, to continue the expansion of community social services associated with municipal and charitable homes for the aged. Our department will continue to support elderly persons' centres, senior citizens' clubs and drop-in centres, and such important programmes as vacation care and meals-on-wheels for the elderly. While these services are not directly related to extended health care it is our view that participation by the elderly in community activities is preventive in nature and can make possible the continued independence of our elderly people in their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, this government is establishing a pattern for truly integrated services for the elderly that will be of lasting benefit to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PHYSICIANS BILLING TO OHSIP

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Does the minister plan a statement to the House which will back up the allegations he made at the meeting of the Ontario Medical Association last Friday at which, in a series of questions, he indicated that there was substantial doubt as to the professional and business ethics of some doctors participating in the OHSIP programme?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I have not contemplated it. I do not know what kind of statement the Leader of the Opposition would want. As he knows, the legislation itself is very restrictive insofar as giving information about the operation of the plan is concerned. The way the Act reads, the information we have in this field can only be published in statistical form and dealing with what in this case would be the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Perhaps there is some more particularity as to what the Leader of the Opposition wants.

Mr. Nixon: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that

a statistical reference, from the date that it must be available to him, without reference to any particular individual could be used to back up the series of charges the minister made in reference to about seven categories of let us say, milking the funds that are available to OHSIP?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, they were not charges, as I said in the speech—

Mr. Nixon: They were questions.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —nor were they a bill of indictment. They were questions that arose from the facts as we see them coming out of the OHSIP operations.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but we do not see the facts. The minister does, but the people do not.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As the statistics develop, I can give those statistics to the House, I can undertake that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary, would the minister not agree that for him even to refer to the areas of problems which his controllers must experience in dealing with the medical profession, that referring to them in a list as he did would be enough basis for him to give a statement to this House as to where OHSIP is running into financial problems in dealing with the medical profession and others?

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawernce: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can give a statement to the House. It would probably be more valuable in a few months' time than it would be today.

Mr. Nixon: As a further supplementary, I think the value is to the people who are losing confidence because of the statements that the minister has made.

Mr. Speaker: Question!

Mr. Nixon: Would the minister agree that at least by putting the cards on the table as they are available to him statistically, he would allow the Legislature, the citizens and taxpayers of the province to know the direction of the government's and the minister's concern and how they intend to alleviate this problem?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The minister's estimates start today, anyway.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not see any problem with it, Mr. Speaker, but I will not make an undertaking to do it within the next few days.

Mr. Nixon: Is it not a $100 million profit?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a supplementary?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have a supplementary question of the minister. Now that the minister has indicated to the doctors what they could or should do, would he indicate to the House what he and his department are going to do by way of a more effective routine check over alleged abuses of the public funds?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I outlined that in some detail in the particular speech which was only in a minor way related to the doctors and their responsibility vis-à-vis the plan. One thing is certain, what the government can do is to give the College of Physicians and Surgeons, for example, the legislative power in the field of self-discipline and investigation and auditing.

On top of that, of course, as I mentioned again in the speech, we should structure and set up an appeal board in relation to public complaints involving the medical profession. Insofar as the mechanics of the thing are concerned we can and will make available, not only to profession but for use internally, the more sophisticated profiles that we will be developing insofar as physician use and insofar as patient use of the plan is concerned.

This is the kind of thing that is an obvious responsibility of government and which I undertook in that speech to press forward.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: How and why should we give to the College of Physicians and Surgeons the obligation to check doctors' bills? Is it not a legitimate proposition that we who have control over the billing through OHSIP should do it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: What I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, was that both of us should have a responsibility in this field. Certainly I cannot see the government tying its hands when it comes to auditing, examining

or investigating any accounts paid through its health insurance system. Nor, on the other hand, do I feel that we should forgo the very valuable exercise of self-discipline and assessment that will result from the profession itself having these powers.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid: Will the minister provide a copy of his Friday statement, together with the statistical data upon which he made that statement, to members of the human resources committee before it examines various witnesses and experts on this very subject on Wednesday?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, I can certainly agree with the former, and perhaps I should send a copy of my speech forthwith to all members of the House. Statistical data is a rather wide phrase, but I will see how far we can go into developing statistics relating, as was asked earlier, to the specific questions asked in that speech.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West has a supplementary?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Yes. Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that the doctor-sponsored prepaid plans, which went out of existence with OHSIP, regularly rejected claims of their members who were excessively billing? And will he give the same kind of instruction to his staff at OHSIP to do the same—to reject claims which are clearly in excess of service provided—until he has completed his study?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, rejection is only one sanction in relation to control of costs. The other sanctions are even more severe; paying part of the bill is another alternative. That is about all I can say, Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Could the minister tell us the basis on which he asked the at least seemingly rhetorical question relating to the very high incidence of tonsillectomies or the other seemingly rhetorical question—I think it was one in a series of eight—as to an apparent abuse if doctors were running laboratories, or sharing in the profits of laboratories? Is either of these based on any factual analysis or not?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, there are two different factual analyses involved here. One with regard to, shall we say, tonsillectomies having opened what I have described —and I think we all agree on—as being a scientific debate within the profession itself as to the efficacy or value of the particular procedure. With regard to the comparatively high cost of services provided by laboratories and their relationship to ownership by doctors, yes, we have statistical information that points in this direction and that is why the questions were asked.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary in relation to the minister's reply, is the minister of the opinion that the incidence of tonsillectomies is too great, and is the minister of the opinion that where doctors either operate or share in the responsibility of operating a laboratory, the fees charged by those laboratories are in fact excessive and beyond the price charged by independent laboratories?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give—and it perhaps relates to the question asked earlier—is that those questions in that speech were asked for the purpose not by way of indictment on specific charges against the profession; they were basically and must remain show-cause questions until the investigation is complete. In other words when, as laymen, those of us here who are not doctors see this kind of phenomenon, or these kinds of phenomena, I think it is quite proper that we ask the profession, as I did simply in that speech, to tell me why, tell the public why this is happening.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): May I ask one supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I would like to ask the minister if the results of his investigation uncover that certain physicians in the province have been, if not overcharging, at least using the scheme inappropriately, what action will be taken by the department to recover the losses that have been incurred?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot answer that this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, because the spectrum of sanctions that are available will require a lot of consideration. On one end

of the spectrum, of course, is de-licensing. On the other end of the spectrum is paying only a certain percentage of the account. In between there we must develop fairly subtle sanctions.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY RIOTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Now that a second death has occurred, caused by the riots in Kingston three weeks ago, will the Attorney General report to the House on the status of the investigation that he reported previously was being undertaken by the Ontario Provincial Police in matters associated with this riot?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, I will be glad to, because I have been attempting to keep myself conversant with the problems in the Kingston Penitentiary.

First of all the alleged murder, or murders, as they may now be, of course, took place in an area in which the Ontario Provincial Police does not have primary jurisdiction. Primary jurisdiction for the Kingston Penitentiary is with the Kingston police force. The Kingston police force has been in constant contact with the Crown Attorney for the Kingston area.

An investigation has been proceeding—a very thorough investigation—under the direct supervision of the Kingston police force. We have been assisting—by "we," I mean the Ontario Provincial Police—by lending to them the services of an inspector and other personnel who are more conversant with homicide charges than some of the personnel in the Kingston police force.

I am not able to tell the House today when or if or what the charges are that will be laid, but I can assure the House that the matter has been under very intensive investigation. There may well be some announcements in this respect this week.

ONTARIO PLACE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY IN RECEIVERSHIP

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Can he confirm the fact that when Secant Construction, the firm responsible for the building of Ontario Place, went into receivership, the government had to cover $77,000 worth of NSF cheques in connection with this difficulty?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): No, I cannot confirm that at this moment, Mr. Speaker. I will get the information.

Mr. Nixon: Can the minister indicate to the House whether the failure of Secant Construction was a direct cost in addition to the planned cost of Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take that question as notice and get the answer.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

GASOLINE RETAILERS REQUEST ARBITRATOR

Mr. MacDonald: I have one further question, of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Would the minister indicate whether it is his intention to respond to the request of the Ontario Retail Gasoline Association for the government to appoint an arbitrator who might chair negotiations between certain gasoline retailers in the Richmond area who have been placed by Imperial Oil on a small consignment margin which will force them into bankruptcy?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter is under discussion with my colleagues at the moment. I cannot say what the policy would be but I think it will be resolved very shortly.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of exploring it in a supplementary question: Is the minister of the view that intervention in a mild way, by just chairing these negotiations at this time, might make it possible for the industry to regulate itself and thereby avoid the government's having to move in with strict regulations that will require continuing supervision as we did, for example, in the past with used car dealers some years ago?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is one fair possibility but I cannot say it is policy. If the question is whether this is my view, I would like to discuss it with my colleagues a little further so whatever we do, would be a government policy.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, when will this be resolved? In a matter of weeks, months, when?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I said in my first reply shortly. I think it would certainly be within weeks, not months.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

Mr. Singer: No, I have a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Then the Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question asked last week.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of answers to questions. As long as you will permit I will answer them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will answer the one question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the member for Wentworth on April 15 asked:

> Could the minister indicate what form of investigation took place into the reported bankruptcy of Brocair Systems Limited, of Brockville, which received $139,083 in May, 1969? How much of this money has been recovered, or is it the intention of ODC to recover any?

Mr. Speaker, in the customary follow-up procedures of the Ontario Development Corporation, it became apparent that the company was having difficulties for two major reasons. First, the company had encountered technical problems concerning its aircraft recording devices; second, major difficulties arose due to the drastic cutback in the US space programme which has affected all the companies in this field.

However, the ODC has placed a receiver in Brocair Systems to look after its interests. The ODC has security in the form of the company's buildings and equipment, which have a book value of $468,000. We are currently in the midst of delicate negotiations for the re-establishment of operations in this plant. If the negotiations are not successful, then ODC will take whatever action is necessary, through its holding of assets, to recover the loan.

Would you take some more, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No, because there must be opportunities for supplementary questions, if there are any.

Are there any supplementary questions? If not, the member for Downsview has the floor.

POLICE SUPERVISION OF ROCK FESTIVAL

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. In light of the statement made by Chief Superintendent L. R. Gartner, of the Ontario Provincial Police, to the effect that the police kept peace at the rock festival last summer by simply staying away, does the Attroney General think that this is a logical way that police should supervise rock festivals?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have not seen or heard of that statement before. I will be glad to take the question as notice.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the minister care to examine the Toronto Daily Star of Saturday, May 15, 1971, at page 15, where he could read that story?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: May 15? Yes, I did not see the weekend papers. I shall try to get them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

ARREARS IN OHC RENTALS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker: Did the installation of a centralized computer accounting system last winter result in the Ontario Housing Corporation losing control of the situation in connection with rental collection, resulting in rental arrears of hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not know they had such a computer system, Mr. Speaker. I will get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker: If the minister did not know he has the computer system, did he know this computer system resulted in west Toronto alone having rental arrears of $240,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not necessarily accept that editorial comment, Mr. Speaker. I will get the information.

Mr. Shulman: One final supplementary, if I may: Does the minister approve of the written instructions on this matter which were given out by his director of housing operations, saying this matter must be kept confidential?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is a good speech for the question period. Obviously, if I did not know of the existence of the computerized system, I would not know the answer to the last question.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The Minister has a lot of catching up to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am doing my best.

Mr. Nixon: His memoranda circulate through the NDP.

CHILDREN'S RESTRAINT DEVICES FOR AUTOMOBILES

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. As tests conducted by the Highway Safety Research Institute of the University of Michigan found only two of the 37 safety seat and restraining devices could provide a satisfactory degree of child protection, and since the Ontario Safety League endorses all car safety devices for children that meet US federal motor vehicle standards, what is the minister doing to protect the purchaser of safety restraining devices for children in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice so as to afford the member a full reply.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION BY CALEDON MOUNTAIN ESTATES

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs: Can he report to the House any information he might have on an application on a plan of subdivision in the name of Caledon Mountain Estates Limited, if this application has been circularized through the regular departments and if it has been approved by The Department of Lands and Forests?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to have more particulars than the member has given me.

Mr. Nixon: If I might then, as a supplementary question: Would the minister not feel that he could find an application for a subdivision in the name of Caledon Mountain Estates Limited in his department, if in fact such an application exists?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member, has he a particular application or location in mind?

Mr. Nixon: I want to know if there are any applications, and obviously the one I have in mind is the one at the Forks of the Credit.

Mr. Peacock: We struggled for years for an instant Hansard and the minister does not read it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I do not have the information before me, but I will take the question as notice and obtain it.

Mr. Singer: It has been going on for three days and he still does not know.

Mr. Nixon: I would like that information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

CO-ORDINATION WITH QUEBEC ON HYDRO DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. In view of the recent announcement made by Premier Bourassa about a $2 billion hydro development scheme that will foster development in the northwest section of Quebec, have any discussions or dialogue taken place with the Province of Quebec in order to foster the same kind of development, or some degree of co-ordination along the lines of the mid-Canada corridor development, on behalf of the people in northeastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am advised by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), that Ontario Hydro has been engaged in discussions with Quebec along these lines.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps we might allow the minister to give another answer. He has a whole lot of them and we might put them in here.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis) asked me to table a list of 13 companies for which subsidies have been cancelled because they did not proceed with their announced intention to build or expand their plants.

It would not be in the public interest, Mr. Speaker, nor would it be fair to the companies concerned, to list their names. Ontario Development Corporation did not proceed

with the plans of the original agreement because the companies themselves did not wish to proceed. I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that it would be evident to the hon. leader of the NDP, particularly in these days of serious unemployment, that the naming of companies concerned could have serious repercussions. It would seriously damage the companies and the people employed by them, as well as the communities in which they are located; and further, Mr. Speaker, I do not see that it would serve any useful purpose.

Mr. Peacock: Would you permit a supplementary in the absence of the member who asked the minister the question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask the minister then, of the 13 companies in question, how many of the loans to these companies were approved and then not proceeded with?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My recollection is that there were some of them at least which were approved, but because, for some reason or other, the companies did not want to proceed with the expansion of the plans they had in mind, obviously the loans were not processed.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, given that the names of some of the companies were used in the announcements of the approvals, why then can the minister not give us the names of those same companies now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It seems obvious, Mr. Speaker, at least to me, that whereas in the original instance an announcement was made that loans were being given to them, or had been approved, that public information at this time that loans were not proceeded with might imply to some people there was something wrong with the companies, whereas that is not necessarily the case.

Mr. MacDonald: Well give us the facts.

Mr. Peacock: The minister did it then.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Can the minister indicate whether or not those companies might reapply under the broader basis of the so-called Ventures programmes that the minister announced a couple of weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may very well be, Mr. Speaker. If they qualify under the new programme then we would, of course, consider their application. However, I wish to repeat that the companies involved here did not proceed on their own initiative.

Mr. Nixon: All of them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All of them.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker; I am ust trying to dispel my puzzlement.

If the government has already announced —which they always do with great fanfare— all those loans that they are going to give to certain companies across this province, is he not now going to delete from that list those who did not get loans, so that we in this Legislature and the public do not linger on with the impression that company X got a loan when in fact it did not get it. Why this hugger-mugger approach?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Hugger-mugger?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I explained that.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister explained it, but I am wondering why?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I explained the reason for that too. Somebody who may not have read the original announcement— made I do not know how many months ago —all of a sudden sees a news item in the papers that loans to company so-and-so were not approved. That may very well harm that company.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister now explain to me how I can avoid harming the company and everybody else by going around saying this company X got a loan when in fact it was promised a loan and then ultimately the loan was not given?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know why the hon. member, at this stage, months later, would go around telling people that this company got a loan. Why would he do that?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: I go into riding X and people say to me there is such-and-such a company in this area, which according to the papers, got a loan, and I say, "Yes, they got a loan." Are the people not entitled to find out that they did not in fact get a loan?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think that in those areas where loans were granted, the people in that area of the community would generally be familiar with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a final supplementary question, I am talking about communities that do not know the company did not get a loan. Are we and others not entitled to know that in fact, after the original announcement, the loan was not given?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): There is no sense to it!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member does not think there is logic in this, I should advise him that, so far as we know, this is the policy in most governments —in the federal government, and in the great Shangri-la of the NDP in Manitoba.

As a matter of fact, what the hon. members may be very interested in knowing is that by statute, in Manitoba, not only is their development corporation not permitted to give information about loans which were refused but they are not even permitted, by statute, to give information to the Legislature and the public as to those that have been granted.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is a hugger-mugger.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

AMERICAN PROFESSORS AT WINDSOR UNIVERSITY

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Is it in the Canadian public interest that four of the five tenured professors in the faculty of law at Windsor University are American citizens and, of these four, three live in Detroit, including the assistant dean?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): There is no way that I can say yes or no to that question, Mr. Speaker. That would depend on a number of circumstances, it seems to me.

If the hon. member would be interested in a general comment from me I would be glad to offer one. The Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), when he was Minister of University Affairs, wrote some months ago to the universities, asking that they give the Canadian the position open whenever the Canadian applicant had the same qualifications as the non-Canadian applicant.

I am optimistic that this request will be adhered to. I have the feeling, without a lot of hard facts to substantiate it, that the problem has lessened to some extent and that the wishes so expressed by my predecessor and the very wide concern being evidenced by the public and the media are correcting this situation to some extent.

If we find a continuation of nepotism in this particular form, then we will have to turn to some more extreme remedy. I think this will not be necessary. I very much hope it will not be necessary because these universities are autonomous in this fashion and I for one would be most reluctant to interfere with their autonomy.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question: Would the minister consider instructing the standing committee on human resources to ask the president of Windsor University and the dean of the law school to come to the committee to explain why the situation has arisen and what steps they are taking to accede to the previous Minister of University Affair's memorandum, as a point of public information?

Hon. Mr. White: We have no objection to that at all; as a matter of fact, I think it would be rather useful. The member's question leads me to believe that the committee has this power and if it has that power, I certainly would have no objection to that at all.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

USE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management concerning the community college courses which are preparing technicians to help in the fight against pollution: Is the minister's department consciously planning this programme to take advantage of the services of these students who are now taking this training?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any classes or students who will be completing a course this spring, for example, on the environment from one of our community colleges. Certainly when those students finish their course, or even during the summer, for example, between their first and second years, we would do everything possible to see that openings within my department, are filled with these students as much as possible.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister let the community colleges know just what the future requirements of his department are?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if we have specifically let the community colleges know. I think it is very easy to ascertain that information. Whether it is in association with the OWRC or one of our branches, such as air management branch or the waste management branch, the type of training that is required is quite easy to ascertain. It really is quite common knowledge among our colleges and universities, so that it would just be a matter of any of these students who are interested in ecology or in the environment in any way to write and that information would be available.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I might assist the hon. member by saying that we have had people from my department attend at these community colleges, giving lectures and giving papers, indicating what the total responsibility is of the Ontario government and, therefore, in this way, indicating the amount of work we are involved in and the type of training required by the various people in the department.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

TEST USE OF LIGNITE DEPOSITS FOR HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Could the minister explain the reluctance of Ontario Hydro to co-operate with the Ontario Economic Council in the test use of the lignite deposits of northeastern Ontario in the production of hydro-electric power?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro has been involved in investigation of lignite deposits in northern Ontario for a number of years now. When the commission built some of its substations up there, it was quite aware of the great potential as far as lignite deposits were concerned. There is some question as to the value of lignite as fuel in generating stations. The fact is there is a certain amount of fly ash and it has to be cleaned and this type of thing might cause a problem from the point of view of emission. However, because of certain recent developments, I am hoping that Hydro will take another look, particularly in respect to the request of the Ontario Economic Council.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will Hydro then go ahead and use the lignite deposits in its Thunder Bay plant within the next short period of time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, if lignite can be used reasonably and economically as fuel for the generating stations, certainly I would think Hydro would use it, particularly in its stations up north.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

SHIP DUMPING COAL DUST IN HAMILTON HARBOUR

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources: Has the minister received the report of an alleged dumping into the air of coal dust by a ship in Hamilton harbour last week and what action is being taken by the department to discover the ship—to find out what ship it was—and what action is being taken to recompense the residents for losses?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of a particular incident involving the dumping of coal dust.

Mr. Deans: It appeared to be coal dust.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will certainly look into that and report to the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: May I ask the minister, by way of a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The member cannot ask a supplementary question because the question has not been answered. The member for Huron-Bruce has the floor.

CLARIFYING DAY NURSERIES ACT

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Would the minister consider clarifying The Day Nurseries Act and the regulations under it so that children's birthday parties, Sunday school classes and YMCA classes would be clearly exempt?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would be happy, Mr. Speaker, to clarify it. I am not just sure exactly what the member wishes. I certainly would not want to interfere with children's birthday parties and YMCA parties. Perhaps if he would tell me exactly what the problem

is we will see if we can get it straightened out.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary of the minister? Is the minister familiar with the case of Mrs. Gertrude O'Connor in Stratford?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Mr. Gaunt: Just as a matter of clarification, Mr. Speaker, the matter that is causing all the problems—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member could supply the minister with that information. Then the minister will take that as notice and bring an answer perhaps, because, since the minister has not heard about it, he could not give an answer today.

The member for Waterloo North.

STUDY OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs relating to the study of regional government that was announced last week. By whom will this study be done; how long will it take and will any other regional government, other than the Niagara regional government be studied?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, might I hear the first part of the hon. member's question?

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, the question relates to the study of regional government that we announced a week ago. I am asking whether any other regional governments will be studied in the Niagara area, by whom will the study be conducted, will there be an investigation into its effectiveness and how long will it take?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I did not announce any regional government study. What I said to a group from St. Catharines was that I have a group within my department who are looking at the various regional governments that are in existence, to see what the situation is in each one and what changes might be considered or what recommendations they have for change. It is entirely within the department.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, how long will this study take, and will any regional governments other than the Niagara regional government be looked at?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the matter has been going on now for about three or four weeks within my department. There has been the Niagara study and there are three others involved at the present time. It is information for me.

Mr. Good: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would it be the minister's intention to introduce legislation for either the Sudbury or Waterloo areas prior to the results of the findings of his study into the existing operations of regional government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I asked the people in both the Sudbury area and the Waterloo area to make submissions to me in regard to the proposals by June of this year. I will not introduce any legislation until I have their submissions.

Mr. Good: One final supplementary: The question I asked, Mr. Speaker, was, would the minister introduce legislation prior to the completion of the departmental study that the minister has going on on regional governments in other areas of the Province?

Hon. Mr. Bales: These are on-going studies and they will be a continuing matter. I may be making certain changes, but the studies will carry on because I think they are of assistance.

Mr. Good: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The member has pursued this question far enough. The member for Windsor West has the floor.

CROWN CORPORATION FOR HARBOUR CITY

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development about Harbour City. Has a draft document outlining the structure of a new Crown corporation for Harbour City been prepared and submitted to the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The document has been prepared for some time. As I recall, the city of Toronto is familiar with its contents —they must be, because they disagree with the matter in principle. Further than that I do not think I can answer.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: As a result of the disagreement, has the minister instructed the architects, Craig, Zeigler to revamp the project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Their objection as far as I know, is not to any of the architectural plans at this particular stage; the city is concerned with the fact that the Crown corporation that has been discussed, would have the majority of one representative of the province. On this basis there is some objection.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we might have the Minister of Trade and Development give another answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What would the member have, a short or a long one?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It is like a serial.

Mr. Speaker: Like a serial? There is no one on his feet at the moment.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): On-going! On-going out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will be on-going long after the member has gone. Long after the member has gone.

Mr. Ruston: The minister has now gone.

ODC DIRECTORS' INTERESTS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. leader of the NDP asked a question and supplementary concerning ODC directors' interests. He asked if there are procedures governing the board of the Ontario Development Corporation to identify any interests or associations that board members may have by way of professional or corporate relationships with those companies which do receive and have received forgivable loans. The answer to that is yes, there are such procedures. The bylaws of the corporation, in fact, provide, and I quote:

> Every director who is in any way directly or indirectly interested in a proposed contract or a contract with a corporation, shall declare his interest at a meeting of the directors of the corporation and shall refrain from voting in any manner pertaining to the proposed contract or arrangement as mentioned above.

As a result of the question, Mr. Speaker, every member of the board has been consulted and we are satisfied that this bylaw has been honoured.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? If not, the member for Yorkview has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: No questions.

ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I have a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development. Could the minister tell us what the decibel level is in some of the sections of Ontario Place, particularly the cinesphere and the pod representing Genesis?

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I hope the member can appreciate now why some of these answers have to be accumulated. Obviously a detailed question like that cannot be answered off the top of one's head. I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the minister that it is always possible to direct questions like that to the notice paper, the order paper.

Mr. Young: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be a supplementary to a question which has not been answered. There has been no answer.

Mr. Young: The minister made no investigations ahead of time?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister was deafened by the noise.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health, if I can get his attention.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health is not in his seat. The member for Hamilton East.

An hon. member: The minister is not in his seat?

Another hon. member: The Minister of Health is there now, Mr. Speaker.

NEW HAMILTON JUVENILE DETENTION CENTRE

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General. Has the minister decided on the site for the new juvenile detention centre in Hamilton, which was declared obsolete and hazardous over 1½ years ago and a new one was promised by his predecessor?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the current detention

premises for the juvenile family court in Hamilton are something that should be done away with. The Department of Public Works, I understand, is proceeding with negotiations to acquire, or at least take possession of, other premises in the Hamilton area. I am not too sure of the exact location, but even if I was I am afraid that I would not be able to indicate that location to the House, simply because the last report I had, which was about Thursday of last week, was that the negotiations with the present owner were still in the negotiation stage.

Mr. Gisborn: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister check with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) to ascertain directly what the plans are? On questioning him in his estimates two days ago the answer I received was that there was no requisition for new facilities or a new building of that nature in the Hamilton area.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My understanding of that conversation, or that request of the minister, was what his knowledge was and I understand that he referred the question to me; and I am reporting here and now to the House and the member that we are proceeding with the negotiations to acquire new premises in the Hamilton area right now.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. W. Hodgson from the standing estimates committee reported the following resolution:

RESOLVED,

that supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of The Department of Public Works be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972:

Department of Public Works

Departmental administration programme	$ 1,844,000
Provision of accommodation programme	108,580,000
Central services programme	5,098,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the orders of the day, I wonder if you could elicit from the government which minister is speaking for The Department of Agriculture during the temporary absence of the minister?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if any definite arrangement has been made but I will inquire and perhaps make some arrangement if necessary and report very shortly to the House.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to bring to the attention of the members of the House the significant day in the lives of some 15,000 citizens of Ontario who are of Norwegian descent.

On this day, May 17, 1814, the Norwegian constitution was ratified and became that country's guarantee of all personal freedom. Not only were the Norwegians our allies in World War II, and many of us have recollections of little Norway here in the city, but thousands of that Scandinavian country's sons and daughters have emigrated to Canada and are making their contribution.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to remind all members that this is the 147th anniversary of Norway's national day commemorating that most important document.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

On vote 1103:

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Lands and Forests, vote 1103. I believe certain questions had been directed to the minister when we left this estimate at the last sitting. Does the minister have some replies?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Yes. When the House recessed at 1 o'clock on Friday, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) asked me a few questions and I have some of the answers.

He asked me questions with reference to the Kolapore land purchase in the Kolapore Uplands. This area, Mr. Chairman, was recommended in the Gertler report as a major natural park. The total acreage of the proposal is 7,800 acres, of which 7,300 acres are to be acquired; 1,200 acres had been recommended for priority 1 acquisition and the remainder priority 3. The priority 1 area has been so rated in order that special features

such as waterfalls, viewpoints and caves might be preserved. Just over one-half of this area is now owned by the Crown. Specifically he asked me about the first part of lot 7, concession 10, Collingwood township.

This site is in the priority acquisition area as indicated—this is all as recommended by the Gertler report. Secondly, part lot 7, concession 12, Collingwood township. This property changed ownership on May 1, 1970, and it has been established that the new owner is unwilling to sell. No option has been taken with the present or previous owners. Thirdly, part of lot 7, concession 9, Collingwood township. This site is also in the priority 3 acquisition area by Gertler. Fourthly, lot 7, concession 10, Collingwood township, which site is in priority 3 acquisition area. Fifthly, lot 10, 10 acres owned by a 70-year-old farmer. There is insufficient information, Mr. Chairman, to establish the status of this property. We could find no trace of this.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the department has been pursuing a policy of negotiation by agreement in this area. If an owner has not been willing to sell, expropriation has not been threatened. The remainder of the priority acquisition area is under the ownership of two individuals who intend to use the land in the manner compatible with the objectives of the Gertler report.

In case of the major owner, commitment has been made to provide public access by means of easement across his land and he has indicated a desire to enter into an agreement with the department for professional advice on the management of the natural resources on his land. It is intended that a similar agreement can be arranged with the other owners.

In summation, Mr. Chairman, of the section of the Kolapore Uplands area to which Gertler assigned a No. 1 priority, over one-half has been purchased and agreement has been reached to permit public use of a further one-quarter of the area.

Also, the hon. member for Scarborough West wanted information about prices of property paid by previous owners. I would say to this that this information will take some time to gather. Public Works has undertaken to get this information and it will be available at a later date. The member also asked me about the application of subdivisions, and the department responded to The Department of Municipal Affairs in May and June, 1970, indicating any approval should not be given to the subdivision until the Ontario Parks Integration Board had the opportunity of determining what lands might be required for public purposes and approving subsequent purchase of them. I believe these were some of the questions that the hon. member asked me.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1103, item 1. The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, dealing very briefly with the first part of the hon. minister's answer, he said that in relation to—what was it, the Kolapore Estates?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Kolapore Estates.

Mr. Singer: The Kolapore Estates—that one of the owners had agreed not to use the lands in a manner contrary to that recommended by the Gertler report. Is there a written agreement entered into with the government to that effect and is it registerable and registered against the land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to find that out and let the hon. member know, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we are constantly in trouble with this minister. There is nothing that he brings to us that is in sort of the logical sequence from the questions that we pose to him, and I just wonder why the minister is not able to supply us with information when his estimates come up. Does the minister really not know anything or is he seeking refuge until he can get a better answer?

Now, let us go back to the Caledon Mountain Estates. I have great difficulty in following the variety of answers that we have had from the minister, from the Minister of Public Works and, as late as this afternoon, from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Minister of Municipal—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am on to this now. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, as recently as a half an hour ago, seemed to be strangely uninformed about a question on a question he was most authoritative about on Friday. He said he did not know what additional applications were pending in relation to subdivision applications from Caledon Mountain Estates in an answer to a question posed by my leader.

Is the minister listening or is he going to tell me in a few minutes that he does not know?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am listening, Mr. Chairman. I do not have to look at the member to listen to him, do I?

Mr. Singer: Even when the minister pays attention, he does not know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is hard enough to listen to the member without having to look at him.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right. The minister does not have to look at me, but let me know that he is listening, because even when he listens he does not know. This is most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman.

Now, which is correct. Which of the three sets of answers we have had is correct? Is it in fact true that of the 1,070 acres of land situated at the Forks of the Credit, which were acquired by Caledon Mountain Estates within the last two years, only 505 acres have been taken over by the government—and those were the 505 acres that were in fact acquired at the rate of $1,500 per acre? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we have purchased 506 acres. We have under consideration, I believe, either two or three other land purchases in that area. Some are within and some are outside of the Caledon Mountain Estates holdings; there are areas that we think have a very high recreation value and that we wish to acquire to be part and parcel of that park development.

Mr. Singer: The minister has answered the first question about the 505 or 506 acres. What is the present situation of the balance of the 1,050 acres? Subtract 506 from 1,050 and, if my arithmetic is correct, that leaves 546 acres of land owned by Caledon Mountain Estates Limited, which they have acquired within the last two years. Is that land the subject of consideration for acquisition by the government, either by negotiation or by expropriation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is not all land owned by Caledon. Some is owned by other owners.

Mr. Singer: No, but, Mr. Chairman, I am back into the same difficulty again. Either we accept what the minister has told us earlier or we do not. I thought it had been pretty clearly established that Caledon Mountain Estates Limited within the last two years had acquired 1,050 acres of the land generally described as being at the Forks of the Credit. Now that was a figure that has been tossed around here for four days now and which the minister seemed to have accepted up until this minute.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Gertler figure, Mr. Chairman, is 1,070.

Mr. Singer: All right. Let us move my 546 up to 566 acres. Are there 566 acres now in the ownership of Caledon Mountain Estates Limited which they acquired two years ago; in the forks of the Credit area?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Covered by Gertler's recommendation.

Mr. Singer: Covered by Gertler's recommendation, if you want me to—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have not the facts.

Mr. Singer: As I understand the minister's latest addition, there are still 570 acres left —is that right?—in Caledon Mountain Estates' ownership which was referred to by Gertler as being high priority for acquisition and which was acquired by Caledon Mountain Estates within the last two years at an average price of $723 an acre? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Singer: Well then, what is correct? Where does the 1,070-acre figure come from?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that we have acquired 506 acres from Caledon Estates and we also are in the process of acquiring lands that are both inside and outside of the Caledon Mountain Estate area. It is land that is valuable, has high recreational value, that may not have been recommended by Gertler. And again, we are not bound by Gertler. If we feel that land should be acquired which is not in the area that he recommended, we are and we have—

Mr. Singer: All right, The minister again is trying to sidestep the question that I am posing to him. Is it not correct that Caledon Mountain Estates still owns the difference between what you have already acquired and the 1,050 or 1,070 acres in that immediate area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Singer: How many acres—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There are other owners.

Mr. Singer: There may be other owners in addition? Does Caledon not still own the difference between that sum and something in excess of 500 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They own, I believe, around 3,000 acres, yes, and we have purchased 506.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Then can we get down specifically to the question? It seemed to have been pretty clearly established, at least to my satisfaction, that Caledon acquired 1,070 acres within the last two years in this immediate area.

Apparently they have acquired all sorts of other acres in other areas which perhaps total as much as 3,000—that was the minister's last figure. I am not familiar with that. But in this area, before you acquired 506 acres, did they not own 1,050 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, they have been acquiring land over a period of years. I do not know when they purchased this land.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister say it is wrong that, at the time the government of Ontario acquired the 506 acres, in that immediate area Caledon in fact owned 1,050 acres? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Of the 1,070 acres that Gertler recommended in his report, some of those lands are owned by Caledon Mountain Estates and some are owned by other private owners. We purchased 506 acres from Caledon and we are in the process of purchasing lands from other owners.

Mr. Singer: The minister refuses to hit this question dead on and has for four days refused to hit the question dead on. All right; I am apparently not going to get anything more definite from him out of that.

At one stage, the minister told us that the new plan of subdivision had been approved on the basis—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the next day I corrected this—

Mr. Singer: I said, "at one stage."

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and said that I had been in error—and that is in Hansard. I corrected myself and said that no approval had been given until 1966, I believe. The last approval was 1966.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the minister as usual was premature. If he had listened to the question and perhaps faced the question and answered it, we all might become a little more educated about these matters.

I said, at one stage, Mr. Chairman, the minister told us that there had been a recent approval of a subdivision application by The Department of Municipal Affairs on the application of Caledon Mountain Estates for land in this area.

As the minister says, he subsequently corrected himself about that and said the last approval for an application by Caledon Mountain Estates for a subdivision in this area had been given in 1966.

Now I will get to another area of very substantial confusion. How many applications submitted by Caledon Mountain Estates are at present in the hands of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) for subdivision approval in this area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member will have to ask this question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: If the area is the area that is under the consideration of this minister for acquisition in public ownership of the lands of the Niagara Escarpment, and if this question has been so urgently put here by us for the last four days, and if the Minister of Municipal Affairs could not answer us earlier this afternoon, is it possible in any way, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this House can be advised as to what the situation is today or any other day?

The Minister of Municipal Affairs does not know. This minister just stands up and says, "You will have to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs." Is there any way that the government is prepared to give us frank and honest and factual answers about this situation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be glad to buy the hon. member a hearing aid. Again, I repeat that this comes under the purview of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Chairman, if there was an application for subdivision approval of lands which this minister was charged with acquiring by his government, he would have—certainly even in advance of his estimates, pretending that the last four days had not happened. But since the last four days of debate have in fact happened and since the Minister of Municipal Affairs says he knows nothing, and since the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) says in his

estimates downstairs, "I only carry out the instructions of the Minister of Lands and Forests," does the Minister of Lands and Forests think that all the rest of us are so stupid that we accept today from him the answer that he does not know and it must be the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Why can he not be honest with us?

Now, can the minister tell me if there are any applications by Caledon Estates presently pending before government for subdivision approval in relation to the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It comes under the purview of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: The minister does not know. All right. The minister purported to give some kind of an answer to the questions posed by the hon. member for Scarborough West to the effect that no approval has been given by his department to applications for draft plan approval in relation to Caledon Estates in 1970. That is what he said. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Singer: No. What did the minister say? Would he go back to that written piece he read to us earlier and read me the piece about Caledon Estates and approval so maybe we can understand that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our department responded to The Department of Municipal Affairs in May and June, 1970, indicating any approval should not be given to the subdivision until the Ontario Parks Integration Board had had the opportunity of determining what lands might be required for public purposes and approving subsequent purchase of them.

Mr. Singer: Now in relation to that statement the minister has just read, what particular T file in The Department of Municipal Affairs did it relate to?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member will have to ask The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: The minister does not know? Is there any memo in his department that indicates how that information was conveyed to The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We indicated to The Department of Municipal Affairs our interest in that area and that no subdivision plan should be approved without our consent and no subdivision plan had been approved.

Mr. Singer: Fine! Has the minister ever seen a circulation from The Department of Municipal Affairs that goes to Lands and Forests and almost everybody else in the world asking for their comment when a plan of subdivision is submitted for draft approval? Has he ever seen the correspondence emanating out of the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs in regard to this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My officials deal with these matters.

Mr. Singer: The minister's officials? All right. When his officials or whoever drafted that memo for him—the one that he read to us that he does not understand—apparently conveyed that information to Municipal Affairs, it must have been in relation to a specific plan or application for a plan. Can the minister tell me which specific application it referred to? And I tell the minister it would be identified by a T number.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, the member should ask The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: No, I am asking the minister because it came out of his department and you just do not write memos in the air. You identify it in some way.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I did not write any memos.

Mr. Singer: Has the minister never heard of the theory of cabinet responsibility? Does he believe at this stage—he is not a newcomer to the ministry; he has been at it quite some time—that he is going to successfully be able to take shelter behind the fact that "I, the minister, did not do it?" He is responsible for everything that happens in his department.

Now I ask the minister to advise me in relation to what specific request that memo, if it was a memo, was in fact written. Could he find out for me now before we go any further?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member will have to ask The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: No, I am asking the minister because it is departmental correspondence emanating out of Lands and Forests. Now if the department is writing Municipal Affairs, it is concerning a specific matter, is it not? Is that not correct?

All right, the minister obviously does not know, obviously does not care to find out, obviously holds this House in complete and

utter contempt, and obviously holds the people of Ontario in complete and utter contempt.

Let me ask the minister another question. How many applications are presently in Municipal Affairs for approval of draft plans for subdivision for lands in the Niagara Escarpment area submitted by Caledon Mountain Estates? Is there one, or two, or five, or 10? Does the minister know that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Singer: You do not know—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That comes under Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: We asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the third time, and he does not know. So this minister does not know either, is that right? And he does not care to find out?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Those applications, Mr. Chairman, go directly to The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: But it is circulated to you.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. They ask for our views and we submit our views to them.

Mr. Singer: Then there must be a file in your office where you set your views out. Where is the file?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In our office.

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister not bring it here so that he can answer our questions?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Why do you not ask the right department?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These questions refer to The Department of Municipal Affairs, and that is where they should be directed.

Mr. Singer: They do not refer to The Department of Municipal Affairs, they refer to actions in the minister's department and as the responsible minister, bringing these estimates here and asking for the approval of this House to these expenditures, he has a duty and a responsibility to all the people of Ontario to inform himself and to tell us honestly and frankly what, in fact, has gone on and not to play this shadowy game of saying, "I do not know. I did not do it. Maybe my officials did it. Maybe it is Municipal Affairs. Maybe it is Public Works." It is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman.

May I ask the minister another question? Has he been able to ascertain whether or not there were any evaluations made for the purchase of the 505 acres? Any written evaluations?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: That is The Department of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —I am sure that I told this hon. member on Friday that the land acquisitions are carried in the Ontario Department of Public Works. They have experts in this field. They have negotiated it at a fair market price. Expropriation was not necessary, and it was a fair market price that they obtained.

Mr. Singer: I did not ask the minister his opinion as to its fairness or unfairness. I asked the minister before, and I ask him again now, has the minister been able to ascertain whether there were any written evaluations prepared either by any governmental official or by any independent person knowledgeable about land values in relation to this land? Now, can the minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member will have to ask that question of The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Singer: Public Works—that is right. All right, that is fine. Can the minister tell us what specific instruction he gave to The Department of Public Works insofar as the acquisition of this land is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. This matter was discussed at the Ontario Parks Integration Board, and like most land acquisitions we request Public Works to negotiate a price that can be recommended, a recommended price, and then they go in and negotiate and report back to the board.

Mr. Peacock: So the minister must know what they came back with.

Mr. Singer: All right then, Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell us, when these discussions were going on, were they ever reduced to written memoranda emanating from The Department of Lands and Forests or did he just talk off the top of his head like he is doing so badly now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, these matters were discussed at the OPIB meetings. The members of Public Works report to us, they give us a verbal and sometimes a written statement, and we decide whether we accept

this or not, and if we feel that the price is not fair we will maybe recommend that they expropriate. In this case, they mentioned to us the price, they mentioned the price of the adjoining lands and so forth, and we thought that the price was a fair price. We still believe it is a fair price.

Mr. Singer: All right. Could the minister tell me when Public Works was instructed to proceed in this way, if the minister told them how much money he had to spend?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We told them that we were interested in about 500 acres, and it turned out it was 506 acres. They came back to us and they said that the price range was in this bracket, so we said, "Go back and negotiate further." They went back and they negotiated and reported back to us and then they told us the price that they had arrived at, which included the easement, which included the restrictions on the cutting of trees and all those added values, and we thought this was a fair price and we accepted that.

Mr. Singer: Okay, well we are making a little progress. The minister tells us he told them they wanted about 500 acres. Have you any memo that indicates how you communicated that information to them? Did you just sit around the table one day and say, "It would be a good idea, fellows, if we got 500 acres in there"? Or did you give them written instructions? Did you perhaps give them a map? Is there any of that information available in your department records at all as to how those instructions were in fact conveyed?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the minutes of the board. We have a group of planners within our own department and they went in and looked over the area and they decided on a specific area and then this report was submitted to the parks integration board and subsequently to the board. Then we asked Public Works to go in and to acquire these lands, and we would negotiate for them.

Mr. Singer: And are you not telling me there was a report from somebody that you submitted as yours?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Singer: Is the minister not telling me that his planners gave him a report, which made this recommendation, which was the report that in fact went on to The Department of Public Works? Is that what the minister says?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My people give me continuous reports on lands that should be acquired. They are the experts on this kind of planning. They submitted a report to me. They went in and looked over this area, and then they submitted a report to me and recommended that we acquire this. This is normal procedure.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about what generally is the normal procedure, or what his officials do. What I am trying to get at is the method by which specific instructions were conveyed in this instance—only in this instance—to The Department of Public Works, which indicated to them they should go and get the 500 acres. Now is there a report that says that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I can tell you. I believe it was on September 3, 1970, when the board—that is the Parks Integration Board—requested Public Works to carry out the appraisal and to negotiate the land in question. It is the Ontario Parks Integration Board.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now on what basis did the board make that decision? Was it on the basis of a verbal report made by this minister, or by one of his officials, or was there, in fact, as is usual in most business establishments, a written report summarizing your recommendations, perhaps with maps attached, and perhaps with the area outlined, so it could clearly be identified? You just cannot go and buy land out of the air.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, but our people looked the area over. They have assessed it. We have information in our files about the value of the area in question so I fail, Mr. Chairman, to understand just what the hon. member is trying to ascertain.

Mr. Singer: The minister understands full well, or else he is far more stupid than anybody in this House imagines.

If the minister does not understand that you just cannot give general instructions out of the air about the purchase of land then I guess there is no hope for him at all. But I know, having known him for many years, the minister is not a stupid man. He must know that you just cannot instruct people to go and buy an unknown quantity of land and to spend government money on it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was not unknown.

Mr. Singer: I am asking the minister specifically to bring before this House the

memo that indicated how much land he wanted to acquire.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Those are minutes; the minutes of the Parks Integration Board, and the minutes of the secretary to me. The size of the area is clearly indicated. There is some information as to the reasons why we should acquire this, and also a map indicating the area. So all this information is in our files.

Mr. Singer: Then if it is there, why does the minister not, since it is now such an important issue, bring those documents, or extracts from them, before this House, or at least read us what they say? Because this is what we are trying to find out about. Is that possible or does he refuse to do that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not too sure, Mr. Chairman, whether a lot of these reports are confidential. Some are not. I am not too sure exactly what the member has in mind.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely my questions are not that devious. They are quite simple. I want to know the basis on which the request was made of The Department of Public Works.

Did you (a) instruct them to get a designated 500 or 560 acres? Did you (b) tell them how much money you had to spend for it? Did you discuss with them at all the question of—well I have lost the minister again, he is telling jokes to his civil servants. Did you tell them, or mention to them, whether or not you were interested in the other 550, 560, or 570 acres?

That is what we would like to find out. That is most relevant to this issue, and if the minister will not tell us that, or now has discovered that maybe it is in secret documents, then he should say that.

I think it is about time he became frank and honest with the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, personally I would have no objection to make available minutes of the Parks Integration Board. At the same time, I feel I would like to ascertain whether this is proper.

But those minutes—I have looked them over during the weekend. They are straightforward. We indicate the size that we wanted. I have indicated to the member that we are also interested in two of the other parcels of land in that area—that we also wish to acquire these.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am obviously getting nowhere. Let me just summarize for the record this. This debate and the minister's estimates on this particular subject started last Thursday. It raged all of Thursday afternoon—and the minister was saved by the House leader on Thursday night—all Friday morning, and today is Monday. We have gone Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday and the questions directed to the minister by the opposition have not really changed in essence. We want to find out what you are doing.

The minister has refused to tell us; he and his colleagues, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Public Works apparently only know segregated little things. The Minister of Lands and Forests has a better dodge; he says, "I, personally, did not do it." He refuses to accept the theory of parliamentary or cabinet responsibility which certainly should be well known to anyone who has sat here as long as this minister. He refuses to tell us the basis on which the instructions were given. He says maybe he will go back and look and see if maybe the minutes could be made available to us. It should be of no great surprise to him this afternoon that this is what we have been after.

No one can tell us with any authority and without the story changing from moment to moment whether or not here have been approvals of subdivisions. One day, they have been approved; the next day they have not been approved. Whether there are subdivision applications presently pending, nobody knows how many there are. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was struck dumb this afternoon. The Minister of Lands and Forests says his officials did something on Friday—yes, they approved, and today apparently they did not. Whatever they did not approve of, the minister cannot identify for us by a Municipal Affairs department number.

One must think, Mr. Chairman, one must conclude that the devious and obtuse method with which this minister is—

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): I do not think that is parliamentary.

Mr. Singer: —proceeding is designed to hide something which he and his colleagues do not want to see the light of day.

I would think that even if there have been serious mistakes committed in government administrations, this minister and his colleagues would have been far better advised to be honest and frank with the Legislature and with the public. They have been far less than that, and other than expressing our sentiment

in the vote on the amendment that I moved earlier, I do not know that we can get too much further. Trying to get straightforward answers out of this minister is just like trying to fight your way out of a wet paper bag; it is absolutely impossible. He is a nice fellow. He is not stupid, but he just refuses to face this issue and to give us frank and honest answers.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The hon. member for Downsview made reference to a motion.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Has that motion been placed before the committee?

Mr. Singer: Yes, sir, it was placed by me last Friday.

Mr. Chairman: No, has the Chairman placed the motion before the committee?

Mr. Singer: I think so. I moved that they—

Mr. Chairman: I have a written motion but I am not sure whether it has been placed before the committee or not.

Mr. Singer: I think it has been.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I know that the member for Downsview has covered most of the ground that the minister was supposed to answer for. I go back to his answer to the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) about the recommendation of The Department of Lands and Forests on the request for subdivision approval by Caledon Estates. It was the same answer that the member for Downsview asked the minister to read again and, if I can paraphrase it as closely as possible, it goes something like this: "The plan of subdivision was not to be given approval by The Department of Municipal Affairs until the Ontario Parks Integration Board had the opportunity to see what the public need was."

That is a paraphrase of what I took the minister to say in the answer to the last question he gave us this afternoon. That his department would not put its imprimatur, its seal of approval, on the application for a plan of subdivision by Caledon Estates until Lands and Forests, or rather the Ontario Parks Integration Board, had determined what lands were needed for public use.

What I want to ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, is about the determination of the 506 acres and I would repeat a question by the member for Downsview into the judgement to acquire only the 540 acres rather than all of the lands given priority by Gertler which fell within the boundaries of the request for approval of the plan of subdivision? I think the question was raised earlier.

Mr. Singer: It must have been the responsibility of the Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. White: Part of it.

Mr. Peacock: If the 504 acres was the determination of the Parks Integration Board as the area of lands needed for public use, did that determination automatically release the request for subdivision approval from The Department of Lands and Forests and, so to speak return it to Municipal Affairs for its disposition? Was that automatic, that once having determined upon the 504 acres, Lands and Forests said, "That is it. We have no further interest in the request for subdivision approval." Or did The Department of Lands and Forests actually make some recommendation to The Department of Municipal Affairs about the balance of the land, saying, "We have determined upon the 504 acres: What you do insofar as Caledon's wish to develop the rest of the 170 acres is your business in Municipal Affairs."

What did the minister or his department say in respect of the balance of the land? Did the department give its approval or its recommendation for its use as proposed by Caledon Estates or did it oppose or object to the use that Caledon wanted to make of the balance of the 1,070 acres?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, our people, as I mentioned earlier went into this area, looked it over, and they decided on a choice site where the Credit River flows through. They decided to acquire about 500 acres, which is choice land. They also wanted to make sure that the Bruce Trail was protected—and the Bruce Trail is protected for about 1½ miles, a strip 20 feet wide—and that if a subdivision was in there, that there would be no tree cutting on the western slope.

They also looked at land in the adjoining area, which could become part of this proposed park, and the land in the adjoining area did not command as high a price as the land that they purchased. Therefore with these considerations, the fact that we

had a choice parcel of land, we had the Bruce Trail protected, we had these restrictions and also that we have adjoining land that we are in the process of acquiring—all these things together make the reasons why we came to these decisions.

Again, the price of land is high in that area, as the hon. member knows, and again, I would like to repeat we have a limited budget; so, with the amount of money available we thought—and we still do—that we made a good acquisition at a fair price.

Mr. Peacock: It has already been pointed out—and it should not be allowed to be repeated by the minister without challenge—that price has nothing to do with it if this government is determined to acquire the land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We only have so much money available. Budget limitations are a consideration in government policy. There is only so much available for parkland, for highways, for health and so forth. Sure, it is easy for those people sitting over there to suggest more welfare, more social benefits, more parkland, more of anything, but where would they find the money? where would you find the money?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We told the minister the other day.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): How about the $1.5 million he threw away?

Mr. Peacock: I will tell the minister—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They would go bankrupt like any other socialist country.

Mr. Lawlor: There are different forms of bankruptcy.

Mr. Peacock: If The Department of Lands and Forests said to Municipal Affairs, "Do not approve the request for subdivision control," does the minister think that the Caledon Estates would get the values out of the land that it proposes to get out once they are developed? Not a whit. It would not get anything like the $22,000 to $28,000 per lot in the surrounding 1,070 acres if that minister said to his colleague, "Do not approve the request for subdivision."

The government's declared intention to buy would freeze the value, whether he mentioned the word "expropriation" or not to Caledon Mountain Estates. And all of that land, the priority lands recommended by Gertler, could have been acquired.

What we do not know, Mr. Chairman, is how the Ontario Parks Integration Board reached its judgement to acquire only 504 acres and so instruct The Department of Public Works. We do not know whether OPIB instructed DPW to go after additional lands, the whole 1,070 acres, or not. We do not know whether the minister or the OPIB gave DPW the right to go ahead and get more lands within the priority recommended by Gertler. We do not know what the effect of the OPIB determination was upon the request for subdivision by Caledon Mountain Estates. We do not know whether that determination released Caledon Mountain Estates' application from all further entanglement with Lands and Forests and left Municipal Affairs to decide what to do with it. We do not know whether the Minister of Lands and Forests objected to the plan of subdivision submitted to Municipal Affairs by Caledon Mountain Estates.

None of this do we know. All we know, Mr. Chairman, is what the minister has done, the amount of land he has purchased, what he has paid for it, how it increased in value by the time he purchased it and how far all of that falls short of what was recommended by Gertler and what apparently was a policy commitment on the part of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

On May 22, the Minister of Trade and Development will officially open Ontario Place at a cost some $10 million over estimate, and yet the Minister of Lands and Forests tells us he cannot get another several million dollars to round out the purchases that Gertler recommended. That is what we know.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I did not say that, Mr. Chairman. I said that we, in our land acquisition, are limited by the amount of money available. At the same time—

Mr. Peacock: The Minister of Trade and Development was under some limit, was he not?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): He is going to get that all back again.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the same time, I do believe that there will be a certain amount of funds available in the announcement of the provincial Treasurer in the $20 million bank fund that will be used for parkland purposes.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There will be now, but there were not before. There will be now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Lewis: If there was not before, there will be money now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is stated right here —"recreational lands"—and the Niagara Escarpment would certainly lend itself for this very purpose.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The implication, Mr. Chairman, has been made on more than one occasion that this minister is not familiar with the duties of his department, that he is too soft in his dealings with his cabinet colleagues. Frankly, I reject all of those implications. I believe he is thoroughly familiar with the dealings in his department but he lacks one thing, and that is the thrust to exert his own feelings on policy that is enunciated by his cabinet colleagues.

I have had an opportunity to question the Minister of Public Works at the committee meeting that was held with this committee last week, having to do with the methods of acquisition of the lands that have been debated here for so many hours. I felt that minister's statements were not at odds with what the Minister of Lands and Forests was saying at just about the same time in the House, except that both ministers attempted, fairly or unfairly, to indicate that the main responsibility lay with the other minister.

Perhaps they are not mutually exclusive. The Minister of Lands and Forests has said, it is true, that under the direction of his department, the decision is made as to what specific land should be acquired. The information is then given to Public Works, which then must go forward on procedures for which they alone are responsible for the purchase of those lands.

In talking to the two ministers, in listening to their answers, in comparing their answers in the written report, I do not see that there is anything mutually exclusive in those two statements, and yet here once again there is a feeling that the two ministers do not even talk to each other in the cabinet dining room, that in fact there is not the kind of communication between the two of them. And perhaps just as important, the Minister of Municipal Affairs—who also has been asked to give specific information pertaining to the land deal and more than one deal that has been discussed in the last few days—seems to be powerless to exert the responsibility that must be his in Lands and Forests, that must come ahead of the other two ministers when we are talking about the acquisition of parks and recreation lands, that obviously he is the one who must have the main responsibility for the utilization of the funds that he was just referring to that are going to be associated with the land bank which was a part of the Treasurer's statement a few days ago.

Now, I do not intend to reiterate the questions that have been put by the member for Downsview and others, because the minister opposite has refused to use his position of authority to co-ordinate the information that lies in his own department and two other departments to satisfy the questioners. The implication is that it is not possible to gather that information in such a way that will be satisfactory. Surely, with the time that has been at the disposal of the Minister of Lands and Forests, he could have co-ordinated the information as to the status of the application for plans of subdivision in the Caledon area by the Caledon Mountain Estates Limited corporation.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs was not prepared to give that information, and there are no estimates currently underway which will enable us to question him closely in that regard. The Minister of Public Works, when we pursued this very same line of questioning, indicated in the committee that was meeting in another place and late last week that he felt that the plan of subdivision had not gone forward and that in fact the owners of the lands would have been left with a large area of land upon which a plan of subdivision would not be approved.

In response to his answer I said, "It looks like the original owner is going to be left with his own large park," and the minister indicated that that was what he thought as well. So there is great difficulty on our side of the House to get the kind of information which is not that detailed but which obviously has a tremendous role to play in fathoming the course of the government in deciding which lands to buy and which lands to postpone in their purchase, even though the recommendations have been available and strongly put to the government for the last three years.

The minister makes a good point, you cannot buy all the land at once, that he is hamstrung by budgetary limitations, but obviously the availability of the $20 million a year that was supposed to have been available over the last 10 years for parks projects and recreation projects has been a substantial sum indeed which the minister and his predecessor have not used effectively.

Now we are coming into a new approach of the acquisition of public land. It has a new name, land bank programme, and is being funded in very much the same way as was announced I believe back in 1966 with a special fund for the purchase of recreational and park land. There is nothing too new there. And the amounts, as far as I am concerned, while they appear in absolute terms to be impressive are not particularly impressive in relationship to the rest of the provincial budget. I do not believe the commitment is large enough to begin with or that its organization has been directed to the appropriate department and in an understandable way.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the minister has a number of alternatives in his recommendations to the Premier and to his cabinet colleagues. Essentially, we are now debating a resolution which will reduce the minister's appropriation by $15,000, an amount identical with the minister's salary. This is the only way we have of indicating by our vote that we disapprove, not only of the government's policy in this regard, but in the administration that this minister has undertaken, which is a very high responsibility indeed, to be sure that it is understandable by objective observers and some that are not so objective, that everything was done in the best public interest for the conservation not only of very valuable public lands but of very scarce public dollars.

Now his first alternative is to recommend to the Premier (Mr. Davis) that we dispel the problems associated with this by having a judicial inquiry. I of course understand the minister's reluctance to do this. The implication is that there is something rotten in the administration of his department and we want to know the facts and figures associated with the negotiations with a number of individuals and corporations on the acquisition of this property, why the evaluation of the land was so high.

The minister has pointed out, correctly, that the responsibility for the evaluation is with the Minister of Public Works, and why in fact there were not impartial evaluations, why not proceed by expropriation. Which is not such a horrendous procedure when you understand that that simply means the courts will devise the value on such public land. I do not think there is anything wrong with that kind of a procedure because we have legislation now which is designed to safeguard the interests, not only of the public—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): It could cost more.

Mr. Nixon: —not only of the public who want the land, but of the people who own the land in the first place and are not going to have the land gouged out of them by some special powers of government. There is no reason why this is not an alternative in the acquisition of public lands that the minister should not consider.

This whole means of expropriation was used by, for example, conservation authorities, over many years for the development of large areas of public lands which the conservation authorities wanted to use. The last time the government faced problems in the acquisition of public lands was through expropriation, and the minister may remember the controversy over the Gordon Pittock land properties in Woodstock. In that case the government was forced by public opinion not to have a judicial inquiry but to establish a select committee, which I guess took the heat off them to some extent, which was one of the purposes, as far as the government was concerned.

But it had a salutary effect. It certainly disciplined those leaders in conservation authorities who were prepared to ride roughshod over private land owners. But it also was the basis for a new expropriation procedures Act, which I, for one, think is a good one and which does satisfy the requirements and safeguards individuals as well as put forward the public interest. And, of course, it is a good balance. It is a good judicial balance and I recommend it to the study—in fact, the use—of the hon. minister opposite.

If you are not going to recommend a judicial inquiry, which we in the Liberal Party feel is the best means to dispel the uncertainty about the acquisition of these lands, then there are two alternatives remaining. One alternative could be used immediately, and that is a reference, on the minister's motion to the standing committee on natural resources. Obviously the committees are busy, but if the minister were to put such a motion before the House he could be sure of support on all sides.

That committee, with the powers that it has, could call the hon. minister himself, his colleague the Minister of Public Works and his other colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and their civil servants, and the files appropriate to these particular land acquisitions. So, in one room, with the powers represented by this Legislature, there would be

no particular witch-hunt, but we would be able to co-ordinate the facts that have been missing in the series of questions that have been put to the minister.

In my view, unless the minister, or at least the ministry, has something to hide, this would be the best all-round solution. But I can see why he would want to avoid a judicial inquiry. The overtones there are perhaps a little rich for even the ministry opposite to undertake. But a reference by the government to the Legislature, putting the whole matter before the standing committee on natural resources, is a most reasonable reference indeed, and would, in fact, show that the Premier, who has often said he wants to upgrade the status of these committees, is serious in what he puts forward.

Now the final alternative—and, as I say, this would not be the best as far as I am concerned, but it is one which should be considered—is that the minister could recommend to the Premier the establishment of a select committee, and that one again would represent the views of all parties of the Legislature, and it would do something that the minister is so concerned with.

A few moments ago, in answer to the comments made by the hon. member for Windsor West, he said: "Well, of course, you people in opposition would deal with this easily. You would just spend more money and probably you would go broke like socialist governments everywhere"—something like that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the problem that the minister faces is that he does not have a broad enough base of advice in land acquisition. Perhaps during the last few days he has been getting more advice than he wants from sources even other than the opposition, because I think some of his own colleagues are deeply concerned at the embarrassing position this minister has been left in by others responsible for the problem.

Mr. Singer: They do not even sit with him.

Mr. Nixon: And they will not come in and assist him in answering these questions. I think there is a certain feeling of sympathy on all sides for this particular minister in this regard.

But if this select committee was empowered to look into these particular land transactions and also examine the balancing of an admittedly limited budget for the acquisition of land with the large numbers of valuable land tracts available, then the minister would not have the decision as to which lands to buy and which lands to reject so much on his own shoulders and even those of the Parks Integration Board, that mysterious group that meets on occasion somewhere else.

I feel the community is so deeply concerned with the need for a broad programme in the acquisition of land that such a select committee would have the power to examine specifically these problems. But beyond that, it could travel out to the site concerned, have hearings with the people in the conservation authority, even with the people who own the property and do not want to give it up. They should be able to say: "You should not expropriate this because . . ." and give some reason, because in my view expropriation is going to be one of the most effective and the safest means of carrying forward a substantial land acquisition programme.

I am just saying to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that he would get the support of the community and the advice of the community in a way which would be, for one thing, politically fortuitous and for another, involve the community in programmes in which they have very deep personal commitments themselves.

So I would say to the minister, Mr. Chairman, we are calling for the reduction of his salary and we would intend to have a division in the House on the basis of that motion. But it is in that form most specifically because we cannot move a motion under our rules and under these circumstances which would in effect have the House approve the establishment of some kind of a committee.

There are the three alternatives that I put before you. We in the Liberal Party feel that the minister should make a motion referring this matter to the committee on natural resources, but there are two other alternatives. I hope that from the three he can select one which meets his own needs, because I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the information available to use on this side of the House in the present circumstances is inadequate. It indicates that the minister, in his powers to administer the department, is inadequate, particularly in the light of the support that is missing from his cabinet colleagues in this sensitive and important matter.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I listened with great interest to the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. As far as I am concerned, if the committee on natural resources felt it was advisable to have a discussion on the Niagara Escarpment, we would be prepared

to go there. It would be very interesting. I think it would be very enlightening to have maps to show the areas we have acquired. There is a lot of information available. And I for one, Mr. Chairman, would be pleased, if the committee so desired.

Mr. Nixon: If the minister would favour that kind of a reference, would he do two things? Would he undertake to have a motion put before the House referring this matter to the committee which, as I understand, is necessary under the new rules? And, second, would he undertake to speak to his colleagues in the other two departments mentioned, so that the ministers, the officials and the appropriate files would be available in one room at one time before a committee empowered to investigate these matters? And the officials of Caledon Estates should be there as well.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this would be up to the discretion of the committee.

Mr. Nixon: I think, Mr. Chairman, the minister is aware that in recent days with the reconstitution of the committees, it has been necessary for the government to move a motion getting the support of at least a majority, and so far unanimous, support of the Legislature, for a reference to some specific matter to the committee.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this would be the appropriate procedure and one that the minister should undertake.

Mr. Chairman: Just on a point of clarification, on—I think—Friday, Mr. Singer took the first step in placing a motion to reduce the salary, but it was not carried through because—

Mr. Singer: The motion has not yet been placed.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it has not been placed. Does the member wish it to be placed?

Mr. Singer: I do indeed, sir, when the debate is over.

Mr. Nixon: Just before you place the motion, is the minister prepared to give us a further undertaking, other than the one he said that if the committee wants to look into it, they may? Would he undertake to give the proposition of a reference some further consideration, at least?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would just like to reiterate what I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that if the committee on natural resources felt they wanted to have a discussion on the Niagara Escarpment, I would be pleased to go there with my officials.

Mr. Nixon: The minister must surely see the problem that is faced by the representatives in the Legislature, on this side at least, in co-ordinating the information that should be available from the three departments, and the company.

The minister is surely aware, having been part of the questioning, of the difficulties that we face. The organization of the Legislature does have means whereby this kind of co-ordination could take place. He is surely aware, however, that if the position is put in committee by a member of the opposition the majority supporting the minister and his party will probably vote it down, unless the minister gives the lead.

The minister has an opportunity to open this up—firstly, to share the responsibility with those with whom it should be shared, and secondly, to make a clean breast of all of the facts and figures associated with this matter. I simply submit to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that unless he would undertake to recommend to his cabinet colleagues that such a referral takes place that the chances of it occurring are not very great. There would be a tendency for his supporters to follow the lead of the minister and say, "Well, the minister has been as reasonable as he can be in this regard." But he has not taken that step which would permit the co-ordination of the information which really must be available for a full disclosure of the facts.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should just speak for matters that come under my responsibility, under the administration of The Department of Lands and Forests. I feel again, that if the committee on natural and physical resources wishes to have our department appear before it to give information on the Niagara Escarpment, as it concerns our department, we would be pleased to do so.

Mr. Nixon: I will not pursue this further because I feel that the minister wants to have a forum in which there can be the kind of examination of all the facts that will get him out from under a cloud which, I would say, Mr. Chairman, has definitely come up over the horizon with regard to this particular job. Will he undertake to consult with his colleagues in government about the possibility of having such a referral?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Chairman, as far as our department is concerned, I would be pleased to appear any time before the committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it is my understanding that this motion is presently before the committee of the Whole House. Am I correct in that?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: No, not really, not officially. I have not placed the motion yet. There was an understanding that we would hold it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, pursuing my point of order, I indicated if the minister could satisfy me, I might withdraw it. He has not satisfied me, so it is not withdrawn. May I ask then that it be put and that the debate be allowed to continue on?

Mr. Chairman: I will place the motion then. Mr. Singer moves that item 1 of vote 1103 be reduced by $15,000.

Is there any further discussion on this?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, alas I was not here at 3 o'clock to hear the discussion which took place. My colleague from Windsor West, I think, has filled me in fairly fully, and I suspect that I have not missed that much. Not too many revelations came from the minister by way of supplementing his answers last Friday and Thursday on the matter of Caledon Mountain Estates, particularly, and the escarpment in general.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this minister and I do not entirely understand this debate, and I must say that many of us are rather perplexed about it. I think the minister is searching frantically for a way of getting himself off the hook and his department off the hook, without incriminating further of his colleagues.

His colleagues, on the other hand, are taking him aside in the corridor of Queen's Park and saying in effect, "Rene, you are going to have to take the rap for this, because the rest of us do not want to get involved. We do not want to get involved, not because something is rotten in the state of Denmark, but because it is too complicated and it was too incompetently handled and it was too inappropriately dealt with. We just do not want the general inadequacy of government revealed in public terms, so you keep quiet. You answer nothing. You pretend it is our responsibility. Our estimates will never come before the House in the immediate aftermath of this questioning—I do not see The Department of Municipal Affairs on the lineup for estimates—and hopefully the whole matter will blow over and generally then be forgotten."

I see here a very quiet and considered cabinet decision to put the top on the whole issue, to just get it out of sight, to do everything within its power to prevent the legitimate answers from being given.

The minister had a whole weekend. He had from Friday at 1 o'clock until 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I was in Windsor this morning.

Mr. Lewis: I was in London this morning and I am prepared to ask some questions that I asked before, hoping that answers would be available, but they are not available. They have not been available from this minister from the beginning of the debate.

Let me tell the minister what perplexes me about it further, Mr. Chairman, if I can be permitted to think as I am going, as it were.

I do not like the $15,000 mechanism either. None of us in this party particularly does, but it is one of the few ways in which we can demonstrate our lack of confidence in government. I am not enamoured of a select committee idea because I have learned from painful experience of the select committees in this House that that is a stall which can take us through to 1980 before we can have any considered action. Although I will support the proposition and we in this party will support the proposition of a reference to the standing committee on natural resources, that does not please us either. It does not please us for two reasons.

1. Because it becomes immediately apparent that this has not been seriously considered by cabinet and that the other ministers are unlikely to be there at the same time to give the answers.

2. Most important of all, I do not think this minister should be left off the hook that way. Mr. Chairman, these are the estimates of Lands and Forests. This is the minister responsible for answering the questions and although it pains me to say so, I want to tell him as a friend and as a minister, if he cannot answer the questions then leave the cabinet, because he should not be holding his portfolio.

There is not a thing that has been asked in the Legislature in the last four days with which the minister should not now be familliar. There is not a question that is in any

sense extravagant or unjustified. There is not a thing of which he does not have knowledge; he could give the answers to them all. He is giving us this stonewalled, inscrutable front, not a word. Just a few gentle, friendly protestations, and if he cannot, handle the portfolio on something as simple and as crucial as this, then the minister can resign, because that is a simple alternative and we will then get someone else in to answer the questions.

Everything we are doing in this House is facilitating the minister's comfort and denying answers to the public. If we pretend that reference to a committee will solve it then, as I stand here, I am prepared to predict that we will have all kinds of difficulty getting the committee together; getting all the civil servants there; getting, as the member for Downsview so correctly pointed out, the representatives of Caledon Mountain Estates in the same room, at the same time—the minister, the Parks Integration Board, all the relevant material. It will suddenly become very difficult; more than difficult—it will become unorthodox government practice that such a thing should happen.

The willingness of the minister to share with us his confidences will have been frustrated not, of course, by the minister, who wishes to extend himself to everybody, but by his cabinet colleagues, who do not wish to convey the information. It is just not good enough. In another season, one would call it a snow job. You are engaged in an effective piece of politicking and it is an extremely frustrating business for the opposition, let me tell you.

You know, as you sit there, what arrangement was made with Caledon Mountain Estates. You know whether or not the subdivision land will now be approved. You indicated what it was contingent on in June, 1970, if the notes from my colleague from Windsor West are accurate, as I am sure they are. The implication is clear. The 504 acres having been cleared, the subdivision approval would go through.

You have had a chance to consult with your colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. What farce is being made of government in the process? To what shambles are you reducing responsible government? What confusion exists over there in the cabinet? What absurdity is all of this? We have a legislative process. We have estimates.

The opposition, acting as an opposition should act, comes before you and asks you specific questions. You say you have not got the answers. You must return for them. You return for them. Days pass. Four or five days pass. You have an entire civil service apparatus from whom to draw and you walk into this Legislature, tail between legs, humble, apologetic, and not a single answer worthy of the name comes from the minister.

Well, I repeat it. It grieves me to repeat it. But you should step out of the cabinet if you cannot handle the portfolio, because this is not a game we are playing. This is a serious matter of public business and you are as competent to handle it, I suspect, as any other member, if you were given the opportunity to do so. But, for whatever reason over there, it is not happening.

A lot of us in this caucus, Mr. Minister, through the Chair, would not mind engaging in a filibuster on this situation. We would not mind taking you through, hour by hour, day by day, until we broke it down, because that is what estimates are for, to ask legitimate questions. We cannot even do that, because the new rules of the House so confine and order the hours of estimates that if we were to prolong this unduly, then major estimates at the end of the session would be frustrated and in terms of all obligations, we cannot engage in that either. So, look at how neatly you have manipulated the legislative process.

You do not have the answers. Public Works is off the griddle—neatly, just after the estimates are through committee. The Department of Municipal Affairs is nowhere to be seen. The Department of Energy and Resources Management is nowhere to be seen. The provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is nowhere to be seen and I do not mean just physically seen, having deserted you in the front benches, in this your time of travail.

And the estimates are not called, either in committee or before the House.

Mr. Singer: And Billy is not here to take the responsibility either.

Mr. Lewis: And the Premier—who sits so restlessly between you and your colleagues, hoping quietly to himself that somehow it is a bizarre nightmare that will disappear, washed away by the new wave—is not even here this afternoon, when you are prepared to give your answers. Well, maybe he is appropriately involved in public business. That is not for me to say. But none of the others who are directly involved are now present—not a one.

And then you say you will support a reference to committee. How magnanimous! The way the committee structure now works, we need a formal motion from the cabinet minister responsible.

When we wanted to discuss the costs of education, the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) had to rise in his seat and move a motion. When we wanted to discuss the cost of University Affairs, the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) had to rise in his seat and move a motion. When we wanted to discuss day-care centres, the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) had to rise in his seat and move a motion.

Why are you not rising in your seat and giving a public commitment to the Legislature, as the minister responsible, that you will move a motion for reference to committee? And why will you not detail that motion, specifying those amongst your colleagues and civil servants who should attend?

I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman. Because the government has no intention of pursuing it. Because the government is quite prepared to participate in the entire fiasco, to reduce this legislative process to some kind of travesty and refuse to give the answers to simple, legitimate, responsible questions around a compelling political issue.

That does not serve you well, as a minister. Year in and year out, Mr. Chairman, the minister comes in, friendly, amiable, charming, and gives his estimates. We share it with him. We know the kind of person he is. Then the crunch comes and the minister collapses.

It is not good enough. It is not the way government is run. I am saying to the minister that although we feel truly boxed-in by all of this, we will vote for that diminution in salary with enthusiasm and we will find a way of bringing it before the House.

It is, I suppose, legitimate for an opposition party, one or the other of us—I am not interested in one-upmanship—to bring before the House a motion detailing this to the committee on natural resources tomorrow, before the orders of the day, and indicating the ministers and the civil servants who should be there. Then we will see whether the government is prepared to use that avenue, having closed off this one.

It is a shabby show that the minister has participated in. We have not seen the like of it for a number of months in this House. It is a shabby start for a so-called new cabinet, very few of whom have been here to rescue the minister. It is just another item in this crescendo of folly and difficulty which has harrassed you since the Throne Speech came down. One mistake after another, and instead of saving it you compound it. That is why you are in so much difficulty. That is why we are going to the polls in October and not in June.

I am assuming, Mr. Chairman, as I take my seat, that there are no further answers, that the minister absolutely refuses to give us the details and, as a result, we resort to whatever mechanisms are left. Let me then add the final point, Mr. Chairman.

We are voting to reduce the minister's salary by $15,000, not primarily because of his handling of Caledon Mountain Estates and his refusal to give information. Not primarily for that reason, although it measures high among the reasons. We are reducing his salary symbolically because we believe the government has made a considered judgement to surrender the entire escarpment to private abuse and speculative control. That offends us as a social issue more than any individual piece of incompetence that you can muster, but on both grounds our vote will be equally vigorous.

Mr. Chairman: The motion before the House is that of Mr. Singer who moved that item 1 of vote 1103 be reduced by $15,000.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are "34." the nays "45."

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Item 1 of vote 1103 is carried. We will now move to item 2, fish and wildlife. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to pursue in a little greater depth some of the items that I raised in the lead-off as it affects the fish and wildlife vote.

I would like to find out from the minister, if I may, how many conservation officers are employed at the present time, how much of an increase it was over last year, and whether any additional funds have been voted to acquire the services of more conservation officers.

I drew to the attention of the minister on numerous occasions the inadequacy of the

regulations controlling the hunting and fishing laws in the province—how inadequate they were at the present time. We have some conservation officers covering an area of 2,500 square miles. Indeed, it has even been suggested by some of the conservation officers that they are restricted to a certain number of miles per week and when they have logged those they are restricted to base until the following week.

I am wondering whether this has been one of the reasons for the morale of the department's new classification, the resource technicians. I am wondering if the minister has given any thought to the new policy of reclassification of forest technicians, wildlife technicians and rangers in the one group, with very little, if any, consideration given to the particular skills required to follow out those particular duties. I would like to find out from the minister just what progress has been made in the department over the past couple of years when this problem came to the front.

How many conservation officers are there; what is the complement at this time; has there been an increase over the past year; and will any additional funds in the wildlife vote go toward recruiting additional conservation officers?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the figures for the number of our conservation officers right now are close to 300—299.

The hon. member refers to morale. I find it hard to understand what he is referring to, because the morale of our staff is very high and there have been very few affected by the reclassification.

This reclassification is not because of the reorganization, but rather as part of an ongoing process of review of all series to ensure that all positions are properly classified. We have 1,362 positions in this new interlocking series and they were formerly in three separate series and practically all incumbents enjoyed an immediate upward increase in salary.

A few positions were affected by what they call the "red circle" process. That is, their salaries were frozen at the levels existing at the time of the reclassification. However, in most cases, the red circle procedure has been removed, either through transfer or restructuring of the position. Where employees have not been returned to their original salary levels, it is simply because they are not carrying out work that would justify the payment of higher rates.

It has also been inferred that the new series has lumped professionally trained staff with the non-professional staff. This is not a professional series, it is the technician series and staff reach technical competency by on-the-job experience and also by training.

Graduates of the forestry technical schools are recruited and this formal training is recognized by a starting salary of the minimum of the second level of the series. Non-graduates are recruited at the minimum of level 1, but both non-graduates and graduates can be advanced to level 3 and, since they are similar levels of complexity in work carried out, the series provides for equal pay.

The resource technicians senior series is restricted to graduates only and is the supervisory or specialist level. It is considered this more formal academic training is essential for positions at this level.

So. Mr. Chairman, I fail to understand. As I said, there have been very, very few who have not received an increase in salary.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to pursue this a little bit further, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I would like to quote from a letter that I got highlighting the objections that some of your staff had to the reclassifications, particularly in view of the time.

I quote from the letter:

> In regard to the letter you received from the department which you forwarded to me, we feel the purpose of the reclassification has been concealed. Why would they reclassify people two months prior to salary negotiation? They knew they would be looked upon with suspicion. Did they not want the conservation officers, as a special group, to get a justifiable raise and they thereby removed the classification?
>
> It says on the letter you sent, the first paragraph of page 2, they indicate equal pay for equal work. They maintain that this is not true.

And he says:

> Enclosed please find a copy of the preamble of the resource technician series as set out by the government. Please note that rangers who are now known as resource technicians are not allowed to do full-time fish and wildlife work if they do not have technical school training.
>
> However, for not having this training or responsibility, they are paid a maximum

of $3.60 an hour, the same as a conservation officer.

They are indicating there that you are not taking into consideration at all the two years required for technical training at what was formerly known as Dorset, so that you are lumping them all into one group and they are all getting the basic pay of $3.60 an hour. And I quote further from the letter:

Has the department informed the different schools that their students taking the forestry course when they graduate they will be classified as resource technicians, the same as a person who did not devote two years of his life to specialize in forestry?

It is now felt that the department can now use the reclassification to lower a man's pension. For example, a man in charge of keeping the warehouse clean is a resource technician. Let us say a conservation officer, now classed as a resource technician, is around 55 years old and earns $3.60 an hour, is judged by somebody to be too old to chase people or poachers on a ski-doo, so instead of promoting him they can now give him a broom in the warehouse and he does not lose any pay. But he is red-circled, which means he receives no pay boosts until his pay reaches a new level, which means 10 years later he could retire at an hourly pay of $3.60 per hour.

However, if he had remained as a conservation officer his job might, in 10 years, be worth $4 per hour.

This is a clear indication that, in their minds at least, the reclassification was done primarily to restrict increases or increments in the pension based on years of service having regard for the hourly pay over his working years. I will go on further. He said:

Did you know that when reclassification was first mentioned the forestry technicians and the president approached the minister in this regard and it was given a deaf ear?

Did you know that a vote across the province was just completed and they voted in favour of having the Civil Service Association represent them as a special case before the arbitration board in the forthcoming wage negotiations, and reclassification is the main question?

The forestry technicians feel that a person with two years extra schooling should be, in their field of work, equal to a person with his BA and not to a person who elects to go directly into the labour force. So if the minister can successfully answer those apprehensions of the people in his own department, I will be happy to pass it on to them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, conservation officers must work within the budget that is allocated for the fish and game management budget. Their work includes, of course, law enforcement patrols, projects for fish and wildlife management. And as I said earlier, most of the salaries have been increased, and if the member has some specific examples of some conservation officers who feel that they have been unfairly treated, if he would bring them to my attention I would be pleased to look into it.

I also would like to mention that our law enforcement cases have doubled over the last few years.

Mr. Stokes: It is not because there are more conservation officers, it is because there are more offences.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not necessarily.

Mr. Stokes: I raised with the minister on two occasions, one down here in southern Ontario where conservation officers were restricted to 60 hours—or was it 60 miles—a week? It was not 60 hours a week obviously; it must have been 60 miles a week—

An hon. member: Is it a 48-hour week or 40-hour week?

An hon. member: Forty-hour week.

Mr. Stokes: Another instance where one conservation officer was called upon to enforce the fish and game laws over 2,500 square miles. Surely the minister does not think they can adequately cover this area of such a tremendous size? The minister asked for specific instances; I brought those two specific instances to the attention of the minister in the past. I am wondering if he has given any thought to increasing the number of people in areas where there is obviously a very great shortage of conservation officers?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have increased our number of conservation officers in the last year or so and we are—

Mr. Stokes: By how many?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have progressively increased it to about nine, I believe, in the last year and we are prepared to increase it more, again within budget limitations. I would also like to mention that the member

mentioned resource technicians. This is a civil service classification and the actual work done is related to the position specifications.

This job classification is an on-going process and their salaries are continually being reviewed. Again, I would like to say that if the member has a specific case or cases I would be glad to look into them. I am sure that we certainly do not want to see any person who is being discriminated be made feel that he is not getting the proper remuneration for work that he is doing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a couple of questions with regard to Algonquin Park, Mr. Chairman. About six or eight months ago the advisory committee—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on fish and wildlife?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, fish and wildlife in Algonquin Park.

About six months ago the advisory committee in Algonquin Park recommended that the department establish a fish management unit, and that more moneys be spent in the evaluation of the productivity of the lakes in the park. I was wondering if the minister had included in his estimates of this year an increase for this type of work in the parks; and as well, as a general question, is this activity increasing across the province in the other lake areas as well?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This summer, Mr. Chairman, we will have a crew in there, an inventory crew. As to whether we will have a fish management unit which requires more personnel, this again is a question on the priority basis. We have, as the hon. member knows, other areas in his riding, Lake Timagami and Lake Nipissing, so we have other areas that will also come into high priority. We will certainly do our best, again keeping in mind the priority basis.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What I specifically asked was: Is there any increase in the programme this year over last? It is very hard to ascertain from what the minister said whether this is the case or not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, I am advised that there will be additional personnel this summer.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is that additional personnel across the province in different areas or specifically in Algonquin Park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, it is specifically in Algonquin Park.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Are there other surveys that are starting in other lakes? What lakes are being done this year? Perhaps you could tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member would like a list of all the lakes where we will have fish management units? Is that correct?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to make that information available for the hon. member.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What was the increase in dollars for this programme over last year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The increase in dollars this year over last year?

Mr. R. S. Smith: In the estimates this year as compared with what was spent last year.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is an increase, Mr. Chairman, but the increase is mainly the general increase in costs. A lot of the increase is due to salaries and other increased costs. Our programme is about as similar as it was last year. It has maintained the same level.

Mr. R. S. Smith: So the programme this year is no greater than it was last year? The only increase is in the salaries and what not? There are no more people involved? Nor are there are more—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes; we hope to have more people involved. We are employing more summer students this year and we hope to use some of these summer students in some of our lake surveys. We are doing more lake surveys this year than we did last year, as well as other management programmes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to explore for a few moments, Mr. Chairman, with the minister the possibility of constructing more hatcheries across the province. I think it is becoming more obvious to everybody, anglers and commercial fishermen and, indeed, I think even people in the minister's own department that the natural reproduction of fish is not going to satisfy the need for even the angler or certainly for the commercial fisherman.

I am wondering if any thought has been given to either enlarging existing hatcheries

or building new ones in order to satisfy the needs, as highlighted by these lake surveys that are going on in Lake Superior, Lake Nipigon, Lake Nipissing and many of the surveys that the minister has mentioned. I am wondering whether his fish and wildlife experts have come to the conclusion that the only way to keep abreast and make it worth while for people to go out and enjoy fishing depends on whether it is going to be possible to allocate more funds for construction of more hatcheries in order to assist in the natural reproduction.

Coupled with that, I am wondering if there are any studies going on with regard to making it possible and viable for people to go out to harvest the less desirable species of fish. I am talking about suckers, alewives, smelt and these that must be harvested in order to bring the fishery back. I am particularly concerned about the top quality species of pickerel and lake trout and speckled trout. I think the only way that you are going to bring any of these lakes back, or any of these fisheries back, is to clean out the less desirable ones by assisting in the setting up of the fertilizer plants or plants for pet food that would utilize the less desirable species. The only way you are going to rehabilitate some of these lakes is to make it profitable to do so. I am wondering if the minister has any comments in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister might reserve his comments. The time has now arrived for the private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. De Monte moves second reading of Bill 41, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): I am pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to present my private member's bill. I am certainly pleased it has arrived at second reading. My purpose, of course, is to urge the government to bring in a similar measure, since these provisions deserve more than to be talked out at the end of 55 minutes of debate.

Of course, my other purpose is to use the time available to make a few more general but rather related comments on the Workmen's Compensation Board. I also have a good many remarks to make relating to the recent McRuer recommendations, and while I may touch on them closely today, I will reserve my main thrust in this regard for a full-length speech during the budget debate where the time limitation will not press down so remorselessly.

The bill before the House is so simple as to be self-explanatory. It deals with a glaring injustice evident in two areas of the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board and Act.

Firstly, the bill provides for monthly payments to the widow of a workman killed in an industrial accident of 70 per cent of the average earnings of the workman.

Secondly, the bill provides for minimum compensation to an injured workman of at least 85 per cent of his average weekly earnings during a time of temporary total disability.

Underlying both these proposals, Mr. Speaker, is the recognition that the cost of safety and the cost of compensation are fair charges against the price of a job and are a legitimate business overhead, and that any attempt on the part of the Workmen's Compensation Board to keep disbursements at a lower level than that which I have proposed, so as to make the scheme attractive to industry, is putting the cart before the horse.

The Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, ought not to be governed in its awards by the idea that there is any kind of ceiling on those awards beyond which point industry will start to back off and to lobby intensively in government circles. Yet at the present time this attitude is all too prevalent. There is the unspoken fear that if awards are not kept within bounds there will be a reactionary backlash against the whole Workmen's Compensation Board approach, and that in any event the 1,400-member establishment down at 90 Harbour Street, and in the field, will somehow be jeopardized by industrial pressure.

Like all regulatory agencies and boards, the Workmen's Compensation Board, which started off to look after the interests of the

workman, ends up by looking after the interests of the establishment, in this case the industrialists who are levied for its costs and awards. In this way, Mr. Speaker, there creeps a gross distortion of the original Workmen's Compensation Board concept and the meanest inequities occur.

Some of these inequities happen because the Act is framed the way it is, loaded strongly in favour of the employer against the workmen. Others occur because of the narrow, legalistic way in which the Act is interpreted by the board itself. Often one approach is to remind the board of its humanity and is to adapt the method we are employing today; namely, proposing amendments to the Act itself. This gives one more opportunity for the concern of humanity to be aired publicly in this primary forum of Ontario's conscience, the Legislature.

What possible grounds are there for a widow's standard of living taking a calamitous drop just because her husband is killed on the job? Perhaps members would care to turn to page 687 of the Statutes of Ontario for 1968, chapter 143, the amending Act which received royal assent on July 23, 1968. Reading it today one marvels at the casual inhumanity of this Legislature, sweltering, coats off, during that long hot summer. Just look at section 37(1) as it stands. It is appalling, but the plebeian certainly had it better under the Gracchi than the lowly Ontario worker has it today in the compensation field, as legislated by a government 27 years in office and growing older and more cynical every day.

How else can we talk of a $400 burial? Does that include a cardboard coffin or a plastic urn? Who decides what constitutes "a considerable distance" for the transportation of the workman's body from the site of his death to the place of mourning? Remember, this man died because someone was in business to make a profit. Now he is dead. He is no longer a means for the furthering of the employer's wealth, so this government goes along with this shoddy ceiling on costs that will not buy even decency today.

And the widow is expected thereafter to limp along on $125 a month for food, clothing, and a roof over her head, and such heat and light as she can afford in her sorrow. If she has children they get the magnificent sum of $50 apiece out of the fund until their mummy dies, whereupon, a burst of generosity, the board leaves them to fend for themselves, or be cared for, on $60 a month to age 16.

Then, of course, McRuer is totally sarcastic about this. The board takes upon itself the extra-curricular activity of deciding, without benefit of outside advice, whether the child will profit from staying in school beyond the age of 16, and, if it arbitrarily decided that a child shall be denied further educational opportunity, it also cuts off support, leaving the 16-year-old to join the ranks of the uneducated unemployed and to seek public welfare for support.

Thus do we entrench the vicious cycle of poverty, and what ought to be a legitimate charge on production is transferred, as so many of these things are by the privileged, to a charge upon the public purse. This is discriminatory, because it is the inner-city, the core children, who are thought to have had enough schooling by age 16—not the affluent.

I think it is important to underline this point further, by quoting from McRuer, volume 5, page 2148, which reads as follows:

> The board also has a discretionary power to direct that any payment in respect of a child should not be made directly to its parents, but that it should be applied in such manner as the board may deem most advantageous for the child. This power may be exercised when the board is of the opinion that for any reason it is necessary or desirable.
>
> Although this provision is commendable, it nonetheless leaves the board with a wide power to determine the scope of its own power. By objectively limiting it to the circumstances where the board has reasonable grounds to believe that payment to a parent would not be in the best interests of the child, the purpose could be accomplished without any potential infringement on civil rights.
>
> The identification of dependant children as beneficiaries is circumscribed by the requirement that they be under the age of 16 years. The board may, however, extend the period for which compensation may be paid if it is of the opinion that furnishing a further or better education to a child appears advisable. This provision purports to give the board the duty of acting as a wise parent to all dependant children, a position it obviously cannot fill.
>
> We think the philosophy underlying the section should be reversed. It can surely

be assumed that in most cases further education of a 16-year-old child would be advisable and necessary. The section should provide that on application the board "shall," not "may," extend the period of compensation unless on reasonable grounds it is of the opinion that the furnishing of further or better education would not be advisable. The section gives the board a very wide power to discriminate between the dependant children.

This is what McRuer says. Of course, all this is very much to the point when we consider the compensation payable to women and children who are bereaved by an industrial accident to the breadwinner. We are in the Middle Ages still in this regard. For example, I wonder how many appreciate that the Act, as it stands, makes a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children as dependants?

Let us look at what McRuer has to say on this point in the middle of a dissertation on the wide discretionary powers which the board at present possesses to decide whether households are desirable and should be kept together, or whether they ought to be broken up.

Now such discretionary powers, in a field so remote from the actual business of workmen's compensation, must be repugnant and abhorrent to all of us and yet, through default, we have neglected to force the government to rewrite this Act. Of course, it is the keen searchlight eyes of McRuer which have focused once again upon discrepancies and anomalies in Ontario law. In this magnificent fifth volume of his report, he draws them to our attention so that we can no longer pretend ignorance of the true and existing situation in our boards and commissions in Ontario. McRuer forces us to take cognizance of situations. He forces this laggardly government to act, in conscience if belatedly, to remedy these evils.

Here, then, is what McRuer has to say about the destination of compensation when a worker dies.

The most serious problem concerning the destination of compensation arises in the case of fatal injuries. In such cases the board must determine what is the proper destination of the award. When the workman is survived by a widow, invalid husband (where the "workman" was a woman) or dependent children, their entitlement is clear. However, there are many other contingencies where compensation may be awarded.

For instance, entitlement is established for persons acting as foster mothers to dependant children. This entitlement is conditional on the board's first determining that it is desirable to continue the existing household and that the person acting as foster mother has kept up the household in a manner that the board deems proper. This power of decision is both an objective one and a subjective one.

The criteria for concluding that it is desirable to continue the existing household or that the household has been kept up in a satisfactory manner are not laid down specifically. They appear to be open to formulation by the board. Some attempt is made to set out the objective limitations on the power but there are real difficulties in interpreting the language. The section reads:

"Where the workman leaves no widow or the widow subsequently dies, or where there is a mother of a dependant illegitimate child, and it seems desirable to continue the existing household and an aunt, sister or mother of an illegitimate child or other suitable person acts as foster mother in keeping up such household and maintaining and taking care of the children entitled to compensation in a manner that the board deems satisfactory, such foster mother while so doing is entitled to receive the same monthly payments of compensation for herself and the children as if she were the widow of the deceased."

The lack of clarity in this section arises by reason of the attempt to provide in one section entitlement for foster mothers of both illegitimate and legitimate children, whose mother has either predeceased the workman or who has died subsequent to the workman's death. If it is intended to draw a distinction between the rights of compensation for legitimate and illegitimate children, it should be clearly stated.

However, we do not think there should be any difference. If the illegitimate child has, by reason of an industrial accident to a workman, been deprived of maintenance which it was entitled to receive from the workman, it should be entitled to compensation under the Act.

That comment by Mr. McRuer speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, and I need not add anything to it. Let me move on to my second point which concerns the payment of at least 85 per cent of a workman's average weekly earnings, without any ceiling, to a workman during a time of temporary total disability.

Nothing strikes the observer of Workmen's Compensation Board operations as more challenging than the manner in which some bureaucrat will arbitrarily cut back a man's pension during the time that he is recovering from temporary total disability. My amendment has a twofold intention: Not only does it raise the percentage to 85 per cent from 75 per cent, which is a modest enough sum and long overdue, but it also draws our attention to something that has been in the Act all along and which captures the true intent of the Legislature, namely, the unchanged phase "payable so long as the disability lasts."

Look at the RSOs for 1960, Mr. Speaker, at chapter 437, section 40. The phrase is there. Look at the 1968 statutes, chapter 143, section 8. The phrase is unchanged. So the intent of the Legislature is clear throughout. It has always been like that.

Why then does the Workmen's Compensation Board seek every device to get around this intention, by frequently examining a man and eagerly notching up his status as soon as possible, so that he is taken off the total disability scale long before he has recovered? It can only be to kowtow to the contributing employers. The men who are suffering temporary total disability are subject to this humiliation, instead of being allowed to recover in peace, as the affluent are permitted to do so. This gross inhumanity must be stopped, Mr. Speaker, and stopped at once, and this can only be done by the minister giving a clear direction to the Workmen's Compensation Board to abide by the spirit of the Act.

In any change of his status from total temporary disability to something less, the workman is at the serious disadvantage of not having access to medical reports. This is something which McRuer has recommended should be changed. At page 2192 he says:

> If the review committee is to be retained, the claimant should have access to all material which it will consider.

This should apply, Mr. Speaker, when medical reports are used to upgrade a workman's status for total disability to something that is less to his financial detriment, of course.

He ought to have access to the medical documentation on which he can base his appeal for such a decision. At present because of the medical profession's fear of malpractice suits and the ethical considerations as to the confidentiality of medical reports, the workman cannot see his medical report and, even if he had the skill to match his opponent in this adversary system of appeal, he would still not have the necessary evidence on which to base his appeal or against which to offer a medical challenge by virtue of a rebuttal report from a private doctor.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot put this better. Here is what Mr. McRuer says at page 2177:

> It is quite clear that Mr. Justice McGillivray considered that the legislation making a physician's report privileged was only to be considered if the reports were to be shown to claimants. He clearly recommended that the present practice of showing the claimant only a summary of the medical report be continued. But if that recommendation was not adopted then he recommended that there should be legislation making the reports privileged.

I could quote on, Mr. Speaker, but there is one salient point in Mr. McRuer's report and that is that these reports should be given to the claimants and that if we want to protect the medical procession against itself and other people then we should legislate it into existence. That is a poor reason for not allowing the workman to have proper evidence to present before a board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the private members' hour is an unsatisfactory vehicle for delving into matters in depth. All that can be accomplished is to draw the attention of the press and the public to these anomalies and recommendations. I hope that the government will see fit to undertake a thorough review of The Workmen's Compensation Act, not only along the lines of the particular bill that is before us at this moment, but in a very general way. For there is surely no statute on Ontario's books which so favours the rich and discriminates against the poor, which so favours the employer and discriminates against the workman, as the workmen's compensation statute.

I give notice, therefore, that I shall be returning to this topic in greater detail in the budget debate and I hope that the new Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) will heed my words, because I intend to develop everything that McRuer has said in volume 5 of his report in respect of the workman. Certainly, we on this side of the House are not prepared to allow these recommendations to die. We will keep hammering away at this issue and we will keep McRuer's spirit of equity before the House at all times, but especially in this connection.

The record of this government in the whole field of labour legislation has been shocking, and it is time to turn over a new leaf. We intend to be instrumental in that purpose.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, some of the proposals made by the hon. member obviously will help the working people in this province, but I just want to try to make an analysis of what these proposals really mean.

First of all, if we take the 70 per cent and we take a look at a worker in an industry earning $4 per hour, it means an increase from $125 per month to approximately $482 per month. By the same token, the wife of a worker who is receiving the minimum wage of $1.65 an hour, under this formula, as the sole surviving dependant, would receive approximately $198.80 a month. Well, that is quite a discrepancy, between approximately $500 a month for one individual, and $200 a month for another.

It seems to me we just have to somehow rationalize that kind of a position. And I want to suggest to the hon. member for Dovercourt who, I believe, is sincere in making this kind of a proposition, I want him to understand that this government, at the very best, crawls—it has never been known to leap. He is asking it to leap, and it has never really been known to do that. I really do think—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): We have a new Minister of Labour now. He will leap.

Mr. Pilkey: I do think that we could provide in the bill, and using the government's own figures of the minimum wage—take the minimum wage of $1.65 per hour, and though we feel on this side of the House it is totally inadequate, the government feels the minimum wage is an adequate base for a wage in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. De Monte: My proposal is not wrong, the minimum wage is wrong.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, okay, let us take the minimum wage just for a moment. Because at least the government have agreed to that, it is their legislation. Let us take the minimum wage of $1.65 an hour, and if we compute it on the basis of 40 hours per week, if my mathematics are correct that is $66 a week, and 4.3 weeks in a month, then that comes to about $284 per month.

It seems to me that is what the government should propose as a floor for compensation to a widow. That is not stepping out too far. You are not really having to give any leadership in that regard. It is your own legislation, except that we are translating the minimum wage into a pension for a dependent survivor in this province.

It seems to me that this government could justify that to the employer, because obviously in any kind of a change in the compensation the government has to justify it to the employer. I feel quite confident a pension could be justified on that basis.

In addition to that, using the calculations of my friend—and I say this in great respect—my friend from Dovercourt, our 70 per cent of average weekly wage would not be adequate to those on the minimum wage. In other words, the floor would be $284 as opposed to $198.80 for that surviving dependant.

Mr. De Monte: Why does the member not move that amendment?

Mr. Pilkey: I was just making that observation. I cannot move the amendment anyway.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that the $50 that is in section 37 and the $60 for each child, seem to me to be totally inadequate as well. Surely there is no one in this House who is raising a family who would suggest for a moment that it is possible to raise a child in the year 1971 on the basis of $50 per month? It is not adequate, and it seems to me that the government ought to adjust that figure and I want to suggest that probably $75 and $85 respectively might be the figures that they would think of.

Because, as I say, that figure is totally inadequate for providing any kind of a standard of living for the child of a surviving spouse.

The member also suggested in the bill that we increase the compensation benefit of a temporarily totally disabled person from 75 per cent to 85 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can work out a formula in this area too. I am not too sure that we should be dealing with percentages here and just be bandying them around.

I want to suggest to the minister that what should be done is that the minimum benefit should be the level of wages that an employee receives after taking out the income tax and the unemployment insurance contributions and any other legitimate deduction—and I cannot think of any others than those two—

Mr. De Monte: They come to about 15 per cent.

Mr. Pilkey: —without spelling out the 85 per cent, I think that what we ought to say is that is what the benefit should be, without spelling out a percentage.

I think that we then would at least be maintaining the standard of living of that family as it was prior to the accident. Surely everyone will agree with me in this House that when a worker is injured in a plant the rent does not change, the mortgage payments do not change. The cost of food and fuel and clothing—none of that changes for him and yet he has to meet those on-going expenses, with a reduced income.

It is reduced in a couple of ways. It is reduced because of the percentage. It could be reduced because of the ceiling that you have of $7,000, but other people will be speaking to that, I hope.

It seems to me that all we need to do is eliminate the percentages and say that the minimum benefit for a temporary total disability is the level of wages that is appropriate after the deductions. I think that that is how we should spell it out, then everybody could maintain the same standard of living they had previously.

I also want to say in this regard that the principle should be established that any worker receiving compensation will not have his benefit reduced on the grounds that he is fit for light work, unless such work is actually available. I want to tell the minister that the employers in this province, for the most part, will not re-engage an employee unless he is 100 per cent fit. They want 100 per cent production from that employee and they will not re-engage him until he finds himself in that position.

Yet the Compensation Board, you know award 50 per cent; then they reduce it to 25 per cent because he is fit for light work. But there is no light work available, so he ends up on a temporary partial disability benefit that is totally inadequate.

As a matter of fact, it is so inadequate that some employees find themselves on the welfare rolls in this province. The welfare department will make up the difference between his temporary partial disability benefit and the level of welfare in the Province of Ontario. He is subjected to those inhuman indignities because he was injured in a plant in this province, and I just happen to think that the government are going to have to come to grips with that problem. I want to suggest to the minister the only way that it can be handled in any equitable way is for the worker to maintain his level of benefits during that period until he is 100 per cent fit to go back to work, or unless as I said, that work is actually available to that employee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired. Would he please bring his remarks to a conclusion?

Mr. Pilkey: All right then. I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that these are just a few of the things that we wanted to enunciate in relation to this bill and we will be making further proposals later on during the estimates, I hope, when we hear the compensation board's report.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate this afternoon, I might say at the outset that I have a great deal of sympathy for the sentiments expressed both by the member for Dovercourt, who introduced the bill, and by the hon. member for Oshawa, who has just spoken, I think very candidly, on some of the problems that all of us have encountered as members representing workmen before the Workmen's Compensation Board.

This government, as the record will show is responsible for the major benefit increases that have been made in The Workmen's Compensation Act over the years. I think all hon. members will concede that those benefits have been substantial. This bill envisages increases which, with all respect, are not realistic and which, in fact, are contrary to the basic philosophy of workmen's compensation developed by the founder, Sir William Meredith. Let us not forget that the basic tenets of that plan accepted by the government of the province in 1915 were compensation without fault and benefits for dependents without reference to the means test but consistent with their needs.

If we follow that basic principle—and during the years since 1915 various governments, (many of them; most of them for that matter, Conservative) have increased these benefits—it has always been a basic principle that the maximum basis for compensation should reflect the wage range which includes the majority of wage earners. It has always been recognized that income tax is not applied to workmen's compensation benefits and, therefor, it would be foolhardy to apply a percentage factor much more than the 75 per cent factor to average wages, as it would be more

advantageous then for a workman to receive full compensation than to return to his normal job and normal work. Somewhere or other there has to be a balance between the two, and the hon. member for Oshawa has made that quite clear.

These principles are not recognized in this bill. If the compensation basis were to become 85 per cent of average earnings considering our income tax factors today, it would certainly be more advantageous for a workman to remain on compensation than to return to his normal employment.

Mr. De Monte: The member does not believe that.

Mr. Meen: There is a psychological factor, too, that has to be recognized, in convincing a workman on the basis of medical opinion to return to work, if it is going to be easier to stay on compensation. Although I hold no brief for the employers and the cost to them of this, I might point out that increasing from 75 to 85 per cent would increase the basic cost by $7,900,000 a year. The way the bill is worded, the recommendation by the member for Dovercourt, concerning this 70 per cent wage basis for widows' pensions, would have to be retroactive and that would involve, I am advised, an additional $65 million. Capitalized over a 10-year period, it would cost approximately $8,300,000 annually. The cost for new widows and other dependants each year would be a further $6,700,000. This involves a total cost for these benefit changes recommended by the member of $22,900,000, an increase of about 19 per cent.

As I mentioned, I hold no brief for the employers, but that still is money that would have to be found somewhere. It is a rather curious anomaly in the bill, wherein the member for Dovercourt suggests that the present $275 maximum for a deceased workman with no earnings be ignored. This would put a widow, whose husband, for example, earned $2,000 a year and who had, let us say, three or more children, in the position that her income after his decease, would become much greater than before his death. It seems rather obvious that a statutory benefit should not be established, which raises the widow's status after her husband's decease, insofar as financial benefits are concerned, to some astronomical level, way above what they have become accustomed to enjoying. This government recognizes that basic minimums are required. We all know that basic minimums are required. But it certainly would not be the result of legislation with unrealistic benefit levels.

I am more concerned, however, with the departures from the basic principles which the bill envisaged. I have already pointed out the contradiction in providing a workman with a greater incentive to be off work on compensation than to return to gainful employment.

In the widows and dependancies field, however, we would be introducing a kind of benefit that would inevitably involve a means test which could not possibly include the lump sum benefit, on remarriage, of two years' pension, and would therefore remove that incentive factor.

The bill, incidentally, is poorly written in that it restricts children's pensions to age 16, contrary to the present legislation, which permits the children's pensions to be paid to the end of their university education.

As a matter of interest, and with a much greater benefit factor, it seems to me it would be possible to increase the present maximum earnings level to a more realistic figure and, at the same time, increase the children's pension and the widows' pensions at all levels—the total cost of such being a somewhat more realistic additional cost than in the bill we are discussing today. This is the point made by the hon. member for Oshawa, that we should not, necessarily, tie it to percentages but adjust our other levels.

The Workmen's Compensation Board is constantly reviewing and re-assessing the needs of our people and the benefits provided by the Act, and I know that this matter is under careful study. If you look back in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, you will find that changes were made in 1963, 1964, 1968 and again in 1969. I have every confidence that still further improvements in the benefits will be made, perhaps even this year.

In summary, then, may I suggest that the bill is ill-conceived. It would be financially impossible to support it at this time and there are better alternatives for benefit changes forthcoming as a result of this government's on-going and careful study of the situation.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Firstly, I want to support the efforts that my colleague from Dovercourt has suggested, and his views on Bill 41 this afternoon, for justice for the workmen. There is no question in my mind that The Workmen's Compensation Act,

as interpreted by the Workmen's Compensation Board, is becoming more increasingly an adversary system.

I find, in my direct contact with the appeal system of the Workmen's Compensation Board, that the board is putting the onus on the workman to prove his claim. The board should be providing the means of assisting him in establishing his position for benefits and to fulfil the aims of The Workmen's Compensation Act.

The purpose of workmen's compensation, as stated, I believe, in 1914, was to benefit the injured workman, and the purpose of the process of inquiry was to assist the claimant, "and the benefits of doubt shall be given in all due course in favour of the worker." But how has that simple procedure been of late? When one appeals to the board for assistance, the claimant is faced with today's courtroom atmosphere. The question always asked at the appeal, the one the board members always asked was, "Do you believe you have had a fair hearing?" Yes, I do believe there is a fair hearing upon the knowledge of the information that is presented to the board, but I can tell you that there is information there that should be dealt with in more detail than it is today. I am sure it would then be in more favour of the workmen.

I believe in many cases the statement of financial assistance or benefits applied to workmen of this province is looked upon by The Workmen's Compensation Act as a form of welfare. In my dealings with persons who are receiving compensation benefits, they receive far less than those who receive welfare in this province. In a great many of the board's cases, the benefits are applied on an ad hoc basis—a scheme to reduce benefits that definitely creates undue hardship of the injured or disabled worker of the province, and the family has to go begging for municipal welfare. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in about 85 per cent of my claims I have dealt with, the persons are on welfare.

I can well remember attending a meeting of the government commission and I recall a member of the compensation board saying that, "We must remember one thing: In any dealings or assistance given to employees, it is paid by the companies or firms of this province." I was amazed. There was not a reply or a challenge to those remarks. For I cannot agree or accept such a statement. Is it not the employees who labour, who earn the profits to enable the companies to pass it on to the Workmen's Compensation Board? But the cost involved is also massed on to the consumer who purchases the material and goods, and the greatest percentage of the consumers in the province of Ontario are the workers. In other words, it is the majority of the employed in Ontario who support The Workmen's Compensation Act benefits and not the companies. The employee is buying disability insurance, and when he is disabled through injury, is asking for his insurers to give him the means to support himself and his dependants. He may provide these means through insurance at no loss of income. He is not asking for charity, but in a great number of cases he received charity in the eyes of this government.

I believe that the workman is entitled to be compensated for this disability based upon his income at the time of the accident. I support my colleague's amendment in increasing the benefits to 85 per cent from 75 per cent, and payable for as long as the disability lasts or suitable employment can be found for the claimant, with no loss of income.

Too often the board's decisions or conclusions are that the recipient is entitled to partial disability, or permanent partial disability and that he is able to perform modified work. Often the recipient finds a light-work job but is paid peanuts for that service. Combined with what he gets on this light, modified job and his compensation benefits, it is far less than he would get if he were on welfare.

Many companies abuse this system and take advantage of the injured workman, and I bring this to the attention of the Minister of Labour. I know that a number of cases are completely unemployable due to their disability. Many workers are employed in industry today and their health is being affected. Workmen's Compensation should recognize its liability to compensate for chronic working conditions, and the government must take a completely new look at the environmental factor in workmen's claims. At the moment, there is only a tiny fraction of possible illnesses recognized as being attributable to working conditions.

I urge that the government provide more research on human exposure in occupational disease. The government must keep abreast of the rapid changes in industrial methods and material, for I find that research is inadequate in this province as a means of protecting workers.

The other point I would like to touch on is concerning the headlines in the Evening

Tribune dated May 13, 1971: "Lack of Safety Practices Cited in Welder's Death."

The Workmen's Compensation Board is presently advertising on American television stations stressing safety. What this province needs is regulations to establish a safety committee of equal number from management and employees. There must be steps taken by the government to recognize safety committees of employees and industry and to consult with them. I am sure that this alone would reduce greatly the number of deaths and injuries of workers, and reduce the workload of the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support Bill 41.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the Conservative member for York East that this amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act was poorly thought out. I, for one, realize the problems that widows have, whether they are the widow of a spouse injured through industry or just one who has been left in charge of children for any reason. They need more money in their pocket. This bill, of course, this amendment, in my opinion, in this day and age of 1971 is just another mish-mash of the bureaucratic monster that workmen's compensation has developed into over the years. We are talking now about trying to straighten out the categorized handouts that people have to apply for. As I say, we will have to support it.

The reason the widow is slapped so badly as far as income is concerned, or once the husband is no longer entitled to workmen's compensation under the temporary total disablement, when he is cut back by 50 per cent or more, until he goes back to a light job, is in keeping with the government's overall policy in regard to their welfare assistance programmes. They do not want to emasculate the social and benefit allowances, the general welfare assistance allowances, the mothers' allowances, and all of those. They do not want too great a disparity between the allowances a widow can receive.

I think the argument that the member for York East gave centainly does not hold water any longer—that is the old swan song that if you give a person 100 per cent of his wage when he is off injured, he then will not want to go back to work, that he will abuse the plan. If the member, as he says has had any experience in representing people in workmen's compensation cases, he knows that you just do not fool that board. If the person is physically able, in their opinion, to go to work, he goes to work. If you are lucky and you are a strong enough representative or member to keep him on compensation, you have done a terrific job. So the case of abuse, under that term, does not hold water.

What I am concerned about is the amendment. Neither the hon. member for Dovercourt, nor his colleague, dealt at too much length with the actual amendment and its implication. They just dealt with the things we all dealt with in 1968 when we dealt with a series of amendments to the Act, a general approach to workmen's compensation. As my colleague from Oshawa says, if it was based on the minimum wage of this province that would greatly raise the minimum—

Mr. De Monte: Is the member against the Act or for it?

Mr. Gisborn: —from the $2.75 position to the $2.84. That would be an improvement to start from and if we are talking about minimum wages and the interpretation that the government puts on minimum wages—the reason they establish it, to set a floor—then centainly they should see to it that no one falls below that floor. But we had that old argument many times in relation to the poverty level. Everybody talks about it but no governments recognize it.

What would be concerned here if the husband was receiving $100 a week, or $400 plus a small amount per month? His widow would then be entitled to about $300 a month and her children, if she has three children, another $150, which would give her $450 a month. Now that could be over what his income would be, if he had continued to work.

Mr. De Monte: How about the fact he loses income by not being there?

Mr. Gisborn: I am not opposed to that as a measure, but certainly in government accounting, one just cannot be that irresponsible. One has to have some basis for what he is doing. That would go on up the scale to six children where there would be $600 income, which would be $200 a month over the income. I think we have to talk about reasonable subsistences and not irresponsible measures because the member has left out the maximum. I would have thought that this member who is so interested in workmen's compensation would have dealt with two of the most important things a little more strongly.

I think it is about time we have to recognize that there are two basic faults in workmen's compensation, if we are going to stick with that method of looking after injured workmen. One, of course, is the maximum that the 75 per cent can be paid to, because on the bottom we are talking about a relative income for the widow to what her husband made before he was injured or died. So at some time or other we have to talk about a relative income for the others in the upper bracket. If, as my colleague said, we talk about someone in the UAW, in the automobile industry, or in the steel industry, where their incomes range up to $10,000, it is not uncommon to have one in this bracket in the bargaining unit or one where the employer is paying per capita tax per 100 of payroll for him based on his income, but he still receives only his 75 per cent based on $7,000. If he was getting $8,000, which would give him approximately $153 a week, based on the 101 maximum now, he is short $52 a week. If we take $9,000 he is short $72 a week, and if he is in the $10,000 bracket, he has a drastic cut if he is injured by losing $92 a week from his income. I think this is where we have to move. Take that limit of $7,000 off so that there is a wage related income for the person who is injured. We cannot say, "Well, you must save up for that," as we do here sometimes when we are talking about pension plans, because this happens instantaneously, the fellow is injured, he is off and having a drastic cut in his wages hurts that family as well as it hurts others.

I would hope that sometime we can convince the government that they have to change their whole approach. I think the workmen's compensation administration has gone to such a bureaucratic point that it is getting worse all the time to wade through the administration, specifically when we relate it to other problems, those on social and family benefits and those on general welfare assistance and mother's allowances. It just does not add up, the trend we are taking. What I would hope—and I have moved resolutions in this House I guess three times—

Mr. De Monte: When? About 10 years ago?

Mr. Gisborn: —and the first time I raised it, the Liberals did not support it, they thought it was irresponsible. When I asked for an accident and sickness programme which would cover everyone for up to 75 per cent of their wages regardless of whether they were injured in industry or whether they were injured on the street or injured at home, and if they had an illness which kept them off work.

Why they should go on immediate relief—that is before we had the industrial indemnity programmes, they had to go immediately on relief, while if a person was injured, he got his hand caught in the machine, he got 75 per cent of his wages. We had such a discriminatory approach to keeping people alive with money. With one hand we say, "Yes, you should get 75 per cent of your wages if you are hurt in a plant, but if you take sick with a disease that you could not avoid, then you do not get anything unless your collective bargaining agreement provided for it."

I think we have to support the bill, I will and I expect my colleagues will, but it was poorly thought out and it has no relation with really dealing with the workmen's compensation administration and benefits at this point. We want these two real moves. The one I mentioned and the other one is that the man should be paid his 75 per cent until he is back at work. You know, you just relegate him to a welfare case, as has been said many times, and this is the sore point.

No doctor in his right mind is going to say, "You had better stay off until you can do your own job," because the doctor knows it is not likely he will ever be able to do his own job. But the minute he says, "You are ready for some therapeutic work, a light job," that guy is immediately cut 50 per cent. And where does he get a job? The biggest problem we have—and the board knows that—is to try and find a job. Then, as has been said and needs repeating, he ends up on the welfare rolls for a supplement to that payment based on how many children he has. That would be as iniquitous to industry as to accept their responsibility, as this government says, "We pay that out of your money. Until you find that man a job or we are able to find him one through rehab, he gets 100 per cent of his entitlement under compensation, that is, 75 per cent of his wages until the time he goes back to a job and receives the same kind of pay."

Mr. Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the debate on this bill and it reminds me of my early experience in the House also.

I suppose we, as members, if we were called on to tell the story, each one of us would say that workmen's compensation cases are the biggest workload in our offices at home. I know that is the way it is in Niagara Falls. In that industrial area, I too have had the resolution on the order paper not too many years ago stating that compensation should be paid regardless of where the accident occurs whether it be on the job or off.

I also suggested that they have a form of insurance, partial payments to give the man 100 per cent of his income and that would keep him—such as they have in New York State. I do not have time to touch on that except that the thing that often bothers me in my office is when the person does get his 75 per cent and he can manage to get by while that man is sick at home he finds that without notice of any kind the compensation has been cut by 50 per cent, and sometimes it is a more drastic cut than that. That is a very difficult problem for a man to contend with when he is home and cannot work.

The other major problem that they have to contend with is when they are told that they are well enough now to go to work and that they can take light work, but the job on which he was working is no such thing for him. Yet his compensation is cut and he finds that he cannot take the light work that the doctor here claims that he must or can do; so he finds himself in a position where his compensation is cut and he just does not have any way of maintaining himself and his family.

These two steps, without any amendment, could be dealt with immediately by the compensation board. I do not think that any man's wages or compensation should be cut until he is back on the job. I have always argued that, and I think the industry can carry that portion of the costs.

When it comes to the widow and the children, that has been debated by myself many times, previously with the then Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). There were two widows who walked down to get their cheques; one would get a cheque for $50 because her husband was killed in an accident, the other would get $75. If they had children, one would get $12.50 and the other would get $25 because they paid a greater portion in later years. But the first one had to buy the same loaf of bread and pay the same amount of money. That inadequacy has been changed, and the government did correct that not too many years ago.

But it is utterly impossible for me to tell the people who are injured in my constituency or anywhere in the province why the compensation board has to cut by 50 per cent the compensation without notice to them, because they need that money with which to exist. I am sorry we do not have more time. I would like to continue this debate and there may be another day to do just that.

An hon. member: Very good.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the private members' hour.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in order that we may continue with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests when we resume at 8 o'clock, I would call order 13.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 17, 1971

Tabling document, policy for extended care facilities and home care arrangements, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 1625

Policy on extended care facilities, statement by Mr. Wells 1626

Professional and business ethics of some doctors participating in OHSIP, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Singer, Mr. Deans 1626

OPP investigation into matters associated with Kingston Penitentiary riots, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon 1629

Firm building Ontario Place going into receivership, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon 1629

Request of Retail Gasoline Association for government to appoint arbitrator, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. MacDonald 1629

Reported bankruptcy of Brocair Systems Limited of Brockville, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Deans 1630

OPP keeping peace at rock festival by staying away, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Singer 1630

Use of centralized computer accounting system by OHC, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 1630

Protecting purchasers of safety restraining devices for children, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. B. Newman 1631

Application of subdivision plan in name of Caledon Mountain Estates, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon 1631

Dialogue with Quebec to foster Hydro development for northeastern Ontario, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Stokes 1631

Subsidies cancelled to companies who did not proceed with building or expanding plants, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 1631

Professors in faculty of law at Windsor University being American citizens, question to Mr. White, Mr. T. Reid 1633

Community college courses preparing technicians to help fight against pollution, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Burr 1633

Reluctance of Hydro to test use of lignite deposits in production of power, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. R. S. Smith 1634

Alleged dumping of coal dust by ship in Hamilton harbour, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Deans 1634

Clarifying Day Nurseries Act and regulations, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Gaunt 1634

Study of regional government as announced, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Good 1635

Draft document outlining structure of Crown corporation for Harbour City, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Peacock 1635

Procedures governing ODC board to identify possible conflict of interests, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis 1636

Decibel level in some sections of Ontario Place, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Young .. 1636

Site for new juvenile detention centre in Hamilton, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Gisborn 1636

Resolution, standing estimates committee re Department of Public Works, Mr. W. Hodgson 1637

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 1637

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. De Monte, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. Meen, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Bukator 1657

Recess, 6 o'clock p.m. 1667

No. 40

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 17, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(concluded)

On vote 1103:

Mr. Chairman: At the supper hour at 6, we were dealing with vote 1103, item 2. I believe the hon. minister was going to provide some replies to questions.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) asked me some questions with reference to hatcheries—what our programme was.

We have, Mr. Chairman, in Ontario, 16 hatcheries and at the Sandfield hatchery we expect this year to undergo renovations. The reconstruction of the Sandfield station will include facilities to compensate in part for the closure of the Little Hearn hatchery, which was closed a year or two ago.

Also at Chatsworth there is a new substation. This is where our splake programme is in operation.

Exploration for ground water supplies in 1970 proved suitable for the development of a substation adjacent to the Chatsworth hatchery. It is proposed that a new substation be constructed on this site this year, and this new facility will be used for the production of highly selected splake for use in the rehabilitation of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay waters.

Also, in southeastern Ontario, where there is quite a demand, we propose to construct a major hatchery which will produce about five million fish a year.

In 1970, a study was made in co-operation with Ontario Hydro to investigate the practicability of developing a large hatchery complex adjacent to the proposed thermal generating station to be located at Bath. The present plans provide for the construction of a very large hatchery complex which will produce five million fish. This new facility will replace four small, less efficient hatcheries in southeastern Ontario and provide for sufficient stock for the rehabilitation of Lake Ontario. We expect to have this in operation in 1973 and in full-scale production in the following year.

A disease problem arose at the Pembroke hatchery which resulted in the quarantine of the station and the subsequent sterilization of the inherent facilities in 1970. While the station was out of production, the headwater collecting basin was repaired by our engineering services branch.

Also, there is a new substation at Dorion hatchery, which is close to the member's riding. The property was acquired adjacent to our Dorion trout-rearing station and contains excellent potential for expansion and development. It is expected that the Thunder Bay hatchery will be closed in 1971 and that the development of the new substation in Dorion will be commenced to compensate for the loss of the Thunder Bay facility and provide for a more efficient unit for the supply of hatchery fish production for northwestern Ontario. At Normandale, a new substation is also proposed.

The hon. member also asked me what we are doing about utilization of coarse fish. This is a very good question, and we are looking into the utilization of species such as mullet, ling and carp. As the hon. member knows, a fish plant utilizing these species was built at Wheatley in the last year or two, and the Fish Marketing Board is also looking into this aspect of utilization of coarse fish.

We hope in time to be utilizing more and more, because they certainly will be beneficial to the commercial fishermen. Some day I would like to see a plant in northwestern Ontario where we do have a lot of coarse fish. Some day, Mr. Chairman—I mentioned this to the hon. member and some of the members opposite—when time permits—we planned to do this last fall—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Take a tour of Wheatley.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —to go to Wheatley and inspect that plant and see if we could not have a similar one in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for making that information available and I want to thank the minister and members of his department for making me aware of a communication that he had between the commercial fishermen of Lake Superior and a letter sent to Mr. Mudra of the Ontario Council of Commercial Fishermen on May 3. If the minister would just elaborate for the benefit of those people on paragraphs 2 and 3 of the letter, and I quote the minister here:

> I believe that your reference to support of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation refers to the programme undertaken last year by The Department of Fisheries and Forestry under which fish buyers and processors, including the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, received payment for fish they had purchased but which had to be destroyed after inspection because of mercury content.

I was of the opinion that there was a provincial programme underway to compensate fishermen for any loss due to mercury contamination and, obviously, there is no such programme.

I am just wondering, in view of the commitment made, and I quote again of the minister:

> Our programme of sampling extensively is already well underway. We know that different species of fish from the same area of a lake exhibit wide differences in mercury content. It is also believed there will be consistent differences between different size of fish of the same species. We are hopeful that certain species and size grades within species will show mercury levels which will allow shipments without detention.

I am wondering if the minister has sufficient knowledge now that he will be able to advise these fishermen that they can go ahead and market fish directly above or below a certain size? Does the minister have sufficient information now to do that without having every fish analysed for mercury content, and if so, have the fishermen been advised of this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I mentioned last week, Mr. Chairman, small fish, those that are under 24 inches in length, will be able to be shipped directly without being held for detention. This is in the eastern end of Lake Superior, at the eastern portion of Lake Superior. They will be accepted for sale without detention.

Mr. Stokes: But not the west portion?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Stokes: Not the west portion?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the present time, this whole programme is a programme that is sort of a federal-provincial one with the federal Department of Fisheries and we are working closely with them. As time goes on, we are optimistic that it will be enlarged because this applies to the eastern end of Lake Superior. I would hope that it would apply to other areas where these smaller fish could be sold without being detained.

Mr. Stokes: How soon will they know?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How soon? I would hope to be able to know within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 2 carry? The hon. member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Hamilton East, I am sorry.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if he would explain to the House—he might have done previous to this point, but I have not noticed it and I have not read the statements—what qualified his decision to do away with the fishing licences? It seems to me and to many of the people interested in the sport of angling that there is something very unnatural about the minister's move. I am not quite sure about the figures given by different sources that the revenue that is lost by the cancelling of the licence fee runs from $1 million to $1.5 million. It is a surprising move—

An hon. member: It is $1.6 million.

Mr. Gisborn: When one remembers the controversy when the minister introduced the licence fee. His arguments were soundly endorsed by everyone who had an interest in preserving our wildlife and our fish and game by spending money for research to reduce the lamprey eel in the lakes so that it did not get down into the streams and the rivers and therefore destroy the present fishing content. Now that it is taken off, I wonder if the minister would tell the House what his reasons are and what the logic is in

dropping that amount of revenue. Usually the case is pressure from some area. While the minister is giving me some of the answers, would he tell me what commission the issuers of the licences in the different communities received; what commission the issuers of the licences received and was there one rate for the fishing licence? Was it $3 for a residential licence? Could the minister give me what portion of that went to the issuer and what that would amount to per year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If I may begin, Mr. Chairman, with the latter part of the hon. member's remarks, the angling licences were $3 and the issuer had a 25-cent issuing fee which he kept and refunded to the department $2.75.

The reason, as the hon. member knows, that this was introduced is that it was a government policy. It was introduced, I believe, on January 1, 1969, and it was removed this year. Again, it was a government policy. It was felt that this province should provide unrestricted angling opportunities for this very popular outdoor sport. We introduced it two years ago and it has given us very valuable information which is helping us to properly manage our fisheries.

For instance, we now know how many persons fish. We issued these questionnaires —I forget how many thousands were issued —to various fishermen. We have their names and addresses as a result of the angling licences and now we know the area they fish in, the species, what percentage of the population only fish in the wintertime, what percentage fish all year round.

Also, we were better able to manage our fisheries programme when this was introduced. We used to do about 200 lake surveys a year; now we are doing about 1,000 and these lake surveys are a very important part of our management. For instance, take Lake Vernon. This is the type of map that comes out. It gives all sorts of information, the size of the lake, the contour, the depth, the species of fish, the access, how you can get in there, the types of road.

This is waterproof. You can fold it. You can put it in your tackle box. It is a very handy piece of information. So we feel that this two-year period did help us considerably to get much more information on the management of our fisheries.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the real point of my question was that this minister of this department did away with a source of revenue without any pressure whatsoever, or request, and it is almost unbelievable.

I agree with the results of the research and the work that was done because of the revenue raised, but I cannot accept the answer from the minister. If he recalls, in his committee last year when there was a motion put in committee to allow the recipients of old age pensions to enter our provincial parks free of charge, the minister led the defence and opposition against that motion by saying that the loss of the revenue to the government would greatly hamper their programme of supplying and developing good parks.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I was assured by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) that our programme would not be diminished, that the amount of money that has been allocated for fisheries management will not be diminished as a result of the removal of the angling licences. And again this was a government policy. If the hon. member will refer to the budget—page 28 I believe—he will read that it was in order to provide more recreational opportunity.

I also would like to mention that last year there were many people picked Lake St. Clair, where fishing was banned in many areas on account of mercury, who felt that the mercury problem also sort of interfered and therefore the angling licence was not justified.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but point out the contradiction of the miniser's policy. I want to state again, I am in favour of it, I think we should have free fishing—but I just cannot understand the reasoning behind it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gisborn: It is all right. Why did the minister oppose granting free access to our parks to the old age pensioners because he was going to lose $250,000 in revenue? The bell rang and we waited to get Conservative members in to oppose the motion. They failed and the motion was carried. This government was forced by this committee action to allow pensioners into the provincial parks free of charge. But the minister at that time, in committee, opposed that motion on the basis that the government would lose the revenue from the fee for access to the parks.

It is the contradiction of the policy that I cannot understand—and without pressure or request. Is it a case of the fact that now, because of the mercury problem, we are telling people not to eat the game fish and setting down restrictions and this sort of thing, that we think that the fishing industry, the sport fishing industry, has gone kaput in the province? I just want to understand the contradiction of the minister's reasoning.

First he was opposed to allowing pensioners to go into the provincial parks free of charge and put up quite a defence against it. Then, without any pressure whatsoever, he removed the fishing licences and we lose $1.5 million in revenue.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, there were two matters the hon. member raised. One is about old age pensioners' admission to provincial parks. May I remind the hon. member that we do not charge per person, we charge per vehicle, and the admission fee, I believe, is $1 per vehicle. I think you will admit that it would be very difficult administratively if, say an elderly person is driving a car and there are, say, four persons there who are in the 40 age bracket. Or vice versa—say it is the 40-age person who is driving and he has a senior citizen behind him. We charge per vehicle. Our charges in provincial parks are costing us twice as much for administration. The expenditures are twice as much as the revenue. This is just the maintenance, not the capital expenditures.

With reference to the angling licences of senior citizens. Whenever members have brought to my attention that there was, for example, a home for the aged, a group who wanted to go fishing in a certain area, there was no objection to this.

Administratively, to allow senior citizens to go fishing, we would have to have some administrative control. I was ready to introduce this. I mentioned this this year early in the season before we removed completely the annual licence, so we were prepared to do this. But it has to be done—just because a persons says he is 65, you have to have some sort of proof of age or some sort of a permit. There were administrative reasons why this could not be done.

Mr. Gisborn: Can the minister tell me—there might be other reasons. The total recovery from the fishing licence might not be as much as we imagined. Is the $1.5 million a fair figure—to say that was clear revenue?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year it was about $1.5 million and the previous year it was $1.6 million; less the cost of administration.

Mr. Gisborn: That is the point. Has the hon. minister any idea what the total take was?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Is the hon. member for or against it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to make available to the member the cost of printing the licences and the other costs.

Mr. Gisborn: What did we get out of the $3?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have them here. The cost of printing the licences and so forth is somewhere about $60,000. Now mind you, there are other costs that are sort of difficult to delineate specifically because a conservation officer, when he is on duty in an area where there are Americans, has to find out whether they are Americans, and if they are Canadians if they do not have an angling licence, and he also has to check their limit.

So there are certain costs that are very difficult to give, but I can give you specifically the cost of printing the licences and these other costs.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, in regard to the commercial fisheries in Lake Erie and the catching of bass and pickerel: I understand that regulations are to bury them if the contents of mercury are over 0.5 per 1,000. Is that the correct regulation of your department, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The 0.5—I am not sure if I am answering your question—the 0.5 parts per million is the acceptable tolerance level established by the federal Department of Health Food and Drug Directorate and this is the same standard that is being used in the United States and I believe it is used across Canada.

Mr. Spence: Point five parts per million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Point five parts per million. Most of our fish—well, I should not say most, but a large percentage of our fish are exported to the United States and this is why the federal Department of Fisheries inspect our fish and they adhere to this 0.5

parts per million which is also the same level accepted in the United States.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the minister, the bass, the pickerel, the perch that are caught in the nets and have considerable percentage of mercury, do I understand that those fishermen who catch those fish have to bury those species of fish in order to cope with the minister's regulations? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. Yes. In Kent county it is illegal to catch white bass and keep it. If white bass is caught, we have issued instructions that it should be buried.

Mr. Spence: Well, Mr. Minister, with due respect to you, as I understand it the bass has over 0.5 per million per cent mercury. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right. The great majority are.

Mr. Spence: Also the pickerel. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, the majority of the pickerel are above the 0.5 parts per million.

Mr. Spence: Could the minister inform me, with great respect to you, Mr. Minister, what percentage of pickerel or perch is banned from sale? Not too many?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is a very small percentage of the perch that is rejected. The majority of the perch is below the 0.5 parts per million.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): To follow up on that question, may I, Mr. Chairman? Is what I just heard true? That they use these pound nets set up in Lake Erie and in these nets they catch perch for sale? Now the black bass and the yellow pickerel that get into those nets, you take a sampling of them and find out how much mercury content is in them, and the fishermen are informed to bury the black bass and the pickerel that they catch in those nets?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. The reason, Mr. Chairman, why we have issued instructions to bury the bass is because most of the bass have contents of mercury above the 0.5 parts per million, so we feel we do not want to encourage fishermen to catch fish which are not suitable for consumption. We feel that it is not desirable where we know that the great majority of the bass are in that category.

Mr. Bukator: They are not edible? You cannot eat them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: That is, without danger. All right, let us pursue this a bit further. Now if the fishermen are instructed—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are speaking about white bass.

Mr. Bukator: Not black bass?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, white bass.

Mr. Spence: Right. White bass.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member is speaking about—

Mr. Bukator: I am talking about black bass.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Right.

Mr. Bukator: Lake Erie.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Big-mouth or small-mouth?

Mr. Bukator: You get the big-mouth up north. They do not have anything like that in Lake Erie.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): In here they are liable to be big-mouth.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): If you did not have a big mouth you would not get fed.

Mr. Bukator: For what—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Black bass, for instance are—

Mr. Singer: Yes, there are two kinds—big-mouth and small-mouth.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: The black bass then are not caught in the pound nets. They are about to spawn in May or June in the shallow waters, and then they go into the deep water.

If the black bass that come into the pound nets are caught, the perch are taken out of the nets and the black bass are allowed to swim again? Is that it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Bukator: Am I clear on that point?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Bukator: Then we are talking about white bass that are disposed of immediately they are caught, and they bury them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right—the white bass. A great majority of the white bass are—

Mr. Bukator: Then let us talk about the yellow pickerel. They are not too plentiful to start off with. The yellow pickerel are found to have over .5 per million parts of mercury; now they are caught and buried if they come into these nets too. The commercial fishermen catch them. For what period of time will they continue to do this? Does the minister feel that eventually the mercury will be eliminated, and the yellows will have a chance?

Mr. Singer: It is all in the pamphlet, he is going to tell us next.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to say how long it will take before the fish purge themselves of mercury. It may take quite a number of years. We have, I believe, eliminated the sources of mercury, but apparently it takes quite a number of years before fish become—

Mr. Bukator: Whatever happened?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Bukator: Well, let us put it this way then: we are stocking our lakes and rivers with certain types of fish, such as the cohoe salmon. Are we doing that with perch from other bodies of water where they do not have mercury? And with the white bass, black bass, and yellow pickerel too? Or do we not do that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We do not stock perch.

Mr. Bukator: Perch are the coarse fish anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are very prolific anyhow.

Mr. Bukator: Well, let us take it a step further. The fish—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: You bet your life. I did not go to school, because I preferred fishing to getting an education.

Mr. B. Newman: Maybe more of us should have done that.

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, my school-teacher met me not too long ago and she said, "By the way you got along in this world, I should have quit school and gone with you—fishing, that is."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Now, about the stock of fish. For instance, we stock trout—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Any more like that?

Mr. Bukator: I have hundreds of them. There is more education in what I have just said than what I have heard in this House in the last couple of months.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, one day I will take the hon. member for York North with me and show him how they are caught.

Now to get back to the stocking of fish. Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, can organizations such as rod and gun clubs and fishing organizations that we have throughout the peninsula obtain fingerlings of trout or any other fish for stocking in streams if they want to render this service to the public? Would the department provide those fish for them for stocking?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We work very closely Mr. Chairman, with the rod and gun clubs, the anglers and hunters, and various clubs. We work very closely with them and they often assist us in our restocking programme. But as to making fish directly available to them—for instance, they will recommend to us that such-and-such body of water should be stocked and we make a survey of that lake to find out the proper species that should be stocked. Often they assist us voluntarily in doing some of the work.

Mr. Bukator: Then the fish stocking that the department does is done through the department and not through organizations. You work with them but they do not get the fingerlings, as they call them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We do all the supervision of the work. Supposing they said, "We will go into a fish tank and take these," we feel it takes real expert, people who are really knowledgeable; so we send our own people. But we welcome people who wish to assist us.

Mr. Bukator: Well, then, I want to get the address of the people our people can contact, because organizations such as the conservation people in the Niagara Peninsula, the rod and gun club and the anglers' club have

been doing this for years through the overseer or the game warden, Roy Mume, at one time. He was with this department for a long time, and I remember them stocking muskellunge in the Niagara River. That is one of the finest muskie fishing grounds in the country, they tell me. They also put brown trout in there, which did very well. Recently, last fall, there were cohoe salmon at Dufferin Island that you would not believe —five, six, seven or eight pounds. They came down the river to see the falls and decided to get into shallow waters so people could catch them. I did not get that one through very well. I am telling jokes and no one is laughing.

An hon. member: It will get through.

Mr. Bukator: They did stock with muskies and they did stock with black bass. The member for Wellington-Dufferin is sitting there smiling because he gets his ponds stocked with trout. Does the government provide them or does he buy them? Through you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): There are no trout in the pond, only frogs, ducks and muskrat.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I guess that answers my question. My people can contact the minister's department about stocking where they know very well these fish do well.

Mr. Singer: You cannot get the Water Resources Commission to do anything.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bukator: I did not get any answers, but I had fun.

Mr. Spence: —for commercial fishermen having to bury the bass and the pickerel from Lake Erie, it seems to me is a burden on those commercial fishermen who have to go out and ask some farmer or individual if they can bury the bass and pickerel on their place. I wonder if this is the right approach? Why is there not some other way of disposing of the bass and pickerel that are over the 0.5 per million of mercury?

We catch them over there and it is tremendous that they do. I will tell you this, we are industrious people in Kent county and they will do anything to make a dollar. They do not want to go on relief; they will do anything to make a livelihood for themselves, with greatest respect to you. I would say this, it seems to be a hardship that some of the commercial fishermen have to ask somebody, some farmer or individual, "Can I bury the bass and pickerel that are over the 0.5 per cent mercury."

Is there some other way that we can do something in order to assist those commercial fishermen who have bass which is caught in the nets and pickerel which is caught in the nets that are not adapted for bass or pickerel. They have to dispose of these species that have over a 0.5 mercury content.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member is very sympathetic. He has quite a number of commercial fishermen in his riding trying to increase their earnings. Perhaps this is an area we should look further into; maybe some of these fish could be used as fertilizer or if the mercury content was not too high, maybe for pet food. There again, we have to be careful of the content that it is not too high.

The reason we took this step was because not all, but some, were catching white bass, We thought that if we allowed them to keep them, and these white bass were higher than the 0.5 parts per million, this could be a health hazard. That is why we issued this directive that they should be buried, but it is an area we are prepared to look further into to see if we can help the fisherman in utilizing his unused fish.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister, in order to manufacture this bass and pickerel into cat food or other products, they have to be below the 0.5 million mercury content. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to what the member for Hamilton East was saying a few minutes ago in regard to the fishing licence. I could not ascertain whether or not he was in favour of bringing back the fishing licence—but I think that is what he said—

Mr. Ruston: Yes, he wanted it brought back.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He wanted to know why the minister could get away with it. I do not know if that is what—

Mr. B. Newman: He wants the senior citizens to pay for fishing licences again.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer that, this touches again on the inability of the Liberal Party to understand what one is talking about—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The hon. member for Nipissing, unless there—

Mr. Gisborn: On a point of privilege, then.

Mr. Chairman: Privilege?

Mr. Gisborn: Privilege, yes.

Mr. Chairman: What is the privilege?

Mr. Gisborn: To explain to the member in question—

Mr. Chairman: There is no breach of any parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Gisborn: All right, I will get my turn next time.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: At the time I was trying to get the minister to ask the member for Hamilton East if it was NDP policy that they would bring back the fishing licences.

Mr. Chairman: Of course, that has nothing to do with the estimates.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh, yes it has. Anyway, I would like to ask the minister if the doing-away of the resident fishing licence this year is, as far as he is concerned, a definite policy of the government and will be maintained, if they happen to be re-elected.

Mr. Ruston: Boy, that is really stretching the point.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In my opening remarks I think I asked the minister to clarify that, because the provincial Treasurer indicated that he thought that people who use a resource should pay for it, and he indicated that perhaps it would be brought in again. Could the minister straighten us out on that and give us what he considers to be the policy?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that it was government policy two years ago when it was introduced and it is government policy to do away with it. Government policy is always under review and it could well be that all these particular matters are always under review.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I see. In other words, it may be government policy to do away with fishing licences a few months before the election, but government policy could change and it could be brought back a few months after the election.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I thought the member voted against the licence, and—

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am against it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —now we have removed it, is he not happy?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am happy, but I do not trust your motives.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Your motives, as I say—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I gave you our reasons —to give unrestricted recreation opportunities; and, at the same time, we had the benefit of obtaining a lot of valuable information. We have that information now and we can better manage our fisheries.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I doubt very much if even the minister really goes along with that statement. I doubt that is what he really thinks about it. But anyway, I understand his position, and I am sure if I was the Minister of Lands and Forests, I would want the fishing licence removed now. I understand his position.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, if we are both in agreement, what—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh, yes, we are in agreement now, but I am sure we may be in disagreement six months from now, when you review your policy again in light of the fact that the election may be over.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): It is something you will not have to worry about.

An hon. member: He will not be the minister then.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is some possibility, although small. We will not have to worry about him, that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of other questions. I would like the minister to outline to me how the department makes the decision on granting the rights to sell hunting and fishing licences to individuals who make application.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our concern, Mr. Chairman, is to serve the public. Most of our licence issuers—and we have quite a number, about 3,500—are those persons who are, say, tourist outfitters, sports store people who are often open during the summer months for seven days a week. They do not have to be opened seven days a week, but our main consideration is to provide a service to the public. I think the hon. member knows this.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I think every year I have brought this up and we have discussed it in the estimates. I have asked the minister if he was considering a new programme by which the licences would be issued in a different way to permit each tourist camp operator to provide the same service to the public, or so the issuance of licences would be done in some other way to take the competition out of the fact that one tourist operator is able to issue licences and the guy right down the lake is not able to do so.

Also, I would ask the minister if it is still a consideration within his department, when a man makes an application, whether his application is approved or not by the local member or by the defeated Tory candidate?

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): It is the same as Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the member has brought many things to my attention. I think I have been very fair with him.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister has not answered my question.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the same time I do not think we should discriminate against others who bring things to our attention and we feel that we like to be very democratic about these things.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister has not answered my question. I would like an answer to the question.

An hon. member: That is what makes him a democrat.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am not questioning how the minister has dealt with me at all. He has dealt fairly with me, but there are other people who have not been dealt fairly with in regard to this matter.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If the hon. member would bring to my attention cases where he feels this, then I would be pleased to look into it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister is still not answering my question.

Mr. Bukator: The minister has not got any answer.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow on a little further on the area that the member for Thunder Bay dealt with this afternoon, and that is the area of conservation officers. I think the minister said at that time that there were some 300-odd conservation officers in Ontario at the present time. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes! Two hundred and ninety-nine.

Mr. Pitman: Two hundred and ninety-nine. I wonder if the minister could tell me how many conservation officers would be an optimum number?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Would be where?

Mr. Pitman: Would be an optimum number? That would be the best possible number of conservation officers carrying out the activities of his department. I am sure the minister would agree that there are not enough conservation officers. I am sure that he would agree that his conservation officers are overworked. They are covering far too great an area of territory. In many cases they have far too many jurisdictions to look after—townships, counties. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Minister, is to find out, if he had unlimited funds, how many conservation officers does he think it would be useful to have in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, that is a sort of difficult question to answer. What we are doing more and more is that we are providing, on a detachment basis, conservation officers. Also we have areas where we have a Zenith telephone system where people can call collect and get information. We also work closely with other agencies in northern Ontario, with the Northern Affairs office and we work closely also with the OPP.

Mr. Stokes: Is that with regard to policing of The Fish and Game Act?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon? Yes!

Mr. Stokes: The Northern Affairs officers?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not the Northern Affairs officers, with the Ontario Provincial Police. If someone wants information and he wants to report a case, he can report this to the Northern Affairs officer who, in turn, will get in touch with one of our conservation officers or one of our offices. It is just a method of communication.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the minister could indicate if there were ever any studies made by similar jurisdictions taking into account the number of residents, the number of individuals who come into this province during the summertime, the amount of hunting and fishing, how this jurisdiction of Ontario compares with any other jurisdiction in relation to the number of conservation officers. Has there been any study of that kind at all?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased—I cannot give the member that information, but I would be very surprised if we in Ontario have not just as many conservation officers in relation to our population and our tourists. I would also like to mention to those who feel we should have more conservation officers that our officers have doubled in the last couple of years.

Mr. Pitman: I would just say to the minister that my impression—and this impression is not gained from conservation officers but the people who are involved in gun clubs, hunting clubs, fishing clubs and so on—is that if there is one area in our society where indeed it is quite possible to break the law and very rarely get caught it is in the area of offences against The Fish and Game Act.

I would say to the minister—and I am sure he would agree with me—that there is one thing it is very unfortunate to have in any kind of democratic country and that is laws we cannot enforce. I think in most jurisdictions it would be agreed that it is better to have few laws that can be properly enforced than to have a great many laws that are very poorly enforced. I am sure the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) would agree on that point.

And I am suggesting to the minister that I think this is an area of employment that could be radically expanded. I do not think people have any feeling that the fish and game laws of this province are really enforced. They do catch a few and over the past number of months, particularly the last year and a half, I think I have noticed that the courts are becoming far firmer in regard to offences that are brought before the bench. I think we are finally getting out of this kind of syndrome where we thought that poaching was some kind of social justice and, heaven help us, let us hope that with all the talk about pollution and the retention of our natural resources, we are getting out of that kind of syndrome.

But I still think that the area of conservation officers is one that is very badly neglected. I know there have been some changes in the last few months. I have heard about these. I know for the first year or so the poor conservation officers were running around on foot, chasing people on snowmobiles. They were in the position of not really having any of the rather sophisticated methods of communication that poachers were using out in the backwoods.

I still say that these men cover far too wide a territory. In fact, I cannot imagine any job that has within it a greater possibility of tension and of injury than of being a conservation officer. I would not like to be out in the woods with some people I have met who have guns, trying to enforce the fish and game laws in the kind of setting of complete detachment from society which you have out in the backwoods somewhere. I think this is a pretty important function and I think they need far more support, far more help, than they are getting.

Mr. Stokes: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to go even further than that. I would like to ask the minister whether there has been any job analysis on the part of his department. I have the feeling that conservation officers are like jugglers with about eight balls in the air. They are never quite sure of the ones they can keep in the air and the ones that are dropping by the wayside. They are supposed to be giving courses for guns. They are supposed to be looking after licences. They are supposed to be covering massive territories and being everywhere at once. They are supposed to be on call from every person in the community to race up and find where the people are who are hunting illegally and so on. We really have almost a Mack Sennett comic opera scene, if we see a conservation officer working at optimum capacity on a weekend in a crowded area of Ontario, and I just wonder if there has been any job analysis of the conservation officer's role just in that locale.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. However, I would like to say

to the hon. member that our conservation officers are also management officers and they do other work. I agree with the member that we have to be more conservation-minded and the practices that were tolerated in the past, we cannot continue to do so. As time goes on, I would hope that there will be more, maybe not necessarily called conservation officers but management officers. We certainly need more management officers who, at certain times of the year, during the hunting season, for instance, could be doing conservation officers' duties.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask the minister how many Indian people there are working in this area of either conservation or management in his department.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We employ a lot of Indian persons, Mr. Chairman, but mainly in the summertime, mainly in tree planting and forest fire protection. On the permanent staff, I believe, we have somewhere between 40 and 50. In the summertime we employ sometimes close to 1,500 or 2,000.

Mr. Pitman: I cannot help thinking that Indian people in our province would be a very important pool of human resource for the minister, and I do not mean just for tree planting in Quetico Park or carrying out forest fire protection during the summer. I would suggest to him that probably if there are any people in this province who know something about conservation and have been telling us about conservation for the last two centuries, it is the Indian people in this province. That is the kind of work which could be used to bring the Indian people into a more effective relationship with the rest of the people of this province.

For example, I know that in Manitoba they have begun a programme of using Metis and Indian people in what we would call the lands and forests operation. They have begun training programmes, and they have begun experimental education programmes to see what can be done to provide training for people at a pretty sophisticated level to carry out this whole business of resource development in the more remote parts of Manitoba. I would like to see a bit more of that in the minister's department, just a little bit of reaching out, just a little bit of "frontier seeking," in regard to finding places for Indian people in his department. I would put it this way, it is one of those departments where you could really do something for both Indians and young people. It is one of those departments, a service department, where there would be absolutely no reaction on the part of the people of Ontario if there was a considerable expansion in its activities.

I would go further than that. I would say I would like to see some of the money which is spent in The Department of Education given to the Minister of Lands and Forests to provide work for many of the young people who are sitting idly and, in some cases, wasting a great deal of time in a classroom in front of a teacher, because the law says they have to be there until they are 16, because we cannot seem to find anything more for them to do even until they are 20. It would be better if those young people were working with the minister's department, doing something effective in the area of conservation, doing something in the area of recreation and developing parks, doing something in the area of protecting this province. It seems these young people are prepared to do it for nothing.

One has only to look in the newspaper and one will see kids out cleaning up the bottom of the Don River and restoring almost any other kind of resource. They are prepared to work in this area because they think it is important; they know it is important. You have one generation—the generation gap is this—that knows it is important to do something to save this planet if they are going to live their lives on it. We have not got that far as adults yet, or it does not seem to be.

I would suggest we might very well consider the possibility of removing the number of young people who are wasting their time—I say that advisedly—in an academic setting, putting them into our lands and forests in some kind of educational capacity and putting the educational grant that goes with them into the Lands and Forests department. You have $1,500 if they are at secondary level and if they are post-secondary, heaven only knows how much, but you have money there to provide jobs, to provide effective work for them. I will even go further than that. I would suggest that from now on—I notice it is on the minister's estimates here, the SWEEP programme, and I do not want to get into that; at least, let us put it this way, I promise not to talk about it when it comes up—that we involve young people in a meaningful way in determining and planning what these projects are going to be rather than making it a make-work project.

The minister's department, like no other department, has some relationship with youth

training. The junior forest ranger programme is a programme which is known right across this Dominion. No other country has one which has such potential for young people. I have personally been tremendously impressed by what happens to young people; how much they mature; how much they learn and how sensitive they become as a result of that programme, a two-month programme.

It seems to me one of the things the minister might very well do with the new Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) is appeal to him to sit down and make use of The Department of Lands and Forests—some part of the Lands and Forests operation—and take with that a part of The Department of Education in terms of grants in support, because it seems to me this is an area where one could really turn on young people and give them something meaningful to do.

At the same time, the minister would have the maximum support from people across this province who would finally see something useful being done in terms of giving young people an opportunity in their early years. Then they can go back into the school. They can go back into the university after they have spent a year or two with the minister's department. It should be short-term.

But I think that this is something I should very much like to see in a department where I think the opportunities are manifest, where they have already been shown, where one has people who have seen what young people can do in a junior forest ranger programme and would be appreciative of what could be done on a year-long basis, on a semi-permanent basis. So I say, both in training young people, and in training Indian people, I just have not seen the degree of imagination which I think could be certainly contained within the minister's department.

Mr. Chairman: Before we have a reply, perhaps the committee would permit a brief interruption.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it would be in order to welcome members of the St. George Young Progressive Conservatives Association tonight. They are having a new members' night tonight and they have members in the west gallery.

Mr. Chairman: Did you say it was not in order? I think it was perfectly in order.

Does the hon. minister now have any comment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I just want to say to the hon. member that I wish to thank him for his suggestions. I will be pleased to take this up with the Minister of Education. At the present time we do. I know in my own riding, in places like Moosonee—

Mr. Singer: Let us hope it is more fruitful than his discussions with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales).

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The supervisor of our Tidewater Park is an Indian. The deputy chief ranger at Moosonee is an Indian. And also they are the ideal people for these remote areas where the majority of the population are Indian. So we certainly want to encourage more and more to work for us and I would be pleased to discuss this with the Minister of Education.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister about fishing for prizes, for financial reward. The minister can recall I sent him a clipping and wrote him a letter concerning what the State of Michigan undertook in regard to fishing in Lake St. Clair, where the fish are too contaminated with mercury to be edible. I know the experience as far as the State of Michigan is concerned is not quite as favourable as they would like it to have been. But I just wondered whether the minister considered the idea of tagging fish and then giving some type of financial award to the individual who gets the fish with a certain tag on it—something similar to the programme that had been set up but was not successful in the State of Michigan?

I would also like to ask of the minister if he is giving any consideration to the encouragement of youth in the sport of fishing so that they would have some other type of activity to take them off the streets and give them a bit of recreation and a bit of experience with nature itself?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As the hon. member mentioned, he brought this to my attention last year But there are problems in implementing the programme, having prizes for tagged fish, so I understand. Some of the fish would be tagged and then they would be released and there would be an encouragement for people to fish for these fish. But I do believe, as I said, there were some real administrative problems.

This was mainly Lake St. Clair, I believe, that the member was referring to, and I do

believe that there will be more sport fishing this summer than there was last year. I am not sure whether this kind of programme is really necessary; there are some real administrative problems. I am not sure about the reference to encouraging youth to fish more, in the second part of your remarks.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, the experience on the American side is that there were fewer sports fishermen in the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River area last year than in previous years, and they sort of anticipate a further decrease in sports fishing activity.

To encourage the activity, to give the operators of sports fishing marinas and so forth an opportunity to recoup some of the losses that they suffer as a result of the ban on the sale of certain species of fish, I thought it might be of some value for the minister to take some select area in the Great Lakes basin—and I would think possibly the Lake St. Clair area might be of some significance—and institute a pilot programme to see if it is actually feasible. It might be an answer for the present crisis that the fishing industry faces. Would the minister then not consider something similar to that, a "fish for fun for money"?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We could look into it, Mr. Chairman. All our surveys indicate that there are more and more people fishing, and this of course includes young people. As I mentioned earlier, we put out these maps and we are putting out more and more maps. We put out a little book last year called "Let's Go Fishing," which was well received. We are taking many steps to encourage people to fish more, but to have prizes to encourage our younger people, I am not certain how advisable this would be.

Mr. B. Newman: My suggestion is not to offer prizes for the young people alone. The whole suggestion is to encourage greater activity in sports fishing in the area as the result of the mercury problem that the area has been confronted with.

My second question of the minister concerns the Essex county area where most of the marshlands are owned by our neighbours to the south and north of us—that is, by the Americans. Is the minister undertaking any type of programme of leasing the marshlands so that our own residents, the Canadians, could hunt in these marshlands? Is he undertaking any type of a programme, perhaps on a lease-purchase plan, to bring the marshlands back into Canadian ownership?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We do have quite an active land purchasing programme and we have acquired a considerable amount of marshland in the last few years. We have the authority to enter into agreements with private landowners for fishing and hunting purposes. Also, last year we were able to get a very knowledgeable biologist who came from New York State, I believe, and who is in charge of our wildlife management programmes, again to encourage more hunting and more wildlife management programmes on private lands.

Last year on holiday beaches we had some very good water fowl hunting. The price of land, of course, in the Lake St. Clair area is fairly high, between $1,000 to $1,500 per acre, so therefore it sort of limits our acquisition for lands in that area. When we can find land that is the type that we can recommend, we do purchase land for this purpose.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that even though it may cost $1,500 an acre today, it is never going to be any cheaper? It is only going to inflate in value and, as a result, in price in the area; and that if he does not go along and make a move today to acquire some of the properties they may be lost forever to the residents of Ontario? Has the minister acquired any of the marshland for hunting purposes in the Essex county area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We acquired quite a sizable area, not in Essex, in Hullett township.

Mr. B. Newman: What township was that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Hullett township. That is near Goderich. It takes about 25 acres for a blind for two hunters, so it takes a sizable area to have sufficient land for duck hunting. Again, I agree with the member that land will escalate in price, that it will be more expensive a few years from now, but there again it is very difficult to buy land within the budget limitations. How many miles is Goderich from Windsor?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the purchase of these properties that the minister has acquired back in the Goderich area. The only thing is, the average citizen could not afford to be going up into Goderich to do a little bit of hunting, whereas living in the country itself there would be no problem at all for him to be going back into his own backyard, so to speak, to do the hunting.

The thing that really disturbs me more so is if we do not make an effort today to re-nationalize, so to speak, the lands owned by our American friends we may never be able to bring them back and have them once again in the hands of the resident of Ontario and the citizen of Canada.

So I think we are going to have to make some type of start now, in spite of the fact that it might be a little too expensive by today's standards, but by tomorrow's standards it is really going to be a drop in the bucket as far as price is concerned. We have to bring the lands back into Canadian ownership and the sooner we do it the better off we are going to be, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I agree, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member brings this to my attention and rightly so—there is a great demand for more beach land—

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and parkland in the member's area. I have nothing against hunters, but I do think sometimes if you weigh the needs of more parkland and more beach land against those for duck hunting—duck hunting is what, a two-, three-, one-month period? I should not say this, I will probably be criticized by the duck hunters. I am sympathetic to them but it is a question of the availability of money and the many purposes, the many demands for more recreation.

Mr. B. Newman: I can buy the minister's argument very easily. It is a matter of priorities all right but, Mr. Chairman, some method has to be found to re-acquire the lands even if it is only on a long-term lease-purchase plan, so that eventually they return to Canadian ownership rather than be in American hands.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I want to make a plea to the House beyond the minister in the House, in committee, to summon up sufficient determination and moral courage to bring an early end to the wolf bounty. I have given up in pessimism on successive Ministers of Lands and Forests to whom I have addressed the plea.

I really am not optimistic about persuading him or his advisers to bring a surcease to what I conceive to be a ghastly and atrocious, even inhuman, syndrome of the organization of the affairs of the people of this province that they would permit the placing of a price on the head of a wild animal—the majestic and noble wild animal that inhabited the great primordial forests of this continent long before the white man came to its shores.

I am fortified in my stewardship because, indeed, I am a steward in a very special way this year in that a grade 8 class in a school in Toronto, St. Denis School, situated on Balsam Avenue in this city, has been in communication with me in two ways about this very subject. Not only did they write me a letter signed by all of the members of the class but last Thursday morning they sent an emissary, chose one of their number, to come down and see me—I am going to get around to his characteristics in a moment—as their spokesman and emissary in order to urge me on in a personal way once again to take up the cause on behalf of the wolf, to make my annual plea for an expression of human feeling by those who order the affairs of this department and its fish and wildlife branch.

Last Thursday morning, Vincent Di Maria arrived at my office at an appointed hour, at 9 o'clock, bright and shiny in his Sunday best, wearing white shirt and tie. His hair, would you believe it, was cut. He looked like the type of 13-year-old that we used to know, and we do not see too many of now. As he came through the door, I remarked on his fine and gracious appearance. He turned out to be a very articulate, well-mannered, polite, courteous boy who was able to state his stewardship, the message he carried on behalf of his 29 classmates to me. He brought along a tape recorder—he, too, was a captive of the technological age—in order to record the responses that I made and to give him a précis form of the speech that I will make tonight on behalf of the wolf. It was a pleasure to see him.

They, as I say, had been in touch with me by letter—a letter signed by all 30 of them, boys and girls alike. As one looks over the names, one sees the cross-section of this multiracial, multicultural, multi-ethnic and multinational province that makes up the mosaic of Ontario. I am going to read excerpts of the letter into the record, which will give me a launching place to make my remarks on behalf of the wolf. It is addressed to the "people and politicians of Canada."

> Are you just going to sit around and let our wolves, seals, mustang, polar bears,

caribou, mountain lions, and so forth, become extinct?

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): What about our songbirds?

Mr. Sopha: Still quoting from the letter:

> Are these animals to go the same way as the passenger pigeon? Are you going to let hunters and "sportsmen" continue to cover our landscape—what is left of it—with the mutilated carcasses of these innocent animals? Are you going to leave us anything by the time we become adults? Animals such as wolves kill to maintain life—their own—while man kills for money, sport and the vanity a caribou or a moose head can bring. When an animal hunts, its prey has a fair chance of survival while, when man hunts, the animal has no chance of survival. Guns kill in numbers, often in excess of man's need. The wolves do not live in packs, just so they can attack man. That is not the purpose of a pack. A pack represents teamwork, a society, a co-operative effort in taking care of cubs, and hunting the normal diet of wolves which includes, surprisingly, not man but mice, lemmings, small rodents, fish and caribou.
>
> The wolf is accused of killing off deer and caribou herds and leaving carcasses all over the area. In fact, the wolf only kills when it has to and eats what it kills until it is all gone. Not only that, but he tests the herd and preys upon only those who are weak, sick or young, thus maintaining healthy, strong deer and caribou herds. Man, on the other hand, mercilessly kills even the healthy ones, using planes to buzz-bomb whole herds to obtain a prize set of antlers and leaves the rest of the slaughtered herd to decay.
>
> We wonder if the government is still allowing this to go on? We read an article from the Globe Magazine called "The Killers," by Douglas Pimlott, March, 1968, which said that certain "conservationists" want to save the gentler species from the wolves by killing the wolves. We thought that conservationists wanted to protect all wildlife regardless of whether or not it was high or low in man's opinion.
>
> Please stop this senseless slaughter now. If you let this go on, the trappers, hunters and conservationists will just kill off one animal after another, until finally so many will be killed that the resultant ecological imbalance will very probably kill us. The only animals left will be those in a zoo.
>
> Let us enjoy animals in their natural environment, born free, living free.

The letter is signed, "The concerned members of grade 8, St. Denis School, Toronto, Ontario."

It is signed by 30 students. That is a very well written document, very articulate and very expressive. Take it to the Hansard recorder, please.

The cynic, of course, if I may pause at this point, would say, "How can you have any hope for the preservation of the wolf when the greatest hunter, the greatest predator of all, homo sapiens, has managed in this century to kill a hundred million of his own species by violence—one hundred million in this century. What chance has the wolf got?"

That article in the Weekend Magazine of the Toronto Telegram, of April 24, 1971, written by Ernest Hillen, which has been drawn to the attention of the minister, describes the activities of so-called sportsmen, who hunt these animals from aircraft in the name of sport, mostly in the district of Kenora. I thought in answer to a question addressed to the minister, that he had indicated to the House that he had put a cessation on this.

One observes with depression that somehow there passed through this House The Game and Fish Act of 1961-1962. I was here and I must have voted for it at the time. Under that Act, by authority given for it, one finds that there is authority vested in the minister to make regulations, prescribing the terms and conditions upon which aircraft may be used while hunting; prescribing the terms and conditions upon which wolves may be hunted from an aircraft or vehicle.

Now I would have to stop. I would have to question rhetorically. I would have to wonder what manner of entelechy it is in the bureaucracy that could summon up the intellectual effort which would enable any form of licence or permission to be given to an individual to hunt a defenceless animal by means of an aircraft.

I cannot conceive any human action that is imbued with such calculated cruelty as that. Even from the most objective analysis, one must see the unfairness of the competition. There is man with his sophisticated technology, the machinery, the immense power harnessed, supplied by carboniferous fuels, and he brings it to bear upon helpless flesh of one of the members of the ecological system. How that could possibly be called sport in any rational definition of the term really makes the mind boggle.

But apart from the idiosyncrasy of the individual, the peculiarity of the person who would engage in that activity, one wonders about the wielders of power who would give him permission to do it and would sit back and then proffer him a licence to engage in that type of activity.

But I am reminded of the CBC spectacular a couple of years ago which depicted, in living colour, the man from Calgary who, with the licence of the federal government, spent $6,000 of his own money, mind you—$6,000, a tidy amount; an amount that few of us could afford to set aside for one particular type of recreation—$6,000 the man from Calgary was able to spend to shoot a polar bear, perhaps one of the most majestic animals that inhabits the face of the earth.

One hesitates with superlatives, but there are few animals indeed that equal the polar bear with the ingenuity that he has been able to accumulate to adjust to his environment—one of the toughest, most demanding environments on the face of the planet. But the man from Calgary had $6,000 to spend in order to shoot the polar bear.

And of course with the technology of the age, he first sought him out by aircraft, located him, landed in a convenient spot close by, then as I say, in living colour we were shown how the polar bear finally stuck his snout around an outcropping of ice and the Calgarian downed him with one shot. Well, if the children were up, if those under the age of 16 were up watching that, they must have been horrified, to put it as mildly as one dare put it.

I say without hesitation that, in my own view, the man from Calgary who would do that to that superb and majestic animal, has within his soul rotten tendencies. He is rotten, such a person, and equally rotten are the people who give him the licence to do it.

On the optimistic side I am told that no polar bears are going to be shot in Polar Bear Park, the one place within Ontario where there is an arctic environment where we might find those animals to abound. On the other hand, last winter my wife and I were watching the CBC and that remarkable film prepared by the Ontario government, and one of the magnificent shots in it is of the polar bear bounding toward the camera. Do you recall that—the exhilaration that it gives one? Such exhilaration my wife and I felt as we viewed that magnificent scene of the polar bear coming straight for the camera.

Well, I return to the wolves. I am delighted the member for Wellington-Dufferin is in the House, as so often in the past I apologize before transgressing on his preserve. But in making my plea, I want to say to him most seriously—and if the House will give its indulgence to me—that where we went wrong in the slaughter of the dumb animals of nature was in Genesis, the inherent defect of the Christian theology. It started us off on the wrong track, and I will show that to you, and it is necessary to my argument to make that thought, and from that original sin we are suffering the pangs of guilt about what we have done to nature.

But, on the other hand—and I am always an optimist—on the other hand I am told that at the Quetico hearings, among the most vociferous of those who came forward to protest the desecration of that park were people who frankly vouchsafed that not only had they never been to Quetico and they had never seen it, but that they never expected to go. Yet they wanted to be sure that it would be there for their children, their children's children and that what exists is a heritage for future generations.

To me that is a very revealing and significant piece of information, because it shows an awakening of the human soul. It shows the stimulus and the impetus given to those people to concern themselves with what is perhaps the most valuable heritage we have in the Province of Ontario.

I go back to my argument that where we went wrong and where we have to now attempt to recover from our original sin was in the first chapter of Genesis at verses 24 and 28. I had them here a moment ago, where it is said that God commanded that man be made in his own image and he shall have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and he orders man to subdue them.

Out of that, of course, came the whole syndrome, the whole panorama, the whole history of man's activity which is summed up in the phrase, "conquer nature."

That is the basis of the manifest yesterday in the United States, subduing the frontier. That exercising dominion over nature, as if nature is an enemy. There is the essential point—that nature is the enemy and man somehow builds up his own status and his own ego and he makes himself in God's image by conquering nature; the superior being. Let me not leave it, I say to my friend from Wellington-Dufferin, without pointing to the—

Mr. Evans: The member means Dufferin-Simcoe.

Mr. Sopha: Dufferin-Simcoe, forgive me—without pointing to the converse side of that theological message. The converse side, of course, of the making of man in God's image was that only man was imbued with a soul. He was unique and different. The dumb animals of the field, the fowl, the birds of the air and the fish of the sea, they do not have souls. Only man can arrive at the state of grace.

Now that is a very significant portrayal of the history of the human race. That is the basis, of course. I suppose that all this slaughter of all the species and all the violence done to animals, that is the basis that it is put on. But we come down to this day, of course, where there is a complete change and man's guilt is catching up to it. He is beginning to wonder, and he is beginning to survey the destruction that he has done to the ecological integrity and to the environment and to the species. And in many ways he is seeking redress. He is seeking salvation. He is trying to repair the sins that he has committed.

Now, put on that basis, of course, is to make a complete defence of the wolf. That shows how unjustified—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Took a 20-year programme—

Mr. Sopha: —it is for a society that calls itself civilized to put a bounty on the head of the wolf.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: And really, to do that allows one to say that it is a mark of shame.

Mr. Evans: The member has got to be a vegetarian.

Mr. Sopha: It is a stain upon our honour that in this 1971 we would allow this practice to continue.

Let me turn to another side. In order to portray the thesis that I am making, when one speaks of nature one remembers that it used to be pious cant; it used to be litany to speak about wastelands, to speak about certain areas of the earth as if they were of a very low economic order, as if they were not worthy of development. On the other hand, it was the mark of achievement to rid the environment of marshes and bogs and deserts.

Now the biologists, the geographers, the planners, they do not think in those terms, because they see the total picture of nature. What was once thought to be inferior land is now recognized to be part of the total ecological picture.

It is a necessary part and it is quite wrong to view them as being in any way inferior, which is to say that there is a transformation in thinking taking place, that we have a new realization of nature—

Mr. W. Newman: This fellow is just making a long speech.

Mr. Sopha: I recall as an example of that, and I will not be telling stories out of school when I say that there came to our caucus a group of the—what are they called, Pollution Probe—Pollution Probe people on the day following Earth Day to talk to us about things that were bothering them, concerning, of course, the threats to the environment and to express to us once again that the two great containers of human waste, human and natural waste—the air, the atmosphere, and the oceans, the lakes—are in danger of no longer being able to contain the insults that man administers to them.

One of these young fellows, very determined, very outspoken, of the type that one encounters so frequently among our young people, said, "Yesterday, for the first time, man celebrated the earth," to which I responded immediately by giving him the elongated form of BS. I said, "You have never read any poetry."

Mr. W. Newman: You have made more pollution than anyone else in this House.

Mr. Sopha: I said, "You have never read Wordsworth or Browning. You have never read Shelley's 'To a Skylark'." The poets have been celebrating the earth for many hundreds of years, and perhaps only the poets, as Shelley called them, "the unrecognized legislators of mankind", a very expressive phrase.

Nowadays, of course, it is not only the poets. There are growing legions of people who are becoming very outspoken, very determined, on the horizon who are calling attention to the sins, the violence, the atrocities that we have inflicted on nature. All right, where does that bring me? It brings me down to this moral suasion.

I say to you that it is time that we did things that were kind, that we conducted ourselves in ways that were consistent with the finest qualities of which man is capable, that we thought in terms of the eradication of violence in all its forms and this is one. This is one that I speak of.

The Minister of Lands and Forests will pay the bounty of $25 for the successful infliction of violence upon the wolf. He gives a reward for it.

Mr. Evans: He is a vegetarian.

Mr. Sopha: If Charles Reich is correct in his thesis, which has reached the top of the best-seller list, then there is a new consciousness arising that reflects a growing and articulate feeling among many members of the human race, and particularly the young, that we must get away from violence. We must put a surcease to it. If we are going to be truly human, we must have done with it.

Saturday night, I am sitting with my eight-year-old boy and I cannot believe my eyes as I watch the new Tarzan. Really, I am in a state of disbelief. I have gone through—how many Tarzans have I gone through? The former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart)—

Mr. W. Newman: Yourself and 10 others.

Mr. Sopha: —has gone through—he is a man senior in years. He has gone through more Tarzans than I have. But they have a new one. I did not even catch his name, and I am shocked into disbelief—

Hon. Mr. Snow: How many Janes?

Mr. Sopha: —my eight-year-old who is so entranced with this depiction on the television. They show someone in the scene shoot a dark-skinned man in cold blood. He is running to escape and another fellow takes a rifle and plugs him. He falls to the ground prostrate. I am in disbelief that we would permit the CBC to show that: that there is not such a protest that envelops the people from Bonavista to the Queen Charlotte Islands that the CBC would dare put something like that on.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You should be making this speech to Ottawa.

Mr. Sopha: I am talking to intelligent people. You just keep silent.

Mr. W. Newman: Sure you are. You are playing a big emotional issue here tonight. It is not going to get you anywhere.

Mr. Sopha: There are more and more people who believe as I do—that we are not going to tolerate it. We are going to put an end to it. We are going to have done, and we are going to be content only with things that are manifestations of kind, generous, patient, human acts.

We are not going to permit this senseless slaughter of animals. Who is to say, if you want to put this in the scale of human values, who is to say that the wolf is inferior? Who is to say that he deserves that fate? No, one cannot quarrel with the proposition that, on the other hand, the wolf is part of the ecological system. He plays his role. Pimlott has said it; many others have written to that effect. He is in the chain, a necessary link, and as such you cannot think in terms of inferiority.

It is like the man watching the monkeys at the zoo masturbating. And he says "How disgusting" as he employs human values and seeks to judge the dumb group by his values. The monkey did that, of course, because he had always done it, and so the argument goes.

Well, I am determined that some day in this province there is going to be an end to this, and I have always reserved as an escape hatch, and I have taken the position here that if the wolf is, in a given area, a predator then the Minister of Lands and Forests has all kinds of skilled hunters. He has aircraft, all kinds of them; he has more aircraft than the Americans at one time had in Vietnam. He has all the technological aids, and he can send in his predator control group and he can decimate the pack, bring them under control.

But no Minister of Lands and Forests has the licence to permit other people to destroy this animal. No Minister of Lands and Forests has the moral right to permit their hunting from aircraft. No Minister of Lands and Forests has the right to fly in the face of the feelings expressed by those students in grade 8.

The hope, I say to my friend from Dufferin-Simcoe, the hope is with the young. The young will change this. I have looked around these greybeards, these middle-aged like myself here. I all but give up on them. They were born in the age before TV. They think differently. They are inured to the system. They are caught up in the litany, in the pious cant, of an age that is past.

The young will transform that. They will demand humanity. They will say to man,

"You protest that you are human. You protest that you can arrive at the state of grace with God Almighty. Then act like it. Demonstrate it in your own life, your own habits, your own attitudes." Put that way, my argument, of course, is unassailable. I invite anyone to show me where I have gone wrong.

That is about all that I want to say, except to put some statistics on the record just to show you how great the atrocity is. In 1965, they killed 171 by aircraft; 1966 was the better year, as they would put it in the Protestant ethic, 303; 1967, 144; 1968, 195; 1969, 238; 1970, 212.

Those are not modest figures. They are not modest; I am ashamed of them. I am ashamed that in Ontario I live in a province that would permit people—and I fear they are mostly Americans that were permitted to come to Kenora and to do it—to inflict that insane violence upon dumb animals.

There is the picture. It is not a pretty one and it does not do any of us credit that we allow this to go on. I plead with the Minister of Lands and Forests. I do not even ask for a reply from him. You know I usually make my own speeches here; I do not believe in the dialogue that one hears.

But I have quite a few trophies—one day it was the poll tax; it went, after I assailed it. I got Inco subject to taxation, finally. I got the alienation of Crown lands stopped.

I am waiting to be discovered. Some day I am going to be discovered. I am waiting for some brilliant imprimatur of the press to discover me. I fear there is no chance, but you just slug away. That is all you can do, slug away and, in the fullness of time, you persuade enough people and it comes to pass. All you need is patience and determination, the second quality is the most important. At the end I am going to be proved right.

Oh, I have a couple of other things going. I say to my old pal from Dufferin-Simcoe. I have got a couple going.

I was the first to advocate the national marketing board. You know I could show that. I was the first to advocate that securities legislation be given over to the federal government. I was the first. I have got a couple going, but some day a Globe and Mail reporter is going to come in and discover me. But right now I am working on the wolf bounty and I want to see the end of that. As I look around the House I see some who would hasten to agree with me—my friend from Ontario, the former Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond); my friend from Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan)—he would be a kindly man; and from Simco North—is it?—Dufferin-Simcoe and of course, the Attorney General who has always exhibited those most profound of human qualities—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Former Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the former Attorney General, pardon me, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I always think of him as Attorney General and I will continue to think of him until we know the mettle his sucessor shows. On all sides of the House. I have some other correspondence here that I am not going to take the time of the House to read into the record, but as I sit down I just say to my colleagues, let us do the right thing. Let us show that we are capable of a human act. We are going to demonstrate to our young people that we will not tolerate this institutionalized state and bureaucratic supported, senseless, insane, inhuman, atrocious slaughter of the dumb animal of the field. He is entitled, just as much as we are, to inhabit that portion of the earth's surface that falls within what Robert Ardrey calls his "territorial imperative."

If we arrive at that point, then, of course, we will preserve the heritage in the wolf and many other of the species for the generations that come after us.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. The hon. member for Windsor West on item 2.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Item 3, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 2 carry? Carried. Item 3? The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, On item 3, Mr. Chairman, I have two matters that I would like to raise with the minister. One is a matter that he has been acquainted with for a number of years now respecting the desire of the city of Windsor to acquire for itself and its citizens and visitors a larger area of parkland. That area is Peche Island in the Detroit River, lying between the city of Detroit and the City of Windsor. It has had a very chequered history. It was in agricultural use for all of the years of settlement of the frontier between Canada and the United States until 1966, I believe, when a businessman from the city of Detroit applied to the zoning committee of adjustment, the planning board and the

council of the city of Windsor for rezoning of the land to commercial use from agricultural.

That promoter sold the city of Windsor on the development of the island and the rezoning of it by dangling before the members of council and the citizens of the community a $30 million investment. He forecast that it would be the Disneyland of the midwest, another Cedar Point like the great holiday carnival resort area of Sandusky on the Ohio shore of Lake Erie. A great effort was made at that time to save the island for public use either by outright purchase or expropriation by the city of Windsor or by acquisition by The Department of Lands and Forests, or by a combination of both governments acting together.

At that point, the province turned down all of the requests for assistance. An opportunity arose somewhat later when the developer, as had been forecast, failed to bring off the development and wound up with some $700,000 of liens against him. In response to those, he put the island on the auction block in the city of Toronto in March, 1969.

At that point, those that had campaigned to save Peche Island for public use once again renewed their efforts with the minister and with the city council. Once again, despite the likelihood that the island would pass from the ownership of E. J. Harris, the promoter, to private ownership by other US interests, no effort was made to save it.

A third opportunity now presents itself. The liens are outstanding. The courts have issued writs to execute them and we await the reply of the minister and the Ontario Parks Integration Board as to what assistance will be forthcoming this time. The minister well knows the pressure on Holiday Beach and Point Pelee and the Pinery and all the other parklands, federal and provincial. There are so few municipal parks that it is hardly worthwhile mentioning them in the southwestern Ontario region.

There are very few lands left for public use, as was indicated by the recent report of the conservation authorities branch of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, on the shoreline of the great bodies of water in southwestern Ontario. Almost all of it is under private ownership and private development. In fact, one is reminded of the former Minister of Trade and Development who used to stand in his place and talk about financing wall-to-wall factories from Cornwall on the east to Windsor on the west.

Mr. Chairman, as one travels along the CNR, along the St. Clair shore, or as one travels along Highway 18A, what we have in southwestern Ontario are wall-to-wall cottages. It is virtually impossible these days to see the shoreline, to see the water—even from the elevation of the railway carriage—to see the lakefront by virtue of the cramming of cottage development, tightly packed cottages, boathouses, cabins, all along those two shorelines. Little access remains for the public.

Peche Island is one of the last major public recreational resources left. I want to ask the minister what can be done this time to assist the city of Windsor to acquire it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed at the last meeting of the Parks Integration Board this morning. Quite a number of the members along with myself visited Peche Island. We were accompanied by his worship the mayor of Windsor, the city manager and other representatives from Windsor.

There will be another meeting of the Parks Integration Board this week and the matter will be discussed. We saw it this morning under ideal conditions. The weather was nice. There were some nice paths. We saw some wildlife. However, as the hon. member knows, it has its limitations. It is an island. However, we are seriously looking into the purchase of this island and there will be a decision made in the near future.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask the minister a couple of further questions, Mr. Chairman? Was the minister informed today that the extent of the island above the water level could be considerably extended by the filling of water lots lying on the Canadian side of the international boundary?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This was not brought to our attention, but this could well be. We had a good look at the—

Mr. Peacock: I wonder if the minister would keep that in mind, because one of the factors is the smallness of the island. That is perhaps a thought to keep in mind, because the island can be expanded and it was the intention of the developers to so expand it by filling in the water lots. I do not recall exactly by what proportion he proposed to increase its size at present by filling in, but it would have been a substantial increase.

May I ask the minister if he or the Ontario Parks Integration Board has a policy in respect to the handling of the liens that are out-

standing on the island? Are these encumbrances in any way regarded by the minister or the Parks Integration Board as an obstacle to the island's purchase?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This would be a matter that mainly The Department of Public Works would be concerned with and I have asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) if he would ask his officials to take a look into the legal complications facing the purchase of the spot.

Mr. Peacock: The minister should know, Mr. Chairman, that the mortgage holder—at least at the time of purchase by Sirrah Limited, the firm set up by E. J. Harris to acquire and develop the island—is a Windsor firm, R. C. Pruefer Riverside Construction, which gave back a first mortgage to the purchaser, E. J. Harris, to finance his purchase of the island.

So that it is my understanding that with the payment of the liens into court, those encumbrances would be discharged and at that point the title would be clear. Therefore, there should not be any real obstacle.

I want to make this last comment about Peche Island, Mr. Chairman. The city of Windsor itself is encumbered with a very heavy debt respecting the financing of its sewage treatment works and sewage collection. It has had the priority of this capital development forced upon it by the very circumstances of the waterways on which the city stands—the Detroit River and the lack of treatment of drainage from the surrounding municipalities through the waterways of the city into the Detroit River.

A very, very large share of the annual operating budget and of the annual capital works budget goes to the financing and maintenance of these sewage treatment and sewage collection facilities. The city is under OWRC's very watchful eye to maintain these.

The future capital works budget represents also a very high proportion of the total proposed spending over the next 10 years. It is simply not possible for the city to finance 100 per cent, wholly on its own, the acquisition of Peche Island to the order of the price—let us say even the purchase price several years ago—of Sirrah Park. The purchase by Windsor is going to require great assistance, perhaps beyond the maximum permitted under The Parks Assistance Act, by The Department of Lands and Forests, if not total financing by The Department of Lands and Forests.

I know the minister has had some reservation in the past on acquisitions in the name of the department, principally because the island is located in a waterway and access might be difficult. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the problem of access really represents one of the features of the island that makes it an attraction. There is a chance to get on the river and cross to the island and, from then on, enjoy the day, either picnicking or sightseeing, just as the citizens Metropolitan Toronto have access to a magnificent resource in the Toronto bay, the Toronto Islands.

Something of that nature would be ideal for Windsor. They company that is there now has signed over, by way of security for some of its borrowings, the ferries which it purchased. And, I might say, it purchased them at a very, very low price from the Expo 67 Corporation when it was selling off its assets.

One or two of those ferries have since disappeared. One, I understand has disappeared. Perhaps the mayor of Windsor spoke to the minister about that this morning. I hope that this time, Mr. Chairman, the Parks Integration Board will not have the same answer it has had on the last two occasions, and that either Windsor, with the help of the department, will purchase this island in the near future, or The Department of Lands and Forests itself will acquire it as one of the first major public parks an island in a major waterway in the province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of some of the acquisitions that have been made through the Parks Integration Board on behalf of the recommendation of the Minister of Lands and Forests to acquire further recreational land in Simcoe East and the county of Simcoe, and I would commend him for the foresight.

I would suggest—and I feel that I speak on behalf of the other members representing the constituencies in Simcoe county, the member for Simcoe Centre and Dufferin-Simcoe—that inasmuch as a great portion of this area has been designated a green-belt area in the proposed Design for Development, I would urge the minister to give priority to further acquisitions in this area, where the cost of land, particularly in the non-productive agricultural areas, is not too great. It does not need to be in many cases lakeshore property but property that could be used for ski-doo trails and winter recreation usage, and I would urge,

Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, his consideration for further acquisition of recreational land in this area.

However, I would like to ask the minister a question concerning the naming of a park in my area. He will recall that some time ago he indicated, as a result of a request from myself, that he would consider calling the park located at McRae Point, adjacent to Orillia in Ontario county, after the famed novelist and humorist from Orillia, the late Stephen Leacock. I believe the minister did indicate that this park would be named after him in recognition of the centennial of his birth. Since then, prior to the development of the park, the local municipal officials in Mara and Rama townships have indicated that they would like to have the park called after some traditional name or some local personage synonymous with their county or their municipality and, as a result, I would ask the minister if he would consider naming the proposed park north of Orillia, at what is called the Goldstein property, after the late Stephen Leacock and call it the Leacock Park?

You will recall that the Parks Integration Board, through you, did acquire some 100 acres on Lake Couchiching to be held for recreational purposes, and I would hope that when this is developed in the future you would give consideration to calling it after the late Stephen Leacock, and perhaps you could give me some assurance or some indication as to your feeling in this matter, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply, we intend to develop that area, to acquire more property and to develop it into a major park, and I do believe that the name Stephen Leacock would certainly be a popular and a very appropriate one and I would certainly be pleased to take the hon. member's recommendation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I just want to ask one brief question with regard to parks, Mr. Chairman, and that is a problem that arose over the fixing of boundaries in Polar Bear Park. I recall last year when we discussed this that there was some accommodation to be made with regard to the native population situated up at Winisk, and it seemed to me at that time there was some difficulty or some apprehension on the part of the Indians lest they not be allowed to have access to hunting, fishing and trapping as guaranteed to them by former treaties and having due regard for their aboriginal rights.

I am just wondering whether this has now been resolved and whether the people living there have been given every assurance that they will be able to continue to harvest the natural resources that are in the area and that are so necessary for their survival, in many cases, in that area? I am just wondering if that has been resolved to their satisfaction?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, yes, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that we met, my officials and myself, I believe it was in February in Kapuskasing. We flew the chief and the members of his band down to Kapuskasing. We had met with him on previous occasions.

This was a very successful meeting and we assured the chief about the word "park"—we explained to him that this was a primitive park. Their idea of the word "park" was sort of beaches, picnic tables and so forth, and we allayed their fears that this was a primitive park that we established to preserve this unique area and that they would be able to continue their traditional way of life, hunting and fishing.

We also assured them that camps, if they were to be, say, geese camps and commercial fishing camps, that they would be the ones that would operate it, and we also told them that we would translate into Cree the regulations concerning the park and they agreed to this. Mr. Chairman, I certainly can tell the hon. member that we had a very successful meeting and the Indians are quite satisfied with the arrangements we submitted to them.

Mr. Stokes: One final thing. If at any time it is found necessary to have conservation officers on a regular basis to police the restrictions that are associated with a primitive park—whether the band members will be given an opportunity to be trained in the art of protecting the resources in the area, as a primitive area—would they be given first chance to participate in that kind of programme if it should ever become necessary

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we certainly would want to have Indians to assist us in managing this area and to act as conservation officers. Winisk is the largest community, and I think it would only be appropriate that it would be the native people who would do this type of work.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask of the minister concerning the park in Lake St. Clair—I think the minister refers to it as Tremblay Park—if all the lands have been purchased.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, all the lands have been purchased, and I believe this summer the park will be open but not for admission; it is still in the development stage.

Mr. B. Newman: Then the park is not going to be open actually; the department is going to be working on the park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. B. Newman: So really the minister's press release as to the park being open was very misleading, because I had quite a few who had actually approached me for employment concerning the new park. Is the SWEEP programme going to be involved in the new park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The SWEEP programme—well, it could be, but not necessarily. The SWEEP programme could apply to that area, but I cannot specifically tell the member whether there will be people employed. SWEEP is mainly an environmental programme.

Mr. B. Newman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Cleaning of—

Mr. B. Newman: They could clean up the beach and the woodlot in the whole area, and possibly make it that much more attractive.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, we will certainly have a staff that will do the cleaning, but I could not assure the member whether they will be under the SWEEP programme.

Mr. B. Newman: How much in funds does the minister plan on spending this fiscal year on the development of that park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At Tremblay Beach?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Eighty-three thousand dollars.

Mr. B. Newman: Then all of those funds will be spent in the development of the park and none for acquisition of any additional lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, all the lands have been acquired and this will be for development purposes.

Mr. B. Newman: But there is no plan at all for additional acquisition beyond what is now the Tremblay Park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, this park will be day use and the area that has been acquired is a fair size.

Mr. B. Newman: Is it anticipated that this park will be in full operation for the ensuing vacation year? In other words, one year from today does the minister foresee that park being actually used by the public?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In 1972 we will be charging admission fees, and the park will be fully operational.

Mr. B. Newman: We really appreciate the minister purchasing the lands in that area. We hope that he does not stop with the size of the park that he has now, that his plans envisage enlarging the park because he well knows the need for the park in the Lake St. Clair area and the need for parks in Essex county, and we welcome the purchase of that and we wish to commend him for it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Would the minister enlighten the members with a little more elaborate statement in regard to what I consider a most selective and maybe a restrictive recreational programme; that is, the underwater park he announced, and which is explained in just one brief paragraph in his opening comments?

One would think, unless the minister does tell us, that this is a far-away dream sort of programme that is not in keeping with the priorities of today, in that we need more recreational parkland on land where people can use it. This is going to be a really selective and restrictive type of use. And this is what I would like the minister to elaborate to some extent on just what this means. Has he envisaged the cost and can we envisage the realization of this development in say three, four or five years? What does this paragraph mean?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I hope sometime in the near future to have a statement on this Fathom Five Provincial Park; quite true it was very briefly announced in my opening remarks of the estimates. This will be planned over a period of years. What

we are doing now is we are establishing the boundaries and we would like to protect those shipwrecks that are there now—there are somewhere between 15 and 20 old steamboats and tugs.

The major expenditures involved will be the acquisition of a base in the Tobermory area whereby we will establish an interpretive centre. This underwater park will tie in nicely with the whole concept of the Niagara Escarpment. The reason we want to establish it now is to protect those values we feel should be protected.

I hope that sometime in the near future, as I have just said, to give a much fuller statement on the proposed park.

Mr. Gisborn: Is there any money in the estimates for this specific project?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe that there is any sizable sum in our estimates at this time.

Mr. Stokes: Where did the minister get the suit that he posed in for his annual report?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to say, just for a second, Mr. Chairman, that I did go down last summer in the Sublimnos, and it was a very interesting experience. This Sublimnos is about 100 feet off the shoreline and it also has a lot of value in our fisheries management; our fisheries people have been studying fish life and also we have some artificial reefs using cement blocks and so forth. So this has not only a recreational use, it has also a lot of use for biological management of our fisheries.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Under this vote $500,000 for loans under The Fisheries Loans Act, could the minister inform us—

Mr. Chairman Perhaps we had better finish with the parks.

Mr. Spence: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: That is a statutory item in any event. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I have recently written to the minister about changes in admission fees to Ontario provincial parks as a deliberate policy deterrent to use of our parks by non-residents. It has been represented to me by several constituents, who use our parks extensively at various times of the year, that they observe an increasing use by non-residents, particularly from south of the border. While they make their point without proposing an absolute prohibition on entry to our parks by non-residents, they do feel that there is some urgent need for a user charge which differentiates between use by a resident and use by a non-resident.

These constituents have also travelled extensively in the United States. They point out that in most of the jurisdictions in which they have entered state parks—and they have not spoken of non-resident park fees in other provinces of Canada, but in regard to those parks where they have camped in south of the border—they have always been faced with non-resident fees that discriminated or dif ferentiated between non-residents and residents. I wonder how close the minister is to reaching that kind of policy.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, this is a good point and it is certainly one that we have discussed and it is under review. I should also mention that there are other views. The Department of Tourism and Information, which is responsible for promoting tourism in this province, has accurate figures on the value of United States tourists to Ontario, so we have to keep this in mind. But there are some very good arguments that can be put forward why non-Canadians should not be charged a higher fee. As I said, this matter is under review.

Mr. Peacock: How much would the tourist business as such lose by the imposition of a discriminatory non-resident park admission fee? Has Tourism and Information given the minister any suggestions like that, or has he in his own department made some examination of the result?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe that The Department of Tourism and Information would have figures on the possible loss of revenues.

Mr. Peacock: I just do not accept it, Mr. Chairman, unless the minister has some statistics to produce to show that there would indeed be any serious loss of revenue to the tourist outfitters or to motel operators, bait dealers, and so on—particularly in southern Ontario. Perhaps the minister has in mind his own part of the province, northern Ontario, where patronage of the tourist industry is much more heavily in favour of the non-resident. I am speaking of southern Ontario where huge volumes of

people cross the borders specifically to make use of our parks on a day or one overnight stay basis, not for an extended period of time, which I am sure the minister has in mind. This is a very difficult subject, particularly for southwestern Ontario because of its own low density population—by comparison with the huge metropolis of Detroit and beyond in the state of Michigan and other centres of Ohio—which draws very large numbers of Americans to Point Pelee and to Holiday Beach, to Rondeau, and so on. Point Pelee simply cannot take any more pressure of people. It is going to be overrun as a nature preserve. As beach property it is already, because of pollution and because of crowding, becoming less and less attractive a place to go each year. I think before very long, if the minister wishes to preserve even the semblance of parkland, beach front and habitat for wildlife, he is going to have to do some kind of rationing for perhaps both residents and non-residents.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The policy has not been established in parks, but we have, of course, in hunting fees and also angling, non-residents pay much higher fees.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3; the hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: I wonder if the minister could tell me in the estimated amount of $3,550,000 for the acquisition of physical assets, does that include land? Any land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes. That amount, Mr. Chairman, includes lands.

Mr. Gisborn: Has the minister—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that amount does not include land. You are referring to the $3,500,000?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, the $3,550,000.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, $3,550,000. Out of that amount, I am sorry to correct myself here again, it is $3,250,000 for land acquisition, and $300,000 for construction of physical assets.

Mr. Gisborn: Could I ask the minister, has the department established a ratio of acreage per thousand of population in the province as an objective for recreational lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have a variety of parks in the province. We have primitive parks, natural environment parks, Algonquin and Quetico natural parks, nature history parks. You are asking if we have a sort of figure guideline of so many per population or so many acres per population?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have seen some figures used but at the moment we have not any.

Mr. Gisborn: That is what makes one wonder if we know exactly where we are going in the province to preserve and acquire the lands necessary for recreational needs of the province. We know that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: As we have been interested in recreation we have read that—would the chatterbox cease. Does he want the floor?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East has the floor.

Mr. Gisborn: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, my interest in the recreational lands over many years has brought me to read about what was established in 1920 by the United States National Recreational Parks Association. They established that there was a need for 10 acres per thousand of population. That was as far back as 1920. Norman Pearson of the Centre for Resource Development of the University of Guelph has made a study which indicated that we need to raise our objectives to a modest 15 acres per thousand to start to keep up with the recreational needs in this province at the present time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Peacock: The Minister of Highways and Transport is behaving like the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) used to, coming in here late at night—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East has the floor.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): I could hear you outside, that is the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Gisborn: The latest figures that I have been able to obtain to establish a reasonable objective are from Marion Klausson and Jack Ketch, "Economics of Outdoor Recreation," Johns Hopkins, 1966. They are considered the

most contemporary planners and they argue for a standard as high as 78 acres per thousand of population to now take care of the needs because of urban development and congestion. My first question to the minister is, has this department an objective of so much acreage per thousand of population for their recreational parks development and acquisition in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, it would be rather difficult. Take, for instance, Polar Bear Park, which is away up in the north end of the province and has over 9,000 square miles—over nine million acres. So if we were to use those types of criteria I think it would not be very objective.

I would like to say to the hon. member though, that we have 108 provincial parks and we have 19,513 campsites. These are provincial park campsites. We have more campsites than all the national parks put together.

Mr. Gisborn: What is your total acreage?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The total acreage in our parks is approximately 10 million acres.

Mr. Gisborn: We are not talking about the same thing, you see. I am talking about land for public parks and other forms of outdoor recreation—land or private recreation uses, such as golf courses; land for more green space and regeneration of over-used land.

Now I know we have got millions of acres of land, but of the people that I am talking about, in the urban areas of Hamilton and Toronto, only a very small number of them are able to use the kind of parks and areas that you have been buying. I am talking about recreational areas near to the urban centres that can be used by the majority of the people.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I indicated in my remarks on this last Tuesday, when we were rebating this question asked about the Toronto-centred region. I indicated that we have nine areas in this Toronto-centred region that we will be acquiring to develop parklands, in addition to what we presently have. So we have quite a large programme of park acquisition in this densely populated area.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 3 carry?

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, before the vote carries—I am sure it will carry and the weary minister can be relieved of all this—I have one last word for the Minister of Highways and Transport. I may not be running again, but I am going to remain a citizen of Ontario and I want to get into one of those parks that your government boasts so much about.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: From where the member lives he will have no problem.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: From where the member lives it is easy.

Mr. Peacock: If you get there at 6 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Where has the member been?

Mr. Ruston: Has construction started yet on Tremblay Beach in Essex county? I was down in the committee and I may have missed this if it was brought up. There was $35,000 set aside last year; was any of that spent?

Mr. Stokes: That was brought up by your colleague, the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Chairman: Good, okay then.

Will item 3 carry?

Carried.

Vote 1103 agreed to.

This completes the estimates for The Department of Lands and Forests.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. While this carries the vote, the statutory item to which the hon. member for Kent had referred is not subject to voting upon. But I am not going to restrict the discussion. If he wishes to discuss that then he may do so; it does not have to be voted upon.

Mr. Spence: One thing I would like to ask the minister in regard to $500,000 for loans to commercial fishermen: How many commercial fishermen were turned down for loans across the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How many were turned down?

Mr. Spence: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My understanding—

Mr. Spence: With great respect.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in the Lake Erie area where the hon. member lives, it is my understanding that the great majority of the fishermen did receive loans. I believe there are one or two whose applications are still being reviewed.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that their applications for loans are still being considered. I understand that some of them have an income of $500 to $600 a week and up to $800 a week, and I do appreciate the minister saying that their loans are being considered still, I hope. I appreciate those remarks.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Lucky guy. Everybody goes on a holiday for two weeks, eh?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Mr. Sargent: Glad to have Mr. Speaker back.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to indicate that tomorrow it is intended to proceed with the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary. The estimates, I believe, of The Department of Health are being studied in committee at the present time.

On Thursday, I would hope that we might take some of the materials which are on order No. 3 of the present order paper of Committee of the Whole House and perhaps one or two second readings as well as continuing with the estimates of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, can the government House leader give us any idea of the estimates following in the House after the Provincial Secretary's?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I would think so, Mr. Speaker, if I can find my record.

It is planned in the House that the estimates of The Department of University Affairs will follow the Provincial Secretary's, and following that department, The Department of Correctional Services. Then, I anticipate, it would be The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs. That is the House.

In committee I would expect that The Department of Highways and Transport will follow The Department of Health. The Department of Social and Family Services will follow The Department of Highways and Transport, and then The Department of Labour will follow on in committee.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): All next week.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock,, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 17, 1971

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, concluded 1673

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 1699



No. 41

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we have as our guests in the east gallery, students from Main Street School, Toronto, and Park Lawn School, Toronto, and in the west gallery from King Edward Senior Public School, in Toronto and Stephen Leacock Collegiate Institute in Agincourt, and in both galleries from McGregor Public School in Windsor. Later in the east gallery we will have a group of community workers and interested citizens from Peterborough, and in the west gallery students from Jesse Ketchum Public School in Toronto, and this evening the Whitevale Boys' Club from Whitevale will be with us.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the Legislature some distinguished visitors we have from Belgium in the Speaker's gallery. We have with us today His Excellency, Hendrick Fayat, the Minister of Foreign Trade of Belgium; Mr. E. Grandry, Ambassador, head of the ministers' cabinet; Mr. T. De Dobbeleer, Ambassador, administrator, director general of The Department of Foreign Trade; Mr. J. Melsens, the Consul General of Belgium, and other members of the delegation.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members would like to extend a hearty welcome to these visitors representing a country with whom we have very friendly relations, including very good trade relations.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure we are all delighted to have His Excellency and entourage with us this afternoon.

Before the statements by the ministry I might say to the party whips that I have had some difficulty with the matter of accumulated answers to questions. Yesterday, if you recall, I straitjacketed the Minister of Trade and Development, because I felt it was not proper that questions which may have lost their urgency—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): You should never have let him out.

Mr. Speaker: —should take up the time of the question period when other urgent questions come to the members' minds. I would suggest that perhaps the whips might get together and, perhaps with the procedure committee, see if there should not be a different place for these accumulated answers.

I have suggested to the minister that in the statements by the ministry period today he might give the balance of his answers and then they would be open for question in the question period and it would not take up our question period. He has reluctantly agreed, and I would ask the Minister of Trade and Development to carry on.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be in a position to answer any supplementary questions which may arise from this but—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): We will be surprised if the minister is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be surprised if the hon. member was not surprised. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): The member would be surprised if the minister was not surprised too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and the pleasure of accompanying our distinguished visitors to Ontario Place. They must leave at 2.30 so if I should leave before there is an opportunity to answer any supplementary questions, it is not because I am somewhat hesitant in facing any fire.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister planned it this way. He deliberately planned to avoid it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the government calls very good foreign trade relations.

Mr. Speaker, on April 16 the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) asked if the subsidy and loan programme of the Ontario Development Corporation was reviewed last

year by the comprehensive government-wide review of loans and subsidies that was carried out by the Treasury Board. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes, it was reviewed.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What was the result, or was that another interdepartmental report and secret?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was reviewed.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) has asked me a question concerning the housing programme:

> Does the new programme to create additional housing provide for a major expansion by the province in the provision of wholesale water and sewage facilities to eliminate the crippling shortage of serviced lots and, in fact, create a surplus of serviced lots?

The new housing programme, Mr. Speaker, includes $50 million for the acquisition and servicing of land for the HOME plans in 60 municipalities. Generally water and sewer facilities, together with engineering, technical evaluation and financing are provided to municipalities by the Ontario Water Resources Commission rather than the Ontario Housing Corporation. However, Mr. Speaker, there are specific cases where Ontario Housing Corporation will enter into agreements that will assist municipalities in providing services to others. As an example is the $8,750,000 trunk sewer to serve a portion of Hamilton Mountain and work involving $1.3 million of this job is now under way.

In other words we assist in servicing lands adjacent to our major holdings but the prime mover in this regard is OWRC.

ODC LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on April 22, the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) asked me to table a list of the nine Lake Erie fishing companies which had been assisted through the Ontario Development Corporation. I am prepared to table this unless the hon. member would prefer I read it. Thank you.

HOME PROGRAMME VEHICLE

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) asked a question of very urgent and extreme public importance.

Mr. Nixon: The member asked it but the minister did not have the answer.

An hon. member: I notice the truck is gone anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member asked about a large vehicle that had been parked for some time in front of a garage on Highway 10. I have been advised that the vehicle in question is a large trailer that had been used by the Ontario Housing Corporation as an information centre. It had been stored in The Department of Highways lot and the trailer is now located in Ontario Place where it is being utilized.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It would still be there if the hon. member did not ask the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: It would still be there if the member did not ask the question. I am going to miss it every week.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement to the Legislature concerning audited financial statements of the provincially-assisted universities.

Last year the then Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) indicated to the Legislature his desire to table the audited financial statements of each of the 14 provincially assisted universities. It is with pleasure that I am now able to act on this matter. In doing so, I should like to point out that the financial statement for the University of Western Ontario has already been tabled as called for under its Act, and that I am performing this duty for the University of Toronto statements on behalf of the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) as called for under The University of Toronto Act.

In presenting all of these financial statements, I want to emphasize that it must be recognized in making any assessment or comparison of the data contained in these documents that one is dealing with 14 very different institutions. In addition, the internal organizations and the financial records of these institutions vary to a wide degree, rendering it even more difficult to make proper comparisons.

This problem is receiving close attention, and efforts are being directed to developing

improved methods for the disclosure of financial information on university operations in a comparable manner, so that data can be correctly aggregated for the university system and simple and meaningful comparisons made between institutions.

The Legislature may be assured that significant progress is being made in regard to this matter. A committee of financial officers of the Council of Ontario Universities, which is the new name for the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, has two task forces at work which are meeting regularly with officials of the department. The department expects a new reporting form will be introduced in the 1971-1972 financial year which will represent a major step forward. This should enable me to present the Legislature with comparable financial information for the year 1970-1971, either late in 1971 or early in 1972.

Mr. MacDonald: If you are still around.

Hon. Mr. White: That member will not be. Present divergent practices—for which good reasons exist—in the accounting systems and financial reports of the 14 provincially assisted universities make the task undertaken a major challenge. The completion of this work will therefore require close attention for a period of several years. We are proceeding however, on the assumption that the essential requirements for more sophisticated financial information on university operations can be met without the need to introduce standard accounting systems and/or having audited financial statements prepared in a uniform format.

The tabling of these financial statements today is further evidence of the government's determination that there should be full financial accountability not only by government departments and agencies but also by those public and quasi-public institutions which are in receipt of substantial public funds. I know that this development will be welcomed by all hon. members as it is by me on this occasion.

Mr. Shulman: A question of privilege, sir. Yesterday in the House I asked a series of questions of the Minister of Trade and Development in connection with arrears of rent at Ontario Housing. This morning, sir, a group of employees of the Ontario Housing Corporation were threatened that charges would be laid against them under The Official Secrets Act if any further information was given to me or any other member of the opposition. Sir, I submit to you that all employees of a corporation such as Ontario Housing Corporation have a right to come in contact with their MPP and give information on matters of public interest and that the Minister of Trade and Development should be so informed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about the matter raised by the hon. member, about any threats made, but certainly the employees do swear an oath of secrecy and it is expected of them that they shall honour that oath of secrecy. As a matter of fact, if there should be any criticism, I was rather shocked that the hon. member, with a great deal of glee and a grin on his face, passed over to me a copy of a document marked "confidential."—Apparently the hon. member had it photostated and, as far as I have been informed, he handed copies of it to the press, which is a rather shocking way of dealing with civil servants.

Mr. MacDonald: What is confidential about it?

Mr. Shulman: It is not marked "confidential."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It means in fact that there are going to be many civil servants who will have a shadow of suspicion cast over them.

Mr. Lewis: That is because the minister is paranoid.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was no reason the hon. member could not raise the question without divulging a confidential document.

Mr. Lewis: Not because they have done anything wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of the alleged direction to the members of the staff.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Too many of his documents are confidential.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will find that out. Certainly those people who are in charge of OHC are quite within their rights if they draw to the attention of civil servants that they have no right giving out information contained in confidential documents. I know that it has been the experience of not only the member for High Park, but as a matter of fact the leader of his party from time to time, to show how smart alecky they are by getting hold of confidential documents issued—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, go away.

Mr. Pilkey: The minister hides too much from the public. Why does he not involve the people?

Mr. MacDonald: He runs public business like a private preserve.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —between civil servants, and I think they should be censured for that.

Mr. Shulman: May I speak to this? May I speak to these charges?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What charges?

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's charges.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has raised a point that he stated was personal privilege to himself. I find that it is not; it is not a matter of that. It is a matter of departmental procedures and the rights, privileges and duties of members of the civil service of Ontario, and it would be my view that that was not a proper point.

The hon. member having raised the point and castigated the minister, I think the minister was quite proper in defending himself and making a reply. So far as I am concerned the matter is now closed on the floor of this House.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, a cabinet minister stands in the House and talks about casting a shadow of suspicion on employees —who is casting the shadow of suspicion? Certainly not us on this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course they are.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, the member can be more indignant than that.

Mr. Lewis: I am just telling the minister he is always hunting.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS OF LAND ACQUISITIONS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Is he prepared to put a motion before the House which would refer the matter of land acquisition under the direction of The Department of Lands and Forests to the standing committee on resources, so that all three departments involved in land acquisitions discussed in the Legislature over recent days will have an opportunity to put all of the pertinent information before the committee?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I personally have been taking a look at this matter and I will have something to say to the House on Thursday.

STANDARD ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS IN PROVINCE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs, with regard to the statement he just made on the reporting of the financial situation at the provincially assisted universities. Why is the minister unwilling to consider the introduction of standard accounting systems in his effort to get meaningful comparisons from the financial statements of the universities?

Hon. Mr. White: We think at this point in time it is not necessary to have uniform accounting systems in the different institutions where the accounting methods, report forms, and so on, have been specifically designed to meet those institutional needs. We think that by having a common reporting form we will accomplish all of the uniformity required to enable members of this Legislature and other interested observers to compare performance, costs and such like.

If, in fact, this proves not to be the case, then we would have to consider uniformity throughout the accounting systems in each of the universities, but this is a tremendously complex and time-consuming matter and one that we would not embark upon unless we were fully satisfied that the halfway house, so to speak, which we are requiring, or requesting, from the council of universities, is not fully satisfactory for our purposes.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister satisfied in his remarks here that it may be several years before meaningful comparisons would be available because of the complexity of the problem?

Hon. Mr. White: We will have something better a year from now than we have right now. There is no way of my telling the member at this moment in time if that is going to be perfectly satisfactory to the members of the Legislature or not. It will certainly be a big step forward. When we have that uniform method of accounting available for the first time, we will have to determine what, if any, additional improvements are needed.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement in the minister's statement, paragraph 7, that the government is determined that there should be full financial accountability, not only by government departments but by agencies, could the minister explain why there is still no public accountability in these terms from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education?

Hon. Mr. White: So far as my department is concerned, the institute is now on exactly the same basis as any university in Ontario. They receive their grants from my department, based entirely on BIU values. It is up to them from that point on, as with each of the 13 universities to allocate these resources internally. I think in the process they will be induced to use these particular resources economically and efficiently. I would certainly require that there be full accountability so far as these funds are concerned. With respect to the research grants made available by The Department of Education, I think the member's question should be put to the Minister of Education.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Surely the minister could have lunch with the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) and agree that in this minister's statement the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education's total grants, not just the teaching part, should be tabled in the Legislature for public scrutiny and accountability.

Hon. Mr. White: Let the member have lunch with him.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister is his colleague. I am just his critic.

Mr. Lewis: But he does not like him.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would like to ask a supplementary. Is it the expectation of the minister that, when the colleges of applied arts and technology are transferred to the minister's department and are on formula financing in the same way the universities are, we will have the same opportunity to look at the accounts of these institutions in terms of programme and costs as well?

Hon. Mr. White: I certainly would. If I may expand on that for a moment, I like the idea of having the universities autonomous and having them allocate these resources internally without a lot of heavy pressure from politicians. But, it seems to me, that there is a concomitant responsibility not only on the politicians but the university governments to ensure that these public funds are efficiently and effectively used and that there be full accountability. The searching light of public opinion, it seems to me, will encourage and induce the universities to use these funds wisely. So my hope would be that we get complete accountability of the expenditures of public moneys from the various grantees, at the universities, the community colleges, the AGO, ROM, and so on.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture: Can he tell the House what advice will be given to Ontario's council who will be attending the Supreme Court hearings on the constitutionality of the Manitoba agriculture legislation—order-in-council in that case—which is comparable to our recent Bill 10?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered that question in the House a couple of weeks ago. I got the same question from the hon. member, but perhaps it was another hon. member.

The general instructions to council are that we are supporting the Manitoba legislation as being intra vires the provinces.

Mr. Nixon: The Attorney General did not say that before.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member had not heard that before? I guess he was away that week.

Mr. Nixon: No, the Attorney General had not made the statement before.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I did not?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Can we take it for granted that the minister is familiar with the agriculture problem as it is faced in this province here and is prepared to speak for the Minister of Agriculture in matters of policy?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Who is?

Mr. Nixon: The Attorney General.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Me? Not me!

Mr. Nixon: Well I asked the House leader yesterday if he was going to designate some minister who might speak on agriculture policy.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I do not know which came first.

Mr. Nixon: I guess it will be the Premier.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am not the guy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a suggestion which relates to the responsibilities of the Minister of Agriculture who is, as we all know, unfortunately in the hospital at the moment.

I would suggest that we do two things. I will endeavour to answer questions as they relate to The Department of Agriculture. If the matter is of sufficient concern it would be helpful if the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of the NDP would communicate these questions to me in advance of the session so that I would have an opportunity to get this information for them.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask a question of the Premier which I think he could answer. Has there been any attempt to contact the government of Quebec, either at the top level, as to what might be done to alleviate the escalation in the problems that the two provinces face in the interprovincial trade in farm produce?

Mr. MacDonald: I asked that one two weeks ago as well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been and I will get a more definite statement for the Leader of the Opposition for Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

ODC DIRECTORS' INTERESTS

Mr. Lewis: A question first of the Minister of Trade and Development before he has to depart:

In the context of his statement yesterday, can he indicate to the House how many conflicts of interest, to use that term, were declared by directors of the Ontario Development Corporation in the granting of performance loans?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the material handy, but I think I can remember the circumstances.

There were three instances in which the two members of the board felt that, even though within the strict terms of the legislation it was not a conflict of interest, they ought to declare what indirect interest someone may consider they may have and refrain from participating in that discussion on the loans involved.

I recall in two instances it had to do with companies which were applying for assistance for which the directors' accounting firms were doing the auditing, which is rather indirect. I do not think they needed to go that far, but they did.

The other one just escapes me for the moment, but I will get that information for the hon. member. When I was finished with the answer yesterday I took it back in my office.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, I take it that he would be reluctant to name the instances involved? Or would he think that can be a matter of public record?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will look at that, Mr. Speaker. Again, as I say, I like to give all the information that is possible to the House, but I have to be careful in some of these instances so that no one is unfairly or unnecessarily harmed. I will get that information and see whether the House can have that.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise the House at the same time as to whether or not there are any general statements of declaration of interest filed by the members of the board of the Ontario Development Corporation in advance to any matter coming before that board in accordance with normal practice?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information, but as far as I recall—and I read the legislation, I read that portion of the section of the Act to the House yesterday and I do not think it requires them to do that. It merely requires them, if I recall, to declare any possible interest they may have and refrain from participating in the discussion. But I will find out whether in fact they are required to do anything further than that—I do not think so.

Mr. Lewis: Just by a related question, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps a new one. In view of the minister's indication yesterday that he will not give the names of those firms which have decided not to go ahead, or for whom the performance loan has been forfeit, might

he then adopt a policy of not making any announcement about the award of a loan until in fact the loan has been granted, the actual money has been routed?

Hon. Mr. Grosman: I thought about that at the time, Mr. Speaker, because the obvious question arose that if we are making a press release at the time it is agreed they should have their loan, why not do the reverse when they do not go ahead? I have been told that it is of great interest to the community, and there is a great deal of pleasure from the communities and in many cases, but not most, from the officials of the municipalities.

Apparently they feel that it is of enough importance to the goodwill of the community to make an announcement as soon as possible, because it has some ancillary benefits: Other people feel encouraged to carry on; perhaps there may be a number of retail merchants who may have been thinking that unless there is some way of keeping a certain company in existence, of helping it to expand or keeping it from going out of business, that it may harm them. So it is felt that this is important to do.

Personally, I have no strong views on it; if this can be substantiated, I think we should continue to make the announcements. If we find—and I will go into this a little further—that there is really no great benefit for making the announcement, I have no objection to it at all.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister make it his policy not to allow the Conservative candidate to make such announcements in the future?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any Conservative candidate—

Mr. MacDonald: That is fair enough.

Mr. Nixon: That sounds reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —or anyone else making—

Mr. Nixon: Does the minister not know about that either?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, there are a lot of things about the ODC, which has been going on for a number of years, that I have not been—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as I am concerned, once a loan has been granted, if it is important for the community to know, then as many people as possible should make the announcement as far as I am concerned. I have no objections to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker:I do not and never will hold it against a man because he happens to be or ever was a Conservative candidate.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): It must be hurting.

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister now available for the Legislature a list of those requests for subdivision approvals submitted to his department by Caledon Mountain Estates in any area of the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question in the House yesterday by the hon. Leader of the Opposition; I do not think the leader of the New Democratic Party was in the House at that time.

I have answers to that particular question and I have answers in reference to that kind of question as it relates to Caledon township and the effect of the Niagara Escarpment report in that region. I am not aware of any application by Caledon Estates in any other part of the escarpment.

The hon. member for Riverdale placed a question on the order paper which I have not checked yet, but it is being done. It may cover other areas.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, would the minister then be kind enough to give what answers he now has, if that is not asking too much?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Thank you, if it is agreeable—

Mr. Speaker: The minister of course will give the answer in the appropriate time.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has 3,500 civil servants. We have been waiting a long time.

Mr. Speaker: The minister has advised me that he has the answer to a question asked by Mr. Nixon: It is our custom that we allow the leaders of the two parties to ask their

questions before we interpolate answers, and if the leaders are agreeable, I have no objection to the minister giving the answer now. Otherwise he would wait until the member for Scarborough West has completed his questions.

Mr. Lewis: It would be very nice to have it now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The minister might then give the reply to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in three parts, and the first part was whether or not there was an application for a plan of subdivision for the Forks of the Credit River before my department, The Department of Municipal Affairs, in the name of Caledon Mountain Estates. The answer to that is yes, there is.

I indicated that the other day, and the particular point here is that under the Gertler report there were certain lands recommended for acquisition by the province. There is a plan of subdivision which does cover part of the lands recommended for acquisition by the province.

That plan was received by the department in June, 1969, and it covered something more than 450 acres, including 102 residential acreage lots. Only part of that plan covered lands recommended for acquisition. The plan was submitted to the various departments of government and agencies in line with the normal practice.

I would make it very clear to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the other members of the House, that while the department seeks the views of other departments and agencies as to the plans, the decision as to the approval of the plan rests with my department, through the community planning branch.

The second question asked—and I think I have answered it now—was whether the application had been circulated through the regular departments and the answer to that is yes.

The third part was if the plan had been approved by The Department of Lands and Forests and the answer to that is no, Mr. Speaker, it has not. The Department of Lands and Forests recommended quite strongly along with others that the decision be withheld because the application violated the recommendations of the Niagara Escarpment study.

We have received the replies from the various departments and agencies, and since it is the policy to withhold an application of this nature when it is in conflict with a recommendation such as this, this plan has not been approved.

Mr. Nixon: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate to the House if the approval is still pending and how long the application has been before the department?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, the plan was received in June, 1969, and the plan is still before the department. It has not been approved and remains there. The member will appreciate that under the provisions of The Planning Act an application can be made to the minister to refer a plan of subdivisioin to the Ontario Municipal Board. Such an application has not been made to me and hence it is simply one that has not been approved.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: I wonder if the minister would table the recommendations made by The Department of Lands and Forests in this connection? Can he assure the House that no approvals have been given for building lots in the area under discussion which was recommended for public purchase by Gertler?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There was an approval in 1966, as I said to the members of the House last Friday, of a previous application for a plan of subdivision. That was released in 1966. Subsequently, the recommendations as to acquisition of land did cover part of that plan which had been released some two years previously.

Speaking generally, an owner might enter into some informal arrangement with another individual as to a possible sale of lots on a proposed plan over which I would have no control, but there could be no actual sale or conveyance of land under such a plan of subdivision until it were approved.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, would the minister let us see the recommendations of The Department of Lands and Forests?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I see no difficulty about that. It is in a form—I do not have it with me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do the 102 residential lot applications fall within the 1,070 acres of the Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Bales: As I said earlier in my answer, the subdivision application which contains 102 building lots or approximately 450 acres, is partly within the lands recommended for acquisition under Gertler?

Mr. Lewis: How much?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is hard for me to judge, but I would think perhaps a half—no more.

Mr. J. Renwick: About 250 acres?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Not 250; I cannot tell you the acreage, but I would think it would be under 200 acres. But I cannot be sure of that figure.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview has a supplementary?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister: Has the plan in question received draft approval by the local municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am sure the hon. member appreciates, as I do, particularly since he sat on the North York planning board for a long time, that the draft approval from the department must be received before it can really be dealt with effectively by other agencies, including the local municipality. The applicant might well have submitted it to the municipality directly; I am not aware of that. I think they may have approved it, thought I am not absolutely positive about that.

Mr. Young: A further supplementary: Do I understand then that the plan was never forwarded to the local municipality by the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I did not say that. I said that it had not been approved. I do not think it has been forwarded by the department, though it might have been one of the agencies to whom we circulated a copy of the plan.

Mr. Young: A further supplementary. Do I understand that the minister has not received from the local municipality the plan with any kind of approval by that municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bales: My information is that there may have been an earlier approval, but there are revisions in it and there has to be some further discussion on that matter before it can be dealt with. But there has been no draft approval from my department so that it could proceed to any finality.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the minister. What is the T number of the plan application he is referring to?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The number is T-20185.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is there any other application presently pending before the minister from Caledon Mountain Estates Limited for another plan of subdivision which is a part of the 1,070 acres referred to by Gertler?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, for the 1,070 acres recommended for acquisition. May I just put it this way—

Mr. Singer: I am sorry; perhaps I did not make myself sufficiently clear. We had 1,070 acres, 507 of which were acquired by Lands and Forests, which leaves approximately 500. The minister has told us this application, T-20185, covered approximately half of 450 acres, so that is 225. There are about 275 acres left. Is there any application presently before the minister relating to any of that 275 acres?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, not so far as I can ascertain. The 1,070 acres covers land, I believe, other than owned by Caledon.

Mr. Singer: One more supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister indicated that there was a prior consideration. Was there more than one opinion from The Department of Lands and Forests about this application, this T-20185, the one the minister told us about? Is that the only opinion that emanated from The Department of Lands and Forests or was there a previous one?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, as far as I could ascertain there has been only one response to the department and that came about last June or thereabouts, I believe; I am not sure of that date.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary on this subject.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, did the purchase by Lands and Forests through Public Works for 506 acres at

the Forks of the Credit waive the objection by Lands and Forests to approval, reported to us by the minister, or does that objection still stand?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That objection still stands. As I said to the hon. member for Downsview, we have received one response with reference to this matter from Lands and Forests. That is all and that was recommending against it.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. members would allow the Minister of Tourism and Information to introduce to us a very distinguished visitor in Mr. Speaker's gallery?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Monsieur le Président, si parfois la tâche d'un ministre du gouvernement est délicate et difficile, il est d'autres moments au contraire où elle est, comme aujourd'hui, tout particulièrement agréable.

Le titre de ministre du Tourism et de l'Information me vaut le plaisir de souhaiter la bienvenue à une invitée de marque à la législature ontarienne; c'est un devoir dont je m'acquitte avec joie.

La présence de cette dame distinguée n'a pas été étrangère au succès de la fête de samedi dernier à Ste-Marie au pays des Hurons, et je suis heureux de la remercier d'avoir bien voulu en rehausser l'éclat par la grâce de sa personne, l'élégance de ses toilettes et le charme de sa conversation.

Je conserverai de cette belle fête le plus agréable souvenir, ce qui prouve que le plaisir et le devoir vont toujours de pair, et que l'on peut, comme aujourd'hui, jouir de bons moments tout en travaillant pour sa province et son pays.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to introduce to the Ontario Legislature a woman who has done so much, not only for inter-provincial tourism but has also helped to foster and strengthen the very close relationship which the Province of Quebec has with this province.

In 1961, our guest was the first woman to be elected to the Quebec legislative assembly and in rapid succession she was appointed to the cabinet and to the portfolio of Minister of Transport. In 1970, she was appointed Minister of Tourism, a position which she now holds.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally express my thanks to her for attending Ste-Marie on Saturday and lending her charming presence to an occasion which was made so successful because of the presence of the lady minister.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you in the speaker's gallery, the Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game for the Province of Quebec, Madame Claire Kirkland-Casgrain.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Earlier this afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition appeared to cast some doubt on whether or not I had been asked a question and answered a question, relating to the attitude of the Province of Ontario in respect to the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of the Manitoba marketing legislation.

I now point out to the House, sir, that on May 7, which was a Friday, so perhaps the hon. member was not here, in answer to questions from the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha)—perhaps they are not in close contact with the Leader of the Opposition, but the question was asked of me—my answer is on page 1339 of Hansard:

> The instructions will be to support the position that the Manitoba legislature is intra vires the province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I think flows naturally from the discussions with the Minister of Lands and Forests. It is in two parts.

Why when his department—in fact, it is three parts—launched an objection to subdivision approval on the part of Caledon Mountain Estates, did not the department then decide to purchase all of the 1,070 acres and the Parks Integration Board approve it, accordingly?

Second, even if the minister had decided not to purchase all 1,070 acres, why did he not at least ask for the additional 250 to 300 acres, over which we now learn today there was no request for subdivision approval pending?

Third, how was it that this minister of the Crown would not know in his estimates that so important an application for approval had been submitted to his department? How is it that it would never come to his attention?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I will take these questions as notice.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West completed his questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

REQUEST FOR FILE ON SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will he make available for examination by members of this House, the file that is with, I would presume, the community planning branch of his department, No. T-20185?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I was asked if I would file the reply from The Department of Lands and Forests and I said "Yes," I would have to look at the file as to whether it—normally this is not done but I would certainly take that under consideration.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Insofar as I am aware, there is nothing in this kind of a file, an application for subdivision approval—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would ask his question.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Would the minister not agree that there is nothing in this kind of a file, an application for subdivision approval, that should be by its nature secret of confidential and should not be available to members of the House as well as to members of the public?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, files of this nature deal with matters of private individuals in this province. Having been in this department for two months, my general view is that there is nothing in that file that I might not make available to the whole House. It having been the first occasion to submit that, I want to give it careful consideration and I will advise the hon. member tomorrow. My inclination is to make it available, but I would like to consider the precedent.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Scarborough Centre.

RETROACTIVITY OF SOCIAL BENEFITS

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Of the Minister of Social and Family Services, a question with regard to retroactivity when the department has made an error in allowances: Would the minister clarify, since travel allowance was denied to a blind and crippled recipient of family benefits as far back as December, although the legislation became effective November 1, 1970, would the $30 a month allowance now be made retroactive to that particular recipient?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give me the exact case she is referring to, if there has been an injustice it will certainly be corrected.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

ALLEGED MONOPOLY CONTROL OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I have a question of the Minister of Highways and Transport. Is the minister aware that as a result of approvals received from the Ontario Highway Transport Board all public bus transportation in the city of Sarnia—municipal, educational and by private charter—is controlled by one man, named Skinner, from London? And does the minister think that such a monopoly situation is in the public interest?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I must say to the hon. member that I am not aware of the details of what he has referred to. I will be pleased to look into it and comment later.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, is the minister—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot ask a question supplementary to an answer which has never been given. If the member has a further question—

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might be permitted to speak to that, sir, would you direct me then the way you want me to put the question please, because yesterday this went on for at least five minutes from other members.

Mr. Speaker: The member cannot ask a supplementary question if the original question has not been answered—if it is taken as notice, which is what has happened here.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you permit another question?

Mr. Speaker: There does not appear to be any great surge. I will allow the member a second question.

ALLEGED MONOPOLY CONTROL OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you. I wonder if the minister would consider preparing himself, so that we might question him in detail during the course of his upcoming estimates in connection with the holdings of one Skinner relative to public transportation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be glad to brief himself for that discussion that will take place.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT STUDIES

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister tell the House what is the status of regional government in those areas where the studies have been completed, when one considers the statement by the minister yesterday that in the matter of permission to expand Metro eastward, no decision has been made in that regard?

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): How can the member concentrate?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Is the minister going to answer the purple people eater?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That question covers a lot of ground. The member refers to the areas where regional government studies have been completed. Would he like to define those areas that he has in mind?

Mr. Deans: I have two things in mind. I want to know what becomes of regional government in those areas where studies have been completed, when the department cannot yet come to grips with such matters as the size of Metropolitan Toronto, and the effect that the size of Metropolitan Toronto will have on the regions abutting it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, if he is referring to the study in the area east of Metro, it has not been completed. If he is referring to the study in Sudbury, we have made a proposal there and we are waiting for the response from the local area.

Mr. Deans: Try the west.

Hon. Mr. Bales: All right, Kitchener. I made a proposal there and we are waiting for the response in reference to that matter. I recognize that there are certain other areas—

Mr. Deans: Close to my own?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Close to his own. Hamilton-Wentworth, there is no agreement there between the local people as to what should take place, and I think we have to have some greater consensus in those areas before we proceed.

Mr. Deans: May I, by way of supplementary question, ask the minister what efforts are being made by his department to ascertain what consensus has now been reached, and when we might reasonably expect that a decision will be reached in regard to at least the physical setup of regional government in the Peel-Halton, Hamilton-Wentworth and Burlington region?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have arranged for certain matters to be considered there and I will be meeting various groups within those municipalities in the next several months.

An hon. member: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs got it slowed down.

Hon. Mr. Bales: But I am very busy at the moment in reference to Sudbury and to Kitchener-Waterloo.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the real Minister of Education as opposed to the token minister who is—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will address his question properly.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Premier. Why does the province discriminate against retarded children in provincial legislation such that children under 10 can attend school half days only and must leave school

at 18? Why does this government discriminate against mentally retarded children in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the—well, I was going to be a bit facetious too, but I will not, it is too nice a day.

Obviously, this government does not discriminate against retarded children. I would suggest to the member for Scarborough East, if he would analyse the legislation as it relates to the education of the mentally retarded in any jurisdiction in North America—and I will go that far; I will not go beyond the confines of this continent—I would ask him to find legislation that deals in a more comprehensive or realistic fashion with the education of the mentally retarded than he will find in the Province of Ontario.

The questions as to the age and the number of hours that a child should attend have been developed in consultation with experts in the field. There is an on-going discussion as to whether or not the programme might be advanced to a full day for the mentally retarded.

Mr. T. Reid: So there is discrimination?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not discrimination, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member well knows it.

Mr. T. Reid: It is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am really very intrigued by his question as it relates to the age of 18, because he, and other members opposite, in the past two years had been suggesting there should not even be a compulsory age attendance level for the non-mentally retarded children. So, Mr. Speaker, once again—

Mr. T. Reid: That has nothing to do with the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the member is demonstrating his great capacity for contradicting his own position day after day.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question—

Mr. Lewis: The minister could find another target.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the minister who is responsible for this discriminatory legislation against retarded children aware that in the May, 1971, issue of "Wider Horizon" on page 4, such a statement of discrimination is made against this government?

Secondly, as a supplementary, is the minister aware that Dr. R. J. Christie, who is one of the leading authorities in this area of mental retardation, has stated that the legislation that this minister has brought in over the past years is "not based on valid medical or educational principles?"

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered that, but if the hon. member wants further information may I suggest to him that in this field of special education there are a number of conflicting points of view. We have had under review, on an on-going basis, all areas of special education and, as I suggested to him, the question of whether or not mentally retarded children should be attending for a longer period of the day is under consideration by the department.

There is no discrimination whatsoever in the legislation of this province as it relates to the mentally retarded and the member for Scarborough East should be aware of this more than anyone else over there.

Mr. T. Reid: As a supplementary question: When will the minister bring before this House changes in legislation whereby mentally retarded children who are judged to be educable and trainable are allowed to attend the public schools of this province on a full-time basis, at least until the age of 18? Put up or shut up!

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Shame!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will not even dignify the latter part of the hon. member's observation by reply.

Mr. Peacock: Do not dignify it.

Mr. T. Reid: Bring in the legislation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that legislation in this field, as far as this government is concerned—

Mr. T. Reid: When will the minister have it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —is a matter of continuous review and will be re-assessed and will be altered as the government sees the needs developing. I would anticipate that this is not in the too-far-distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. member for Scarborough East that the legislation

developed here as it relates to the mentally retarded sets something of a guideline for the other provinces of Canada and very frankly, in many states of the union. It is among the most advanced the member will find anywhere.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. T. Reid: When is the minister going to present the new legislation?

CHARGES AGAINST CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Can the minister indicate whether his department has yet laid charges against Canadian Gypsum, in view of the fact that they failed to meet the deadline of the ministerial order that lapsed in March?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into that for the hon. member. I understood that there was a possibility that charges would be laid.

GRANTS FOR DAMS

Mr. Nixon: Can the Minister of Energy and Resources Management make his announcement to the House as to the new grant basis for work in conservation authorities regarding dams? Has the minister made a statement on that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. I was a little late today for statements, I believe, and I was indicating that I would do that tomorrow.

Mr. Nixon: Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Thursday, I am sorry, yes.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I had a call from the press this morning saying that the minister had made the announcement.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There was a press release covering it, really, as a result of this information going out to the various conservation authorities. I do not mind filing the information in this House.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): We will read it in the paper.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will do that on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

PRICE OF WINES

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the many complaints recently in the newspapers of this province about the high mark-up the LCBO is putting on the price of wines, does the minister intend to take any action on this particular problem?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the matter of pricing and labelling and other related matters with respect to wines has been under consideration by the LCBO for some time and is continuing.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, if I may. Inasmuch as this has been under consideration for some time, would the minister agree that it is time he did something?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is what we are afraid of.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, we will take action when we find all of the right answers.

Mr. MacDonald: How long is the gestation period?

USE OF MERCER REFORMATORY SITE AS SHELTER

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. In view of his recent statement that the province would let the city of Toronto use the former site of the Mercer Reformatory for the purpose of providing shelter for young people who might travel during the summer, is the minister prepared to expand on that idea and perhaps assist or provide water facilities and sanitary facilities in connection with that use?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld: (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, to correct the question, what I said the other evening was that we would be glad to hear requests from any responsible group, any elected group as to the use of the property. I think at the time I also said that one of the reasons for this is that we have no funds to deal with any facilities or any clean-up and so on that might or might not be required and that we would be delighted to hear requests and when we got the requests and looked at the terms, then we would make a decision.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately the oral question period, as extended, has expired.

I wonder if the members would allow me, while our distinguished guest from Quebec is here, to point out that as she was the first woman in the Quebec cabinet, we have firsts here too. We have had many members with sons as pages. We now have a daughter of a member as a page in the House. I thought you would like to know that Miss De Monte is serving as a page.

While I have a fairly good attendance of the members, I wonder if those of you who have not already let Mr. Speaker's office know that you are coming to dinner tomorrow night would please do so, so that we can count heads.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in the light of some responses today I have a motion to put to the Legislature, seconded by the member for Windsor West as follows:

That the standing natural and physical resources committee be empowered to examine and inquire into the purchase, or offer to purchase by the Province of Ontario of lands owned by Caledon Mountain Estates Limited, with power to send for persons, papers and records and specifically to examine and inquire into:

(a) The decision of the Ontario Parks Integration Board to purchase 506 acres of land in the area of the Forks of the Credit River, rather than the 1,070 acres recommended by the Gertler report in June of 1968;

(b) the reasonableness of the price paid for the 506 acres which were purchased;

(c) the application for approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs of a plan or plans of subdivision, relating to any land under ownership of Caledon Mountain Estates, but especially lands falling within the priority purchase recommendations of the Gertler report;

(d) the correspondence between the Minister of Lands and Forests or his officials and the Minister of Municipal Affairs—or his officials, regarding the plan or plans of subdivision submitted by Caledon Mountain Estates;

(e) the costs of acquisition by the Province of Ontario of any lands within the Niagara Escarpment study area with special reference to the appreciation in values between the date of purchase by the province and the date of purchase by the vendor;

And specifically to send for:

(a) the Minister of Lands and Forests and the chairman of the Ontario Parks Integration Board;

(b) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the director of the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs;

(c) the Minister of Public Works and the director of the property branch of The Department of Public Works;

(d) officers and directors of Caledon Mountain Estates Limited;

(e) and such other persons as, in the opinion of the committee, may assist it in its examination of the matter.

The committee shall report to the House no later than June 15, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: I shall not, of course, put this motion. Obviously the hon. member did not refer to standing order 26a which provides that private members' business will be taken up on Monday afternoon between the hours of 5 and 6 o'clock, p.m. Therefore, this motion can only be accepted at this time as a notice of motion for the notice paper to be called at the discretion of the whips in the usual way.

I again will remind the House that, as I pointed out some time ago, matters may be referred to standing committees by an order of the House on motion moved in the House, usually by the minister, or, if a standing committee, by a majority passing a motion requesting a matter to be referred to it, and when that motion, when reported to the House by the chairman, is accepted by the House, the reference is thereby made.

This, as we all know, is how the reference of day care to the standing committee on resources was made, on a motion by the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) passed by the committee and reported to the House. The reference was not made on the motion by the minister as the member for Scarborough West perhaps had suggested. Therefore, this particular motion, being a private member's motion, is not in order and cannot be put.

Mr. Nixon: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, relating to this matter: Can Mr. Speaker give

reasons to the House for the cancellation of the regular meeting of the committee on natural resources which was originally scheduled for tomorrow and which was cancelled without reason?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, Mr. Speaker receives only notice of committee meetings. Presumably they are arranged by the chairman of the committee and the clerk responsible for staffing the committee and, so far as I am concerned, I have had notice both of the calling and of the cancellation of the committee, but certainly have not investigated the cause. I would be glad to do so.

Mr. Nixon: Further to that point, Mr. Speaker, would you advise the House as to whether the chairman of any committee has the power to unilaterally cancel a meeting that had been originally scheduled?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, at the moment I do not think that is a matter for Mr. Speaker to rule on; I think that is a matter for the committee to deal with—

Mr. Nixon: If the committee is going to meet.

Mr. Speaker: —and when the committee next has its meeting, then I think of course it is a proper matter for investigation.

Mr. MacDonald: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are back to an issue that I raised with you quite early in this session. This is unilateral action with regard to the operation of the committees.

We had unilateral action on the basis of the Prime Minister ruling certain things before those committees as being out of order, and now we have unilateral action, without the consideration of the committee, for cancellation of its meeting.

I submit to you, sir, as the Speaker of the House and the guardian of its activities, including the committee work, that this is a matter that is worthy of your investigation. I personally would like to know from whence came the direction and the order that the committee would be cancelled? We are making a farce out of our committee procedures. The government is doing this.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to draw the Speaker's attention to the fact that the members of the standing committee on human resources received a notice, within the last 24 hours, cancelling the scheduled meeting of the committee on human resources, at which we were going to investigate the alleged overcharging by doctors on the medical plan of this province. That, sir, was cancelled unilaterally by the chairman after the steering committee had decided that it would meet tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: That is a nice way to spend Wednesdays—just take the day off.

Mr. Speaker: The member will understand that I have heard a great deal of discussion of this matter, pointing out that these matters were cancelled unilaterally by the chairman. Of my own knowledge, I do not know that.

I think that the point raised by the member for York South is quite valid, and I most certainly will be glad to look into it and see what has happened and probably have the chairman report to the House the situation, because I think it is quite proper that we should know what goes on with the committees, although I do not think at the moment that Mr. Speaker has any jurisdiction.

Mr. Lewis: Any contentious issue gets swept away.

Mr. Singer: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, if, as the House has been informed, the chairman of a committee has unilaterally cancelled a meeting, it is equally conceivable that committee may never be called again at the behest of that chairman, and if that were in fact the case, in what way could we as members of the House express the grievance?

We must appeal to you, sir, because we have no power. If the chairman has in fact arbitrarily cancelled this meeting and should arbitrarily continue to cancel all other meetings of that committee, in what manner do we ask that our grievance be remedied?

Mr. Speaker: In the first place, of course, I have no assurance that the occurrence is as set out, that the chairman unilaterally cancelled the meeting, and I wish to find out about that. And the second question asked by the member for Downsview is so theoretical that it need not be answered—

Mr. Singer: It is not theoretical at all!

Mr. Speaker: —until the occasion arises. And at that time I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order, especially with relation to your comment that the comment of the

member for Downsview is hypothetical. I ask you to cast your mind back to last year when a unanimous report was brought from the committee on education and university affairs to enable that committee to look into educational costs in this province. The then Premier (Mr. Robarts) of the province supported that aspect and the committee never met again, and we were effectively and factually strangled, not hypothetically strangled.

Mr. Speaker: It was not hypothetical last year, as you say, with the then Premier. The situation of course has not arisen in this session with the present Premier.

Mr. Nixon: It is worse with the present Premier.

Mr. Singer: What a hair-splitting bunch of nonsense!

Mr. Speaker: When it does I will be glad to deal with the matter.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order respecting your ruling, sir, although I feel it to be a rather tight construction of rule 26, nonetheless I can, as members of the government frequently do, request the unanimous consent of the House to proceed, since one minister has already indicated publicly in this Legislature his willingness to come before the committee, since the other key affected minister is here I would therefore request such unanimous consent and we revert to the putting of this motion and acceptance of it by the government.

Mr. Speaker: I would not accept that suggestion until I have had the opportunity to check on something so completely out of order as this—a private member's motion being brought on more or less as a government motion. After I have had the opportunity to check the authorities and confer with the Clerk and those who have custody of the authorities I will deal with it and—

Mr. Lewis: What are you talking about?

Mr. Deans: We are asking for unanimous consent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I have been reviewing the rules and I recall, I believe, if I am correct, your citation of rule 26, which refers to the setting aside of one hour each week for private members' business. I suggest to you, sir, that the routine proceedings of the day, which include motions, are outside the purview of that part of the standing order and that standing order 26 relates specifically to an order of the day following upon the close of routine proceedings, not to this portion of the day's business.

I have checked further to see, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any exclusion of any member of the House moving a motion at this time of routine proceedings other than a minister. I do not find that, and I do not recall whether you cited a rule that only a minister may move a motion on motions. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Scarborough West's motion was in order.

Mr. Speaker: Of course I certainly did not say that only a minister could move motions! Otherwise, things in the House would certainly not progress. The hon. members would not progress more than they do now.

Mr. T. Reid: Very good!

Mr. Lewis: We concur, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a good point and I am certainly not prepared to deal with that at the moment. I am certainly prepared to look it up and take advice on it, and if it does appear to be a proper motion and my ruling today is wrong, I certainly will be pleased to rescind it and place the motion. Not at the present time.

Mr. Lawlor: Why can you not do it right now?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, how was the Speaker so well prepared for my motion put today, since we did not speak of it for a moment in advance? What clairvoyance is given to the Speaker?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It was in the newspapers.

Mr. Nixon: Somebody in the member for High Park's office gave it to him.

Mr. Speaker: It is quite obvious that one who listens to the tapes, as I do, and the proceedings in this House does hear what goes on in the House.

Mr. Nixon: Tapes from the leader of the NDP!

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; would you clarify the ruling of the

House on standing orders that would permit you to defer the request by the member for Scarborough West for the unanimous consent to introduce this motion?

Mr. Speaker: I am not in a position to clarify that, and I am not in a position to deal with it other than to say that I will be pleased to look at it, and I will be pleased to do so this afternoon. Certainly I do not propose to be put in a position of dealing with something about which I have not the necessary knowledge at this particular moment. I would so rule and if the House feels that that is the wrong ruling, the ruling can be dealt with. But I think—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. It was all right for the Speaker to walk in and prejudge my motion and have the prepared text to rule it out of order but not now to consider the obviously relevant point put by the member for Windsor West. That was perfectly all right!

Mr. Speaker: That is quite right. The hon. member came in with a well-prepared motion—

Mr. Lewis: Which you prejudged.

Mr. Speaker: —and the Speaker came in with a prepared method of dealing with it or not dealing with it. I think up to that point we are in the same position.

Mr. Lewis: It is a devil of a way of proceding in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you stated that you would have to have further information before you could make a decision as to whether you put a motion to the House to get unanimous consent. What conceivable further information is required on the part of the Speaker to put a motion to get unanimous consent?

Mr. Nixon: In a motion all you need is an indication from the government leader to the Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that what you were seeking, sir?

Mr. Lewis: The government leader is here. Will he accept that unanimously?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South is always anxious to catch Mr. Speaker out, and he does occasionally.

Mr. MacDonald: If Mr. Speaker is out he should be caught out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is quite right and he is caught out occasionally. All I am pointing out is that I have dealt with the matter from what little knowledge I have. I will say to the hon. members if they want to go to listen to the tape they can hear what appeared on the tape which allowed me to prepare what was read today.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not the motion we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment please! I listened to the hon. members and they might listen to me.

So therefore that aspect of the matter having been dealt with in that manner, the hon. member has asked me to have a vote of the House as to whether this can be allowed by unanimous consent of the House. Now frankly I do not know whether the unanimous consent is either necessary—

Mr. Nixon: Well, that unanimous consent business is easy to settle. Let the government House leader speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Anything can go by unanimous consent. The House leader is there, let him accept it or reject it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I will do this if the hon. members will just restrain themselves for a moment or two. I will consult with the Clerk of the House who has knowledge of these matters and see if it is his opinion that that is so.

Mr. Lewis: No. Let the siren from the Soo stand in his place and weave his spell over the Legislature.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Here it comes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought your reasoning was very sound—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: We will make you Speaker next.

Mr. Lewis: Permanent Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister indicated on a question today in the question period that the subject matter of this motion would be

taken into consideration by him and he would make a statement on it at the sitting of this Legislature on Thursday.

Mr. Lewis: That is fine. He can make all the statements he wants.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: So in any event, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I believe your reasons were most sound. There would certainly not be unanimous consent for the debating of this motion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Now we have got it.

Mr. Lewis: Closure! Who would believe that the minister would impose closure, a man like him!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Not me. Not the member either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if you will put the question to us, now that we know the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a farce.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker has his directions. We will have—

Mr. Lewis: We will appoint the minister to the bench anyway, but we are worried about his partiality.

Mr. Speaker: The Clerk has cleared up the problem which was bothering me and what the Clerk tells me is that the unanimous consent should be—

Mr. J. Renwick: We think it was the minister who cleared up the problem which has—

Mr. Speaker: I gave the hon. members the courtesy of listening to them and if they do not wish to do the same with me I cannot do anything about it, but I would ask that courtesy.

The Clerk says that the motion or the request for unanimous consent should be, as I thought but was not sure, to waive the rule, not to receive the motion. That was what was bothering me. Now the Clerk tells me that it is quite possible to have unanimous consent, and I agree with him, to waive the rule, but not unanimous consent to receive the motion—but unanimous consent to waive the rule and then I receive the motion.

Now that is what was bothering me. The Clerk has cleared it and I am quite prepared to put that now that I know what it is doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, sir, it is very difficult of course for me to ask you to waive the rule since it is now clear that the rule does not apply. Therefore, it would be preferable for you to take five minutes to cogitate about it, and to come back in and accept the motion as it properly falls before the orders of the day and is a motion which a member of this House can put.

Mr. Speaker: As far as I am concerned my original statement stands. I will be glad to reconsider it. I will be glad to place the motion that the rule be waived in this case, and I will also be glad to consider the hon. member for Scarborough West's suggestion when I leave the chair, because I presume the House will be going into committee. And if I find that the submission by the hon. member for Windsor West is correct, which I doubt, then I will be glad to ask the Chairman or the House leader to have the House rise and we can come back into the House again.

Does the hon. member for Scarborough West wish to have a question as to waiving the rule?

Mr. Lewis: No, I have an intimation of what the government will do, Mr. Speaker. I do not think we need go through it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: How did he ever get that message?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He prejudged it.

Mr. Pitman: But it was already prejudged.

Mr. Lewis: But I will await the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We had been just finishing the order of business of introduction of bills. There were no bills?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Bills were not called.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry.

Introduction of bills.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, speaking briefly to this bill, it is a short amendment to The Consumer Protection Act. There are two main provisions the first one ensuring that the assignee of a conditional sale or other contract is in no higher position than the assignor in respect to the promise to pay, and that the assignee takes up the duties, obligations and liabilities of the assignor.

Secondly, the other provision preserves the implied warranties which are set forth in The Sale of Goods Act and which are sometimes destroyed by a term in the contract. The proviso in the Act will prevent the automatic exclusion by some term in the contract form that the implied warranties do not exist and apply.

CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the terms of this amending Act deal with part 6 of The Corporations Act which has to do with insurance corporations, particularly mutual insurance corporations, and generally those relating to farm mutual insurance types of insurance and the terms of the bill will bring up to date the provisions which apply to such companies.

Many of the terms of the present Act are obsolete and outdated and it will enlarge the scope for those mutual insurance companies to operate particularly with respect to amalgamation and incorporation and re-incorporation.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin has the floor.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, it is just Algoma, not Algoma-Manitoulin.

As is customary at this time of the year the page boys are now going to place some maple sugar candy on every member's desk with the compliments of the Algoma Maple Syrup Producers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, House in committee of supply: Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. Does the hon. minister have an opening statement?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) for casting some sugar, if not light, into the proceedings and sweetening up the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you how pleased and delighted I am to be back with The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. It is, for me, almost like a homecoming. I am delighted to become fully immersed again in the department, in its continuing work as well as in its many newly developing programmes.

The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship is a department of other departments I may say that it is really a people-for-people department. I am delighted to find that the department has been strengthened, both in finances and in personnel.

Sometime during the course of these estimates I may have an opportunity to refer to the earlier budgets of the department going back to my first term of office in 1960 and 1961, as it was in the last couple of years, and as it is today. The increase has been substantial, but what I found even of greater interest and worth was the way that the department has been building up its personnel and complement into an interesting, exciting, enthusiastic team which is bringing to the challenges of the department, new ideas, fresh thoughts and always an enthusiasm for people.

I found with interest and with pleasure the department's traditional services both to the public and to the members of the Legislature have been expanded and a number of interesting innovations made.

The Speaker earlier today made reference to the girl pages. I thought it interesting to note that one of the great legislatures of the world, the United States Senate, had just come to the same conclusion and had made that decision a week ago. Of course, as always, the Province of Ontario is first in the field.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Everybody follows in our footsteps.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was a delightful thing to notice. I may say there seemed to be much more controversy there than in this House.

I touch on only certain aspects of the work of the Legislature. I am pleased, as all members are, with the fact that the Hansard reporting service has been so greatly improved, that the staff has been incorporated into the civil service and we are all witnessing on a day-to-day basis the efficiency of this new approach.

It is interesting to note that almost half of the department's budget this year is devoted to supporting the activities of the members of this legislative assembly.

I only touch in passing to remind us of the office of the Registrar General, a very important aspect of the work of that department, which is a very quiet but very efficient one and always enlarging and improving its vital services.

In the past years it has been the policy of this department to proceed to the estimates immediately without any introductory remarks but this year, because of the new developments that have taken place, I want to outline briefly for the members the major steps that have been taken in implementing the total citizenship concept and to give some indication of the plans and priorities that we have established for this year.

The first phase of the total citizenship phase has been completed. In the past year the focus of this ministry has been further broadened to include the needs and aspirations of all groups that make up our multicultural society.

The department now encompasses a community services division with three virtually new branches. These are the community development branch, which is concerned with the broader participation of people in the community affairs; the considerably enlarged citizenship branch, offering a whole new range of reception and orientation services for newcomers as well as a newly developing intergroup development service for established residents; and, of course, the Indian community branch, whose role is designed to assist Ontario's native people with the social, economic and cultural development of their communities through self-help projects in close co-operation with other provincial agencies.

Au cours de l'année dernière, le Secrétaire provincial et Ministre de la Citoyenneté s'est vu aussi confier la responsabilité des trois organismes suivants:

Il s'agit premièrement de la commission permanente Ontario-Québec qui a été établie dans le but de mettre en pratique les termes de l'accord de coopération et d'échange en matière d'éducation et de culture entre le gouvernement du Québec et le gouvernement de l'Ontario, ratifié en 1969;

Deuxièmement, du bureau du Coordonnateur du bilinguisme, institué au printemps de 1970 pour mettre en application le programme de bilinguisme du gouvernement;

Et troisièmement, du bureau du Coordonnateur pour l'Ontario de l'Entente Canada-France qui s'est ajouté à mon ministère juste avant la fin du dernier exercice financier.

We have developed a new communications branch to provide special expertise in communicating with the varied groups in our society that we are trying to reach and to hear from, often in a host of different languages and in remote regions of the province. This branch offers continuing service to all government departments through its protocol and special services function. It also provides a translation service, in all languages, of work certificates, accreditation and other documents. In addition, it provides information to the public about the programme and services of the department.

A research branch has been established to help us in continually assessing the changing needs of the people whom the department serves and evaluating our effectiveness in responding to them.

Support for all of these services will be coordinated by the financial and administrative services division.

Now I should like to discuss some of the underlying policies that guide the programmes of our department.

The stated aim of this comprehensive citizen and community affairs programme is to achieve a greater awareness on the part of every person in Ontario of the part he plays within our province, of the challenges that we all face, and of the community goals that must be obtained. In other words, we are seeking to assist all people to become full and equal citizens of Ontario.

It is a fact of modern life, as all of us recognize, that people want to be a part of the action—they want to become involved. Increasingly, they want to take part in the decisions that affect their lives, and above all people want to feel accepted as participating, creative and contributing members of our society.

With this in mind, our department is making a special effort to discover new and better ways of involving the people these programmes will affect—to get their ideas, to encourage their initiative, and to assist them in carrying out their own objectives in their own communities. We have had a tremendously gratifying response from citizens in this regard.

In the field of newcomer integration, the members are aware that Ontario has always stressed a policy of integration—that is the key word. Inherent in this attitude of acceptance and recognition is the basic assumption that it is possible and, indeed, desirable to achieve unity in diversity. We can create a cohesive society while maintaining every opportunity for people to retain many of the values, social customs and traditions of their cultural heritage. No one need lose his individual identity. We believe that this approach will serve to enrich our society and at the same time to promote a distinctively Canadian way of life.

Over the past quarter century, more than 1,700,000 people have come to Ontario from nearly every nation of the world, making the multi-cultural mosiac of our population an increasingly visual fact of life in this province.

For these reasons our department is implementing a variety of programmes this year to recognize the special needs and contributions of Ontario's ethnic communities, those who make up the third element of our society.

Another fact of the total citizenship concept is the role played by the Indian community. From the beginning its philosophy and emphasis has contributed to this concept of participation and involvement. It has enriched the whole approach by contributing to it the Indian point of view. The function of the Indian community branch has grown out of the recognition that quite often Indian people are not fully aware of what services are available, or cannot take full advantage of what is offered or in some way these services are not particularly suited to them in the light of their needs and their wishes.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Rather a belated revelation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In some instances, through applying the principle of self-help, solutions have been found through better utilization or application of existing community resources. In others, seed money is needed, and in still other cases, the combined services of several provincial departments are required.

In all this we are committed to the principles of consultation with the leaders of Indian communities, Indian organizations and the general public in our on-going search for better solutions that will enable the Indian people, together with all the people of this province, to participate fully and equally.

The third aspect of our total concept, the community development programme, has grown out of the effort to discover new and better ways to involve people with their communities in the decision-making process. The branch itself was created last fall to give increased attention to the new field of citizen and community participation. Its objective is to encourage and assist individual and community groups to identify the concerns of their own communities and to set about solving their problems, either directly or by communication and co-operation with government and other agencies.

It is our experience, and has been the experience of others, that as people are encouraged to set their own priorities and participate fully in the resolution of their own problems, they are less likely to feel the need to resort to the techniques of confrontation. Here in Ontario elected representatives and public administrators are generally receptive to citizen and community dialogue whereby problems can be resolved through a process of consultation and co-operation.

I do not plan at this time to outline in full detail the plans of the department for the coming year. Instead I would like to give the members a representative glimpse of the initiatives we plan to take in several programmes during the months ahead.

This year, in addition to the traditional services provided for many years for newcomers into our province, such as adult language and citizenship classes, the citizenship branch has launched a number of new and exciting programmes. It now provides a reception service at major points of entry and all members are aware of the one recently opened at Malton airport, a fine example of what can be done with imagination and enthusiasm.

In co-operation with voluntary agencies across the province, we are also developing reception services at the community level.

Through this partnership we will provide information and assistance in the language of the newcomer with the aid of multilingual counsellors and information material.

An orientation programme has also been established through which we will provide the newcomer with the type of information he requires as he moves through the various stages of integration into the Ontario way of life.

Part of this programme will be the expansion of both supporting and developmental grants to Ontario's ethnical-cultural community. In particular, grants will be made available to activities and agencies which promote inter-group communication and exchange, and additional grants during this forthcoming year will be aimed at developing the skills and potentials of all of the province's cultural groups so that all may become fully participating members in the family of Ontario's people.

As part of this effort to preserve and develop the cultural heritage of our society, the government announced its intention in the Throne Speech of this year to convene a multicultural congress. This congress will be designed to provide a forum for members of all groups and for all of our people to express their hopes, their aspirations, about the type of life they want to see developed and preserved in Ontario.

All the groups that make up the rich multicultural pattern of Ontario's life will be encouraged to attend and participate. Every attempt will be made to make this one of the most comprehensive public forums of its kind ever held.

The group services staff of our community development branch concentrates on assisting citizen and community groups such as neighbourhood associations, committees, ratepayers or tenants who may be less formally organized than other groups and are therefore less articulate. These are some of the groups we wish to encourage and assist in making their views known and to aid in formulating their own solutions and goals and, in so doing, to enable more directive and effective participation in their communities.

While still quite new, the branch received 59 requests for financial assistance last year and awarded some $35,000 in developmental grants to over 30 groups throughout Ontario. Many more groups were contacted and given various other kinds of help. During the coming year we plan to evaluate a number of these projects to determine whether this particular kind of support is, in fact, contributing to the fuller involvement of those who feel voiceless in our society.

Another essential part of this process is the determination by people of their own needs in establishing their own goals and priorities, in making them aware of existing resources.

For some time now, it has been clearly recognized by many that the people of Ontario have at their disposal an extensive array of services and facilities, both public and private. This growing network of services to people has become so diverse that it is now a complex system, involving as it does various levels of government and the private sector. Recent studies have revealed that those most in need of these services are regrettably often not aware of their existence nor of how to use them effectively.

In recognition of this need, the community development branch in the past year initiated a series of action research projects to investigate the possible role of the Province of Ontario in the co-ordination and dissemination of information at the community level.

We have entered into a variety of partnership agreements and arrangements with other levels of government and the private sector to establish autonomous community-based information centres which offer general information referral and advice services to local residents.

These centres are currently operating in Brockville, Hamilton, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Orillia, Ottawa, St. Catharines and Sault Ste. Marie. In the next six months we will complete an evaluation of these pilot projects and make recommendations as to the future role of the Ontario government in the development and support of information and advice services.

Through the Indian community branch our main objective is to respond to the leadership within the province's Indian communities and, by so doing, to help the Indian people to help themselves.

In all our work we are committed to the principle of consultation and during the coming year our efforts will be directed toward the establishment of two interrelated series of consultations. The first of these will permit Indian organizations that are concerned with economic and other development programmes to come together on a regional basis to share and benefit from each other's experiences and accomplishments.

To date, many have been engaged in development, singly and alone. These gatherings will enable them to act in consort.

Since it is abundantly clear that the broad range of services that are available to the Indian people are only meaningful to them if the services reflect their special needs, perceptions and priorities, a second and all-encompassing consultation will be initiated with the elected representatives of all of Ontario's Indian people. The purpose of this full-scale dialogue will be to obtain a first-hand appreciation of the role that the Indian people of Ontario feel that this government should play. Funds will be made available to native organizations on a reasonable basis so that they can engage in discussions among themselves and communicate their views to this government.

The hon. members will recall that some weeks ago there was tabled in this House the book which set out the projects completed and in the course of action during the past year. The concrete aspects of the work of the branch are very significant and very important. But even more significant and more important is the continuing relationship that has been developed between the department, between the branch and all aspects of the Indian community in organized groups, in individuals, in almost a day-to-day contact with various sectors of the Indian communities across the province.

It is a fact of life now, that as the deliberations within this Legislature and of the actions of the department take place, that there is a continuing rapport with the members of the Indian community. Again, this year we have participating as interested listeners to the discussion of the debates in this House, some of the chief spokesmen of the Indian community, members of the Union of Ontario Indians who have formed and are in a continuing formation of close contact with, I am pleased to say, the minister, the deputy, the branch director and all sectors of the department and, through the department, more and more with other relevant departments.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the total citizenship programme will contribute to an Ontario and to a Canada in which all peoples have an opportunity to fully participate in our social, economic and cultural growth.

If I may sum up, at this time, a particular philosophy that I have been developing for myself in the immediately recent years, is this: I believe that the face of Canada in all it aspects, in its public agencies, in its private sectors, in the fundamental business, industrial and social structures, should reflect the changing makeup of our population and our society, so that as men and women carry out all of the activities that men and women can participate in in a society, everywhere, all facets will reflect the multicultural aspects of our province. To this goal, this very broad and general goal, I as a minister am devoted. I am delighted that with me is a dedicated department which now turns to the Legislature for consideration of the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, once again I am happy to rise on behalf of my party to criticize constructively the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship.

I would like to congratulate the minister on his re-assumption of the portfolio. I wish him God-speed and good luck, but I must put him on notice that I might not be so kind in the next couple of days. This is a job that we do and we exist here for this job and we will have a coffee together after we leave.

There is no doubt Mr. Chairman, that we do exist in a multicultural society where we have the integration of this society into something that recognizes the heritage of the places we came from, where our fathers and mothers came from. It is fortunate that we live in a society that recognizes that I as an Italian-Canadian sit in the legislative assembly and that everyone in this great country has the same possibility to do the same thing.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that we are all proud to be part of Ontario, all proud to be part of Canada and that we of the third force are most proud of the fact that we are Canadians. I sometimes wonder whether the department that is headed by this hon. minister does what it really can do to assist in the integration and the recognition of our heritage. But that is something else again.

I have spoken at length in this chamber, Mr. Chairman, and have pointed out to the hon. minister and to his predecessor what I think of the problems in connection with the ethnic and cultural groups that exist in our society, particularly in Ontario.

Today I am going to take the opportunity to devote the major part of my leadoff speech to the question of the Indian community in Ontario, because of all the functions of the

Provincial Secretary this is clearly the area where a lack of understanding is causing a problem to move from bad to worse. The officers who resigned from their jobs in the Social and Family Services responsibilities were replaced and their successors, who are now of course with the Provincial Secretary's department are still enjoying the same kind of remuneration and work as the men who resigned. They are, however, different people. They have more acceptance of the status quo and they are not people who are going to rock the boat.

Therefore, the thrust of the opposition approach has been not so much to try to pillory the minister in his re-acceptance of responsibility for Indians as Provincial Secretary, but rather to get at the root of the matter by discovering from where in fact the inertia is emanating. Our discussions with members of the Indian community all point to one fact, and that is that nothing can be done so long as there remains an establishment of provincially appointed non-Indian workers in the field of Indian affairs.

The current estimates are laid out in a new fashion and they are full of what I now call transfer payments, but there is no area where transfer payments will have more significance than to the Indians themselves. The phrase would have a real meaning in this context. It would mean the end of fraternalism and the beginning of an acceptance of responsibility on the part of the Indians. Certainly recent documentation has shown how ready and willing they are to accept such responsibility. The heel-dragging is coming from the Ontario government and to a degree from the particular Secretary of State in Ottawa who is responsible for this department, hon. Robert Stanbury.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about Jean Chretien?

Mr. De Monte: I will mention him in a few moments. But of course the hon. member should know that the brief of the Union of Ontario Indians was presented to Jean Chretien but that Robert Stanbury has the responsibility of administering this particular aspect of the department. I thought the member knew that.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He does not know that much.

Mr. De Monte: That is true. But both the hon. Provincial Secretary and hon. Mr. Stanbury are under the same kind of duress, namely pressure to maintain the establishment which has been created to deal with Indians as though they were a commodity. Nor can the minister make much headway in the face of the entrenched interests of the civil service establishment and its very different goals and norms.

This is why the proposals of the Union of Ontario Indians for fiscal 1971 to both levels of government have fallen, if not on deaf ears, at least on reluctant ears. Because the programmes are intimately interrelated, I cannot deal with the one without dealing with the other, they interlock so totally. Both proposals were made in March, 1971, the one to the federal government and the other to the province; the federal submission was filed by Andre Rickard, the executive director of the Union of Ontario Indians—and I think he is in the galleries now, Mr. Chairman—the provincial proposal was filed by Fred Plain, the president.

The federal proposal was directed to the Hon. Jean Chretien, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but, as I said before, it is in fact being dealt with by the hon. Robert Stanbury. The provincial submission, of course, was directed to the hon. John Yaremko, QC, in his present portfolio as Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship for the government of Ontario.

It is interesting to note that in the letter of transmittal to the hon. Jean Chretien, the Union of Ontario Indians said that they felt that the budget, as outlined in the submission, was a realistic assessment of "what we as a union must do in the next fiscal year in order to provide the necessary services for the Indian people of Ontario." The proposal did not provide for an organization and administrative structure to manage the whole spectrum of union affairs, it was purely a programme and project budget.

The objective of the federal submission was threefold; firstly, to indicate to The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the Union of Ontario Indians' intentions to assume increasing responsibilities in 1971 for a number of programmes and projects; secondly, to outline to The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the Union of Ontario Indians' fiscal 1971 plan of operations in the area of programmes and projects; and thirdly, to seek budget support from The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for the fiscal 1971 funding of five sets of outlined programmes and projects.

Complementing this submission, the union proposed to the Provincial Secretary a grass-roots action-oriented implementation programme, managed and executed by Indians for Indians. They said, and I quote:

> Our own assessment of the proposed programme indicates that we have the necessary human resources, and all we require is your financial assistance to help us help ourselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the theme running through both the federal and provincial submissions is so closely parallel that it is worth our while to review the philosophy of the union in the light of changing circumstances. The union says:

> In recent years, we have witnessed various efforts on the part of governments concerned with the Indian people and of Indian people becoming increasingly interested in assuming ever greater responsibilities in areas that socially, culturally and economically, shape their lives and the lives of their children.
>
> The aspirations of Indian people for an equal share in the better way of life are reflected in their growing concern for the provision of opportunities which will enable them to become meaningful and productive individuals within their own community.
>
> The Union of Ontario Indians recognizes and supports these trends as vital to the development of Indians and their communities in Ontario. It wishes to play its rightful role in fostering and encouraging a participating role that Indians must play in determining and, in turn, implementing their social and economic future.

To date, government programmes in the field of community development in education, health services, welfare and economic development have, in general, failed in improving the social and economic development of Indians. And why? Because the programmes were not designed or administered in the light of known differences in culture, location, economic base and level of developments among Indian communities; and because of the tendency of government agencies to separate themselves from the efforts of other agencies which are also aimed to help the Indian people.

For example, the medical services programme has to be matched by housing and education if it is to avoid the vicious circle of ignorance, poverty and disease. Thus, many of the programmes are not complementary inasmuch as they do not assist each other to achieve a common objective.

The third and most important reason is the lack of any meaningful participation on the part of the Indians. The government, at all levels, must come to realize that the problems are Indian problems; they are about Indian people and are not simply problems of education, health, income and employment. They are rather Indian education problems, Indian health problems, Indian income problems and Indian employment problems and, as such, solutions must be arrived at in the context of, and with the full participation and increasing responsibility of the Indian people.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Union of Ontario Indians does not look upon the problems as Indian problems, but rather as Indian opportunities, opportunities to seek and, if need be, demand a better and more just way of life.

It is the union's intention to become increasingly involved in social, cultural and economic programmes and projects to ensure that the so-called Indian problems are in fact turned into Indian opportunities.

The traditional way of doing this has been to become involved in what is called the community development programme. During the past 10 years or so, programmes of community development have been initiated by the various levels of government and by some Indian provincial organizations.

While the objective of government-run community development programmes aims today at local action to achieve locally identifiable goals, the programmes have tended either to develop anti-government positions, without, at the same time, offering reasonable alternatives, or have not been attuned to the needs and aspirations of the Indian people.

The reason that these government-run community development programmes were not attuned to the needs and aspirations of the Indian people is simply because they were organized, directed and staffed by non-Indians. In many instances the community development workers found themselves at odds with their employers the government, or they found themselves at odds with their fellows, the Indian people, and yet they had to work with both of them. The difficulties created in these processes have given the community development programmes at all levels of government a bad image and it certainly has not enhanced the opportunity

of the Indian people to seek support in achieving their own goals.

On the other hand, the community development programmes operated by Indian organizations themselves have the distinct benefit of being organized, operated and staffed by Indians for Indians and they are proving to be a great improvement over the programmes of the past. It is just the nomenclature that has to be changed, because "community development" has now become a bad word.

This has gone so far, in fact, that the Union of Ontario Indians now feels that there is no such thing as community development, regardless of who the originator and the programme operator happen to be. They feel that there are only people—community developers, not community development—people with the gift for acting not as mere catalysts of ideas, but rather as initiators of change in their own right. This is the distinction they are now trying to make.

Such people, it is pointed out, are indeed rare in any field of endeavour. They are possibly non-existent when required to be effective in such diverse fields as medical and dental services, housing, economic development, education, youth and cultural development, information officers in legal areas such as court workers, alcohol and drug addiction, rehabilitation workers and recreational workers.

It is quite clear that when once we recite this formidable list, no single community development officer can hope to have a wide span sufficient to enable him to take in all these functions. The idea of a community development officer with such a wide background as this is just out of the question. These people do not exist, by and large, with the exception of the rare individual.

So a strong argument is now being put forward that effectiveness in all these separate areas can only come about when one person is made responsible for a single separate area such as education, and this area is controlled and administered by a functional co-ordinator who is also responsible in that same area.

The previous idea of what was called a single-programme approach did not work. It has been shown not to work, and the new proposal is an attempt to make the most of the way people's minds function, to the best advantage of the Indian community.

It is proposed that these specialists in the Indian field would be known as resource development workers. As in the case of the community development concept, the resource development worker would also rely on "social animation," based on group participation and the sharing of information, ideas and concern at the level of the Indian reserve. This would be done through the band council, through individual contacts, and through group work.

In this new concept there would be several resource development workers coming into contact with each other on a given reserve at any given time, and close communication would be maintained between the different disciplines. The workers would be coming together on the reserve and they would also be reporting jointly at the provincial level for the purposes of co-ordination and for management control.

The resource areas involved, at both the federal and provincial levels, have grown out of an urgent need, rather than from an attempt at empire-building on the part of the Union of Ontario Indians. For example, in suggesting that the union employ court workers to represent Indian people, the fact is recognized that many Indians do not know their rights, are not at present properly represented and that the already overworked staff of the union is unable to perform this function for them.

How vigilant Indians must be is seen in scores of ways, the latest being that monstrosity, the CTV documentary, "The Taming of the Canadian West." Is that all we can say about the people who were here before we were? That awful, opinionated—I simply cannot describe it. They make our Indian citizens look something other than what they really are.

I know the minister has tried, but I will bet that CTV is going to show that programme again. I trust that the minister will be able to tell them that they will displease many people if they show that programme again; sometimes that is the type of way some people think, and it is time they stopped.

There are five or six key programme areas at the federal level that bear mentioning because they dovetail in with the provincial programming; they are, therefore, completely relevant at this time as we approach the discussion of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary.

Any programme that is seriously designed to raise the Indian population to a level of competitive equality and standard of living with the white community will have to be a truly massive undertaking in comparison with

the limited bits-and-pieces programme that has been so common in the past. There is a tremendous job of catching up to do because of the years of previous neglect.

In the past, survey programmes to examine the economy of the reserves and the Indian communities have suffered because of the credibility gap. This is because the Indian people were uninformed and were sceptical about the conclusions of such studies. It is only when local people, local Indians, are tied in from the very outset that believability is possible as to the aims and objectives of an economic survey. The federal government is being urged to develop a comprehensive economic development programme, staffed by Indians themselves, and involving a complete inventory of human, natural and environmental resources under the impact of economic development.

The Union of Ontario Indians feels that it is only in such a way that Indians will be able to ascertain for themselves the magnitude of the funds that will be required for the catching-up process. At present, Mr. Chairman, the number of Indians unemployed or underemployed in Ontario between the ages of 15 and 16 is thought to exceed 9,000 and that, Mr. Chairman, is a conservative estimate.

In the face of all this, the Indians do not want to be the silent partners in further decisions based on expediency. They feel that the time is long overdue for them to take an active part, if not a dominant role, in all aspects of social and economic developments that directly or indirectly affect them.

It is quite clear from the high level of the presentations that have gone to Ottawa and come to the present minister that the conscious decision on the part of the Indian community to assume increasing responsibility has been reflected in the quality of the presentations that have been put forward by the union.

That decision to accept further responsibility, in fact to take it upon their shoulders to put their house in order, is the result of the lack of meaningful progress on the part of various levels of government to create employment opportunities for Indian people and to further the economic development of the reserves in a way that involves the Indian people themselves. The funds that have been allocated have been eaten up in administrative costs and the civil servants involved have not been Indian personnel, by and large.

The proposed phasing-in of the Indian participation and the phasing-out of the predominantly white civil service element have been worked out in detail and in a most responsible manner. Initial concentration will be on assessing the type and extent of the work already done in the areas of development by the various levels of government.

The past and proposed development projects undertaken by all departments will be critically examined, and the survey group will then undertake a detailed opportunity inventory of human resources, the social environment, the economic base, the viability of proposals and so forth of all the reserves of the province.

Since a considerable amount of work has already been done by the civil service in this area, only the updating of the information should be required in case of certain reserves. However, it is necessary to define the problems and opportunities found on each of the reserves as they relate to, and thus affect, economic development.

The next step the Indians propose is to prepare short-term, that is one to three years, and long-term, that is three to ten years, development plans for each of the reserves in Ontario. This would be accompanied by a 10-year implementation programme which would outline the viability of projects from a human, social and financial point of view. It would demonstrate the education and training required on the part of those who were to take part meaningfully in these projects, would delineate proposed sources of funds, would emphasize the role that the reserves, the union and the government ought to play, and would sketch in the type and size of the overall development fund required for implementation.

The Indians are conscious that this survey would take about five years and would require a considerable amount of outside professional assistance. However, they are asking that the economic staff be hired at the start of this programme so that the people who are employed can participate in the research analysis planning and design phases from the very beginning, so that they can gain valuable experience, and, in effect, an introduction to their work on the assumption that some of these same people would then be appointed to the executive positions in the programme. In this proposal to the federal government, the staff initially would consist of an economic development manager, five regional development advisers and a secretary.

Mr. Chairman, on page 239 of the estimates, under the Indian community item, we see an item, "transfer payments, community projects for Indian people that may be approved by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council" and it sets out $1,100,000. Now the point is that the word "for" is outmoded. In this new concept, that word should be "by" the Indian people. "For" is the sign of paternalism which has been left there in the estimates for everyone to see—community projects for the Indian people, as though they were still children.

This is what is rankling already in the breasts of the Indians who have seen copies of these estimates. It is quite clear that the minister has learned nothing, because otherwise he would have spotted that word and changed it.

But let me continue, Mr. Chairman, in relating the provincial programme and the federal programme in the light of the totality of Indian needs. The second area is court workers. There is an urgent need for the union to employ court workers because the present legal aid system, admirable though it may be, is not enough in view of the cultural, and even language barriers.

Many of the Indian people are presently not aware of their legal rights and so the majority of cases often go to court without proper representation. Indians are sentenced to jail without the benefit of proper legal aid in many cases. This has happened in Kenora, as the minister well knows.

Also, innocent people, the Union of Ontario Indians claims, have been convicted along with the guilty. The union calls this situation intolerable and it proposes, in its budget to the federal government, to hire five court workers—one for each region—to advise the Indian people of their rights and, of course, recourse to the proper and timely legal aid.

To ensure that these people are properly trained, the union proposes that court workers receive intense full-time training by legal experts during the first three months of their employment and thereafter, on-the-job training for the remainder of the year.

They want the hiring of non-professional Indians—laymen—rather than non-Indian professionals since Indian workers, especially if hired from their respective regions, will have a better rapport with the people.

This is because, in the majority of cases, contacts with families and individuals will be made through home visits. It is better to be a lay Indian and accepted than an expert from an alien culture. They have too many of those already.

These five court reporters would advise and educate the Indian people in the province as to their legal rights as Indians. They will arrange and provide all the necessary legal aid and counsel, working with the legal aid branch. They will arrange and provide proper representation before the courts. They will ensure fair treatment in proper correctional institutions of Indians serving their sentences and they will assist former inmates to return to productive life.

The Indians have asked the federal government for an annual budget of about $200,000 for this particular programme. All these figures include travelling, cost of living, the overhead for a small office, and an office manager.

The third programme to which Ontario ought to be relating is the alcohol and drug education and rehabilitation programme; again, an Indian-staffed programme. The union points out that the addiction to alcohol is a common denominator affecting the Indian people in all areas of activity. This makes the various programmes designed for Indians constantly less effective than they might otherwise be.

The anti-alcohol and the anti-drug addiction education programme is plagued by dropouts. This in turn in itself can be traced to the pernicious climate of alcoholic use and, more recently, of drug use. Both alcohol and drugs are being used on an increasing scale by young adults, and even by their parents.

The effectiveness of the addiction education programme is very much dependent on its type and extent. The same can be said of all the programmes commonly lumped under the community development, especially the relationship of the spending of welfare cheques on alcohol; to crime and, in general, to retarded social and cultural programmes.

The work done to date on the part of the government forces the union to the conclusion that there is no effective alcohol and drug education and rehabilitation or other programmes for Indian people per se, and this in spite of the Addiction Research Foundation work.

The union feels that, recognizing the programme's importance and its special Indian connotation, it must have responsibility for it; that this ought not to be just another programme run by civil servants for the Indians, but instead it should be a programme of self-help run by the Indians.

So they propose five workers reporting to a manager, to be employed by the union and to be responsible for the following areas of activity: alcohol and drug education among the old and young in the forms of seminars, group discussions, films, lectures and club-counselling services; the establishment of rehabilitation programmes on the reserves; immediate studies of the causes of addiction among Indian people; and the drafting of a long-term plan for its reduction to an absolute minimum, working with court workers on all matters relating to the law and the alcoholic, working closely with all government agencies and proper organizations to represent the Indians in all matters pertaining to alcohol and drug education, addiction and rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, there is a fourth programme that is very important, extremely important, and that is a programme which relates to medical and dental services. Indians have, of course, on a great many occasions received unfair treatment in regard to their entitled medical services, and this fact came forth very strongly during the recent health survey undertaken by the union, the object of which was to record and assess the type and nature of medical service problems encountered by the Indian people of Ontario. They wanted to be in a better position to combat alleged mistreatment that Indians claim they encounter in their attempt to get proper medical and dental care.

It is felt very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that Indians of the province, as well as all other Indians in Canada, should be entitled to free medical services under the federal government, and I think that is law. However, the union feels that the federal government is engaged in a policy of terminating its involvement in the medical care of Ontario Indians by handing over the jurisdiction in this field to the province; the federal Medicare Act, by which the government of Canada assists the provincial government in providing medical care for all residents of Ontario, makes no exception for Indians.

In order to receive the federal subsidies, Ontario must accept Indian partication in its health plan and so section 97 of the BNA Act, paragraph 4, which gives legislative responsibility for Indians to the federal government is, in a way, bypassed by this measure.

In the latter months of 1969, I understand, the national Health and Welfare department enrolled the Indians of Ontario in OHSIP, and now the third step in this process is taking place as the federal government terminates its involvement by asking band councils to take over the administration of medical programmes and to handle such matters as the eligibility registration certificate with the OHSIP membership number, and the actual dealings with OHSIP itself.

As this process is developed, the federal government intends apparently to step out of the picture, and the National Health and Welfare department is already arguing that medical services are available without its help and the Indians must deal with OHSIP.

The question is then, Mr. Chairman, will the federal government pay the Indians' OHSIP premium, or will the provincial government forgo them? This is something we have to clear up.

The Union of Ontario Indians has stated its policy in opposition to the payment of OHSIP premiums by Indians, because they argue they have a right to receive free medical services, based on their band number. However, the positive side of the health service liaison worker programme, which is the fourth programme I am now outlining, is that in each of the five regions, the worker is on hand to explain what health services are available to the Indian people in Ontario, from federal, provincial and local sources, and how such services may be obtained. The worker is on the spot to take note and answer all inquiries on health matters relating to Indian groups in Ontario and to refer problems directly to the zone director of medical services, national Health and Welfare, and to the local provincial officials.

Finally, the health service liaison worker will submit recommendations to the Union of Ontario Indians regarding major problems relating to health matters, and general recommendations to improve health services available to Indians at the reserve level.

The union feels that this service is critically needed, not only to ensure that adequate medical and dental services are made available to Indians, but—and no less important—to ensure that Indians are fully informed and advised on current developments on the part of government and on the position that Indians should take regarding medical services.

The five health liaison workers would report to a manager of medical services and assume responsibility for the availability of proper and timely medical and dental services on each and every reserve in the province; for informing the Indian people regarding their rights and privileges in the area of medical and dental services; for assisting the Indian

people in obtaining proper and timely medical and dental services; for following up on all complaints regarding medical and dental services; for calling on doctors and dentists treating the Indian people to discuss individual cases and problems; and for working closely with all government agencies and private organizations to represent Indians on all matters pertaining to medical and dental services.

Mr. Chairman, the fifth programme is related to the provincial programme that I shall be speaking of shortly, and of course it is relevant to survey the whole area to see where the province can fit in, in relation to the proposals to the federal government. That is why I am taking the time, at this point, to lay a groundwork for a later debate on individual issues.

In the area of education and youth, a very positive proposal has been made. In the past, the Indians' education was adequately ensured by their parents and by their elders. The father taught the son the necessity and the pride of providing for the family, to read the tracks of the game and to survive within the environment provided by the Great Spirit. The mother taught the daughter to care for her man and her family and to do the work expected of her in the village. The older people taught the children the ways of the people and the history, the legends and the ways of living.

Today the education of the Indian rests in the hands of "professional" teachers either by Indian Affairs or through the Ontario Department of Education. The question arises: What should and what can education do vis-à-vis the native people of this province who once adequately provided this service for themselves?

The record of achievement today leaves much to be desired. Of the 14,000 status children attending school in Ontario, only one out of two go beyond grade 8; only 236 attended university last year. This dismal performance cannot be allowed to continue.

Missing from today's education is the need for the native people to be recognized as those who have a cultural identity, who belong to the different nations — the Algonquins, the Six Nations and so forth — people who are alike and yet are different, people who have histories, who have a past, a present and who must have a future in order to account for themselves.

There is a need for the general recognition of a history and a culture which belongs not just to the native people but also to the people of this country. For Canada, its history and its culture began before 1492; recognition of the cultural identity of each native person must be inherent in any Ontario educational programme. But this recognition must be particularly evident in the Indian classroom to help the child realize his own cultural identity, his own strength and his own security. The Indian child must emerge from his years of schooling proud and confident that he is indeed an Indian.

To be successful, education for native children must involve the parents of these children, and those parents must have some responsibility for the education of their children.

The teachers who work with Indian children, it goes without saying, should have the best qualifications. They should be ready and capable of change; they should be conscious of the child in relation to his particular environment; they should have a knowledge and an understanding of the Indian community and of the people who make up that community. Teachers of Indians should be properly briefed and oriented before they are sent to a native community.

The curriculum in a native community ought to be one of flexibility and relativity. All too often it is formulated in an urban and non-native culture and this is what the teachers' college type of teacher comes out and impresses on the child. A teacher from an alien culture can inflict rapid and permanent genocide upon an aboriginal culture unless he or she is completely attuned to the indigenous climate. That goes without saying—or it should.

The language of the classroom should be the language of the community. The language of the community is the native language, so the child should ideally start in his own language as spoken at home and at a later date, say, at the age of 8 or 9, should be introduced to English. This would encourage the child and leave him with positive memories when he is a young adult whereby he would be strengthened in his cultural identity.

You know, I am a Canadian of Italian descent and my parents and my schools taught me to be proud of my identity, be proud to be a Canadian, but also be proud to be an Italian. That is what we must instill in all our people in Canada. It is the diversity, as the hon. minister says, the multicultural aspect of our nation, that is going to make it strong, and of course the Indian

culture is a strong aspect of that multicultural tradition that we have maintained in this country. It is with great respect that I say that in this area we have fallen down.

So I say that the language of the classroom, and I repeat, should be the language of the community, and the language of the community is the native language so a child should ideally start school in his own language. This would encourage the child and leave him with positive memories when he is a young adult whereby he would be strengthened in his cultural identity. I wanted to repeat that.

This means that the teacher should be fluent in the language of the community in which he or she will teach. In practice this means putting far more Indian teachers through teachers' college and university. The printed matter in the classroom should be that which is relevant to the people of that community. Books for the teaching of reading should be those which are meaningful to the Indian children. The printed matter should include the use of both languages — the native language and then either English or French, whichever is appropriate in the area.

So short do present programmes fall, that it is necessary to point out the absolute lack in such areas. For example, in the area of civics, the governmental processes of the Indian community should be taught: the role of the chief, the council the band, the band clerk and the superintendent. At present, all too often, it is just the civics of the province and the nation that are taught. Other items such as The Indian Act and the treaties which directly or indirectly concern the community should be known and understood. The geography of the local community and the reserve should be a major item of study. The location of other native communities in the province and in Canada ought to form the basis of learning in which the child would discover to which nation the people of his community belong. This would develop a link of knowledge and understanding of other groups, of other bands, and of other Indian nations.

Indian culture should be taught in the schools by the teachers with the help of the people of the community. This ought to include the native religion, the art forms of dancing, chanting, grooming, crafts, painting and songs as well as a thorough grounding in the value system of the people of a particular Indian community.

History should include the story of the people, of the reserve, the band and of the nation, and human relations should be taught, whereby the Indian child would learn of his and many other native peoples, of white people and of the world beyond the native community.

Schools for elementary children should be at home in the native community. Small children should not be required to travel great distances to residential schools or to schools in urban non-Indian communities.

The staff of the secondary schools in major centres should be oriented—and they are not, right now—to receive Indian students. At the moment all the emphasis is put on orienting the children to go to high school and conditioning them into the ways of the high school, but there is no complementary programme to condition the staff of the high school to receive Indian children. Consequently, often there is no involvement on the part of the secondary-school staff with the housing and social accommodation of the Indian students.

One way out of this would be to offer courses in Indian culture and language in secondary schools. Consideration should be given to the creation of secondary schools located in the native community to which the native students might go, and these secondary schools would be the equivalent of any secondary schools in the province of Ontario. This has never been tried but it ought to be, and with quality it could succeed.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, serious thought ought to be given to the creation in Ontario of a cultural venture for native students of all ages whereby they could learn of their own culture in order to create new forms of expression based upon a knowledge and understanding of their inherited past.

Urgent consideration ought also to be given to providing educational opportunities to young adults who have got out of school and wish to return; to older adults who want or need to upgrade their skills in reading, writing and mathematics; to the old people who wish to learn of the new and wish to be of use in the teaching of the group.

For all these reasons it is obvious that Indians must assume a greater involvement in the Indian educational system provided for them in Ontario. This involvement must be extended to the training and upgrading areas in order to ensure that proper programmes and facilities are available to Indians, and that the training and upgrading is in

line with the real, rather than imaginary, job opportunities.

Mr. Stokes: Provided by whom?

Mr. De Monte: This province, if need be. Necessarily you will never provide it. If the province has to provide it, let them provide it. Are you going to get into a battle with the federal government? Are agencies more important to you than people?

Mr. Stokes: I just wanted to know—

Mr. De Monte: Well, listen to the speech and you will become educated. Just listen.

Mr. Stokes: I want to know if you are speaking for the Union of Ontario Indians, for the National Indian Brotherhood, or for yourself?

Mr. De Monte: Well, I would trust that perhaps you might learn something, and if you keep quiet you might.

Mr. Stokes: You are just a Johnny-come-lately.

Mr. Haggerty: Listen, and you will learn.

Mr. Stokes: I listen, but I listen to the Indian people.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Why did you not do something for the native people instead of mouthing off all the time?

Mr. MacDonald: What are the Liberals in Ottawa doing?

Mr. De Monte: Why do you not be quiet too? Be quiet. Read your paper. It is obvious you are not interested in this—you are reading the newspaper.

Mr. MacDonald: We are listening.

Mr. De Monte: You are listening?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, we are listening.

Mr. De Monte: They are mad. We are getting to them again. Go back to your newspaper. You cannot stand education, can you?

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps the party to my left might listen for a while and learn, it is obvious that Indians must assume a greater involvement in the Indian educational system provided for them in Ontario. This involvement must be extended to the training and upgrading areas in order to ensure that proper programmes and facilities are available to Indians and that the training and upgrading is in line with real rather than imaginary job opportunities.

All this shows that there is a real need for human resource workers who will be dealing with young people involving youth development in terms of their aspirations frustrations, problems, opportunities and social and physical requirements. The present high dropout rate among Indians is the fault of both the educational system and the social and physical situations that Indian youth have to live with.

Mr. Chairman, Ontario ought therefore to be deeply involved with the proposal to the federal government by the Union of Ontario Indians that five regional human resource workers, reporting to a manager, assume effective responsibility for the maximum human resource development of Indian people in the province. These areas of development are summarized as follows:

In education: To assess the present educational programmes available to the Indian youth; to determine their relevance and value with an annual update of this information; to undertake a study of the type and extent of Indian participation in the present educational programme, again with an annual update for this; to recommend a comprehensive educational programme for Indian youth in each reserve school in each region and in off-reserve schools and for the province as a whole.

They would also recommend an Indian-oriented educational programme in history, language, arts and crafts, songs and legends and, in general, in the Cree and Ojibway and Delaware ways of life, to be incorporated into the provincial curriculum to be offered to Indian youth and hopefully to others in Ontario.

They would provide advice and counsel to bands and other organizations on all matters relating to education. They would provide advice and counsel to Indian youth in the province on all matters relating to education and try to reduce the dropout rates to an absolute minimum. They would work closely with all government agencies and other organizations on all matters relating to Indian education.

In the field of training and upgrading: They would assess the present programmes available, they would undertake a study of the type and extent of Indian participation, they would recommend comprehensive training and upgrading programmes for each reserve; they would provide advice and counsel

to bands, councils and all interested Indian people on all matters relating to training and upgrading.

They would work closely with the development adviser to ensure the availability of human resources in line with existing or potential economic development opportunities. They would liaise with all government agencies and other organizations on all matters relating to training and upgrading.

In the area of youth development: The five regional human resource workers would attempt to define Indian youth as it is found today in terms of its aspirations, frustrations, problems and opportunities; they would determine the social and physical requirements of the Indian youth and extent of the recreational facilities available to the Indian youth.

They would also recommend a detailed youth programme for each reserve; would provide counsel to bands and their councils, to youth groups, in all matters relating to youth development. They would work closely with court workers on problems relating to drugs and to liquor and would liaise with all government agencies and other organizations in this field.

But there is a sixth field of cultural development and here fine arts and craft workers and a manager of cultural development are set out. I will not develop this in the same details, because obviously it is clearly to do with arts and crafts.

The seventh area is the meetings of chiefs, regional consultation meetings, and meetings between levels of government and the union. Mostly this heading covers travelling and accommodation.

The eighth and final area is for a monthly publication produced by the union, which they asked for in their budget.

What is the relevance of this federal programme to Ontario and what is Ontario's relevance to this programme? Basically it is believed that this programme would save its cost in the amount of welfare that would be saved by the Indian people working to help themselves.

The complementary proposals for a youth development project presented to the present Provincial Secretary in March, is of course germane to these estimates but could not be understood except in the context of the larger proposal to the federal government with which it is designed to dovetail.

In the introduction to this proposal, Chief Fred Plain points out that:

> The white man's world, through the medium of movies, television and the printed word, including textbooks, has made an increasing number of Indian young people ashamed of being Indians.
>
> The education system with its textbooks and its emphasis on off-reserve schooling, has exposed Indian youth to ridicule and ill-treatment and has reinforced an inferiority complex. Just as challenging, it has turned them against education in general.
>
> It is little wonder that 90 per cent of Indian youth are dropping out of high school. It is not because of lack of intelligence or willingness to study, but because of the ideas engendered throughout the educational system, that Indians are second-class citizens.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the treatment that causes Indian dropout. It is also the treatment that follows Indian boys and girls in their everyday life, whenever in fact they become exposed to non-Indian environment. This includes the field of recreation, including sports.

Mr. Chairman,, it is from the heritage in the past that the essential extension of self-confidence must grow. As such, this must become an important ingredient in the Indian youth development programme.

The brief goes on to point out that culture, history, language and pride are all in jeopardy under the present school system. Yet there is no constructive alternative. The union says:

> In the absence of any meaningful alternative, some of our youth turn their energies against society; as evidenced by an ever-increasing rate of juvenile delinquency, alcoholism and drug addiction. As long as Indian girls and boys do not have a favourable image of themselves, their actions, in fact the whole of their existence will not command the respect of others.

Mr. Chairman, the 176 reserves in Ontario scattered over 413,000 square miles have a population exceeding 55,000 registered Indian people. The proposal of the federal government is therefore recognized to be totally inadequate to deal with this aspect of the problem. The provincial government has got to get into the picture at this particular level, but not, of course, in a paternalistic way.

Four youth development workers are urgently needed in each of the five regions of Ontario. They have to be natural leaders of the Indian community. They have to be Indians themselves, not provincial civil servants

who are just parachuted into these areas. There is an urgent need for such ancillary equipment as audio-visual supplies, mobile trailers, recreational and sports equipment, and so forth. But, far more important than equipment is the support of leadership.

In his book, "The Unjust Society," Harold Cardinal has written: "There can be no equality as long as the dignity of the Indian is not respected." Today most Canadians are either indifferent to Indians or else they hate and pity them. The worst of the three is the man who pities the Indians, for he denies the object of his pity the opportunity to be a man.

Mr. Chairman, I will not go into the fine print of the very detailed proposals that the Union of Ontario Indians has passed to the minister. It is in his possession and he knows full well how finely scaled the programme has been so as to generate sufficient local government and non-government support and funding for all the viable programmes to be administratively and operationally self-supporting by the end of the third year of operation of these programmes. The total project cost, until it becomes self-supporting, is $1.5 million.

Chief Fred Plain says:

> At first glance it may appear that we are asking for an extremely large sum of money to fund the youth development project. It is unrealistic if we consider it merely a study, but on the other hand it is realistic and a conservative estimate for the grass-roots action-oriented implementation programme and a vehicle to get Indians started on the road to much deserved pride, self-betterment and self-management.

I agree wholeheartedly with these sentiments, Mr. Chairman. Contrast this non-recurring investment with the bottomless pit of paternalistic welfare handouts, and you cannot seriously question the direction in which Ontario's Indian programme must go in the future. The Union of Ontario Indians has pointed the way in brilliant fashion.

The minister knows that the objections to this programme are coming only from his own civil servants who have a strong reluctance to being phased out. They alone want to continue the paternalism. They do not quarrel with the cost of the programme but they believe that the money under this heading ought to be going mainly into their salaries rather than into Indian self-help, which they see as a threat to their personal career patterns and security.

There, Mr. Chairman, is the crux of the matter and there I will leave my initial remarks on this topic because I think I have set the whole thing out in full. A challenge has been placed directly upon the shoulders of the government to implement one particular programme. If the government denies the implementation of this programme it is now called upon to stand up and explain why.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, despite the exchange between the member for Thunder Bay and the member for Dovercourt, one cannot ignore the member for Dovercourt's contribution to this debate on the opening of the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship—its length, its scope, its detail, the comprehensive nature of it and the amount of attention and devotion which the member for Dovercourt obviously has given to the preparation of that speech on one particular, but extremely important, item of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary.

It is a matter which of course my colleagues, particularly the member for Thunder Bay, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), and the member for York South, perhaps, will discuss. Each of them is particularly knowledgeable in this area, much more so than I, and I do not pretend that I have the capacity at this point in the estimates, or at any point throughout the estimates, to deal with the subject of Indian community development in the manner in which they are capable of dealing with it, or the manner in which the member for Dovercourt has dealt with it.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that in this particular regard, there has been no other activity of government in the province of Ontario for which there has been such great intention, so much expectation and so little fulfillment.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Hear, hear.

Mr. Peacock: There has been put before this Legislature year after year not large, but reasonably large, sums of money to be voted by the Legislature. From the period that I can recall, 1967 through to the present,

sums of money have been voted by the House, but not until only very recent times actually expended.

We all recall — although the member for Dovercourt, I believe did not refer to it directly, or did not discuss it if he did refer to it, at any length in his remarks — the prolonged, difficult debate in which we engaged the minister who is now Provincial Secretary and was then the Minister of Social and Family Services, over the collapse of the Indian development branch of The Department of Social and Family Services.

I for one, Mr. Chairman, am sad that once again we confront this same member of the cabinet on this particular issue. It was not until the fiscal year 1970, that anything like the funds voted by this Legislature were actually expended on the affairs of the Indian development branch or what later became another part, as I take it from the public accounts of the province, of the rehabilitation branch of The Department of Social and Family Services.

Once again, the matter of Indian community development has a status of its own in The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, and once again during the course of these estimates we will find ourselves questioning the same minister as to whether the intentions that he has put before the Legislature are likely to be fulfilled.

I move on, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that during the course of the estimates we will be querying the very substantial increases in the amounts that the minister has asked we vote for the citizenship item, for the programme of community development, the lack of change in many of the items that appear under the legislative services programme—why it is that there are reductions in the appropriations to be voted for Hansard, for the legislative post office and very little change in the amount expended for the legislative library and for sessional and other requirements. These are matters which we can ask about in some detail as we go through the estimate, vote by vote and item by item.

I also propose, as we do so, Mr. Chairman, to raise such matters as the taxation of salaries and expense allowances of members of the Legislature, the services or the lack of them for members, the matter of the use of the library by members and the establishment of research facilities to be associated with it, the televising and radio broadcasting of the proceedings of this House, all of which were matters recommended for study and implementation by the 1969 select committee on the standing orders and procedures of the House.

I would like also to know before the conclusion of this estimate, Mr. Chairman, how the minister proposes to bring before the House—since they are not properly before us in this estimate—the matter of the administration and policies of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario and the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. In past sessions—at least at one point in time, I believe—we have dealt with the report of one of these agencies by way of a motion set down for debate of the annual report, as an order of the day.

If it is not within the rules, Mr. Chairman, to discuss matters of administration on policy of the two alcoholic beverage agencies of Ontario within this estimate, then I make the appeal now, as I will again, that the minister indicate to us his willingness to set down for debate, as a separate order of the day, the annual reports of the Liquor Licence Board and the Liquor Control Board. I do not know of any other way which we in this House can draw together all of the subject matter that surrounds the question of alcoholic beverages in the province other than through such a debate.

Presently in another place, in the standing human resources committee, the estimates of The Department of Health are under consideration. Members of the House who are on that committee are probably discussing right now the funds to be voted for the Addiction Research Foundation. The Addiction Research Foundation carries on a great deal of investigative work which relates directly to the alcoholic beverage pricing, distribution and advertising policies of the government and, as the member for Dovercourt has suggested in his opening remarks, the question of the use of alcoholic beverages as a drug is a very large social issue in the Province of Ontario for all of our people.

As a matter of public health policy, we must have the opportunity to consider and debate how the two agencies for the licensing of use and distribution of alcoholic beverages will act and behave in conformity with that broader public health issue. I trust the minister will give us some indication as to how we can deal with those two reports.

One approaches these estimates each year with some diffidence as to how to proceed on a leadoff. The member for Dovercourt has proceeded in a way which I have touched

upon already. The minister for his part, however, has noted that this year he has made an exception and, unlike his predecessor in two sessions past, has given us some intoductory remarks to describe the programmes and functions of his department.

To be quite gentle about it, Mr. Chairman, I prefer the past practice of the minister's predecessor, because there is very little in the text of the minister's leadoff. And I must say in parentheses that I appreciate receiving it in advance but, ending the parenthesis, I go on from that to say that it does not significantly enlighten any of us as to what the minister has been doing or what he intends to do. I note again the glamorous, absolutely extravagant language that this minister can indulge in so much in this House. The reference to three programmes where the text switches from English to French and then for our benefit back to a translation of the French into English.

Mr. Lawlor: It reminds me of the poem, "Evangeline."

Mr. Peacock: One wonders how it is that three such activities as the Ontario-Quebec permanent commissions, the office of the co-ordinator of bilingualism, and the office of the co-ordinator for Ontario of the Canada-France Agreement, fall under the aegis and jurisdiction of the hon. Provincial Secretary, rather than under some—

Mr. MacDonald: A potential disaster.

Mr. Peacock: —more appropriate department of government, perhaps the federal-provincial secretariat or The Department of Treasury, or in regard to the educational concerns of any of these agreements, The Department of Education or The Department of University Affairs.

I find the inclusion here of these three items rather incongruous and perhaps in regard to them, when we reach that item in the estimates, we can ask the minister just to what extent—although it more properly belongs possibly under another department estimate, that of the civil service—to what extent the office of the co-ordinator of bilingualism will, in effect, be the person or the bureau responsible for carrying out the Province of Ontario's encouragement of bilingualism in the public service, the use of the two official languages of Canada, in all of those programmes and services in which the government is in direct contact with the citizens of the province.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my opening remarks at this point and await the item-by-item consideration.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may say something under the general and overseership situation touching this particular department, having no reference to any specific vote, but a short, I assure you, two or three questions as to its general departmental jurisdiction. The hon. John Robarts, as he then was—perhaps he may not be quite as honourable now as he was on April 3, 1970—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): He still is.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, he has not received the honorifics of the honours. We are all honourable gentlemen, I am sure. He said on April 3, 1970, when this department was in the throes of being reconstituted, that there were two areas which were to be serviced and taken away from other departments. I wonder how this minister—over against his predecessor—feels about encompassing a somewhat wider area within his department.

One of them, that the Prime Minister, as he then was, said would be added to the minister's department, was the activities of the athletics commissioner now located in The Department of Labour. He said that this would be an initial step in the overall social development which he thought should be caught within the fibres of the minister's department, toward the physical development of the province, physical health and what not. He said that there would be greater emphasis upon amateur sports through the minister's auspices than this seems to me to have happened.

The minister's department is somewhat threadbare—an empty department now—except that he seeks to give it some communal determination which basically this government has been loathe to do until this time. Having segregated off the whole of corporation law, there really is not much left but a little verbiage and some finespun poetry.

The second thing that he said would be caught would be the municipal education functions of The Department of Municipal Affairs directed toward making people more aware of their local government and its auspices. I would like to learn from the minister to just what extent he has achieved or is working in that particular area, and what kind of leaflets, pamphlets or what not is he doing, and if the minister is engaged in this area at all?

Secondly, under that head I would like to know whether the minister thinks that should fall within his demesne, whether it is a proper subject and whether he thinks it would be proper to go after that particular area within his general portfolio? I think that covers the ground.

Mr. Chairman: I think we can consider the remarks as questions of clarification. Does the hon. minister have any comments before we deal with these estimates item by item?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I listened of course, with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte) as he expounded, in a very thorough way, a position.

Of course, much of the very basic underlying principles and concepts that run through the whole of his statement as he put forward views mainly garnered from the Union of Ontario Indians is something to which all of us subscribe.

As he went through his remarks I would feel that most of the members of his House would subscribe to the philosophy, in particular, that should guide us as we continue the development of attitudes and programmes in this direction.

I wonder if he really fully grasped that the basic principles which he was expounding were exactly those that have guided this department in its work in the past two years primarily. Our objective is—and always has been—the full participation of the Indian people in the determination and implementation of their own social, cultural and economic goals.

Mr. MacDonald: It always was, but the minister's staff walked out on him because they knew he did not believe in it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That has been and still is and will continue to be the thrust of our programmes.

Now, those programmes will not be judged on the language used either by myself or the language used by the hon. member for Dovercourt or the language used by any other hon. member of this House who takes an interest in these matters.The final judgement will come, first of all, in becoming apprised of exactly what is being done outside these walls and, secondly, an evaluation of what is being done.

Mr. De Monte: How long will it take to re-evaluate?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The most significant thing is that in two years now I have tabled a report, a report of which I have copies, and one of the most significant things about the tabling of this report in this House, Mr. Chairman, is the way that the members opposite pretend, literally pretend, that the report does not exist. I would hazard a guess that perhaps one or two opposite—and I would almost be willing to bet on those individuals—went through this report, because they have a particular interest.

Mr. Peacock: What is the name of the report?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The report is "The Indian Community Projects, 1970-1971" for the fiscal year ending 31 March, 1971—

Mr. MacDonald: What about the year before when you sat on a million and a half and spent nothing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ah, you see, the hon. member is even unaware that this is the second report that I have tabled. I did table that report.

Mr. Peacock: If the minister is going to talk about it, at least put the name on the report.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did table the report. Every member of this House had this on his desk some two weeks ago. I wanted to make sure that it was on their desks so they would be familiar with this report. And for the hon. member for York South, here is a copy of the report which was tabled and to my knowledge every hon. member of this House received it.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's record was so magnificent that his whole staff walked out in protest about the incompetence. Now he can smile and defend it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this is a significant thing. The hon. member for York West—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister means York South. He should get his facts straight.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: York South, would like to pretend that these two documents do not exist. But, the document itself, Mr. Chairman, the document itself—

Mr. Stokes: The minister is being provocative. I have already distributed them to my riding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would have won my bet by having mentioned the member for Thunder Bay. That was one of the bets I would have won.

Mr. MacDonald: Drip on, drip on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the significance is not in the document, the significant thing is that they demonstrate and illustrate that of the 130 or more projects outlined in here in two years, that fully two out of every three have been initiated and undertaken, by Indian people for Indian people. They have been implemented entirely by Indian people. I could go through example after example.

The Chippewas of the Rama band, with their marina, after having received $40,000 in 1969 and $30,000 in 1970. This band decided that they required a tourist facility in the form of a marina. They conducted utilization studies and feasibility studies to determine the amount of money they required and made their submission. They received the money.

I would invite the hon. members of this House, as they proceed north through the Rama reserve, to drop in and see, in a concrete form, what has been accomplished. Indeed if some of the hon. members are "en boat" I would suggest that they tie up at this marina and other marinas that have been initiated and developed by the Indian bands themselves.

The significant thing is not just that they have developed the marina, but they have gone one further. The Gibson band are also developing a recreational facility at the Parry Island reserve—a group of them at the reserve in Rice Lake. They have got together now, having developed their facilities, to go one step further again. They are putting a proposition to us for our funding—they are getting together to now promote as a joint project under our guidance a study which is known now as RAID, which stands for Regional Amalgamated Indian Development.

They now have gone the one step further and are combining their knowledge and resources and experience to move in this direction.

I can go through the whole host of the projects as set out here. The Gibson band, for example, who have initiated their cranberry bog, are among the best examples—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister should watch his language now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —of ingenuity and perseverance and progressiveness that I have ever seen in any community. Again I invite the hon. members to visit; I am sure the chief there would be delighted to see them. They are already receiving a good many tourists. The signs are illustrated here. I think it is Iroquois Cranberry Growers. It is a story of perseverance which, when it is told, will be the highlight of any development taking part in this province, again funded as one of the 130 projects.

The members can examine any one or two out of every three of those projects and see that they have been implemented by and for Indians. In addition to this type of activity, of course, we have participated in a regional and provincial level. We have worked—and I have stressed this as being one of the most significant developments—we have worked hand in hand with the Union of Ontario Indians, as we have time and time again moved to meet their initiatives.

We also, of course, have met the support of Indian participation at the regional level which is in the grand council for treaty No. 3. And AMIK, which is so familiar to most of the members of this House, is a significant example of the encouragement of Indian and non-Indian co-operation for economic development.

Now, I have listened to the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Would the hon. minister permit, with great respect, please an interruption. It seems to me the hon. minister should be replying to the lead-off remarks of the speakers. We have not yet reached the vote in which we are discussing Indian community affairs and I believe that we should save any extended comments on the Indian community or Indian matters until we have reached that particular vote. If the hon. minister proposes to dwell upon Indians at this time, I will have difficulty in restricting the hon. members of the opposition from also entering the debate. I believe it would be much more preferable to deal with the votes in order, if the hon. minister would agree.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I abide by your judgement, Mr. Chairman. Since the lead-off speaker for the Liberal Party has devoted all of his remarks in this regard, I could not reply to his remarks other than I have because I was demonstrating through specifics, an answer which otherwise could have just been a general blanket reply to the hon. member.

I will conclude these remarks, Mr. Chairman, in a broad way—that there is much in the propositions which the hon. member for Dovercourt has placed which do have a certain attractiveness. One of the things that we have announced is that there will be an effort exerted by the branch and the department in this coming year to have consultations with the Indians of this province, in all fashions, in a most comprehensive way before further developments take place on any major scale or broad development.

The will and wishes of the Indians across this province must be taken into consideration. We want to make sure that our relationships with all Indians are on firm ground. There are questions to be answered. There is the question of whether the advocacy role on a general scale should be part and parcel of the actual participation in a community and resource role. Those two roles are quite distinct. They are. It happens not only in this field but also happens in all areas.

There are those groups that do not have the Indian status, the technical Indian status. Our work, of course, concerns itself with all of those who fall into the very general description of that community which needs assistance from our particular branch. Of course, there is still a very fundamental principle here that the government is elected by the people at large to carry out responsibilities.

There is a responsibility in two ways. There is the responsibility to ensure that the services over which it has jurisdiction and a general responsibility for, do meet those for whom they are intended. That is a responsibility that no government and certainly no minister can shuck off himself. The people of Ontario expect the government to govern and the minister to carry out the responsibilities assigned to him.

With respect to the particular programme that the Union of Ontario Indians has placed before the government, the youth development programme, I have been in touch with the Minister of Education subsequent to the presentation. He has been in communication with me and I am in the process, at the moment, of setting up a time with him during which it might be mutually feasible to meet with the union to pursue this very far-reaching programme. That is one of the functions of the branch. We have a community resource development; we have the communications and the co-ordination aspects and it is this aspect that we are working with. I have contacted the Minister of Education in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief comment to the member for Windsor West who touched on these matters and I think he will accept my remarks as directed to him, too. With respect to the debate on the activities of the two liquor boards. Of course, there are a number of opportunities. One is participation either in the Throne debate or the budget debate. There is the opportunity when the two boards have been and may be before the relevant standing committee. There also has been the practice of tabling during the course of the session, the reports of the two boards as an order item, and a full-fledged debate when that order is called. It is called purely for that purpose.

I may say that to me it has been of great interest that the opposition having pounded the table — I think it was the hon. member for Downsview who used to get quite excited in his passion about these things — we will get an opportunity to debate. I think the hon. member for York South used to have a strong feeling there. I think that on at least two occasions the reports were tabled and nobody — but nobody — indicated any interest at all in debating them.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You do not call the orders until about the last two days of the session.

Mr. MacDonald: Having sloughed it off until the end!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I remember that that order was on the paper for quite some considerable time.

Mr. Peacock: We were waiting for you to call it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was no interest evidenced.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not put it as you used to at the end of the estimates so we can have some real debate?

Mr. Peacock: Would the minister permit a question, Mr. Chairman? Given that we are now asking for the reports to be put down as an order for debate; given that the standing committees of the House are engaged in estimates consideration and therefore cannot examine commissions or call them before them, will the minister agree to what we are proposing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not order the business of the House, Mr. Chairman, but I would expect that there will be opportunity during the course of this session to debate all matters relating to the points of view. I would think an expression of points of view from all sides of the House again would be very opportune.

Mr. Lawlor: Well that is normal practice. Why does the minister not set it down formally?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I indicated, I would expect that will be done.

With respect to the hon. member for Lakeshore, of course the hon member is aware that as part of the general review of the whole of the government structure it would be likely that the reorganization of aspects of the parts of various departments would again come under review, and I would imagine that will await anything that has to do with the athletics commissioner that has not been transferred presently. There is nothing in the estimates that would indicate that there is to be such a transfer.

With respect to the municipal education portion, we can discuss that when we come to community services branch.

Mr. MacDonald: Are we on the first vote now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, vote 1701 has six separate items; I am wondering if there is any feeling on the part of the committee that we should take the entire vote as one total. There may be difficulty in trying to separate them.

Does the hon. minister have any comments in that respect? Will it be acceptable to the hon. minister to take vote 1701 in total rather than by items?

Mr. Peacock: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, what difficulty you see in dealing with this item by item?

Mr. Chairman: Well, as usual in the first vote we have the main office vote and the financial and administrative services, and to separate those two from the relationship to any of the others would be difficult. The better procedure, if possible, is to take it item by item. If the committee agrees, we will certainly do that.

Mr. Stokes: It is pretty hard to delineate.

Mr. Chairman: All right. I will call vote 1701, item 1. The hon. member for York South.

On vote 1701:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few things about the department as a whole, and I think the main office is the appropriate place to do it. I am not going to get into the detail of this whole question of Indian affairs, because that has been dealt with by the leadoff spokesman for the Liberal Party, by my colleague for Windsor West and by the minister's response.

I want to say that of all the aspects of the change of government and the establishment of a new government, the one that completely baffled me was the proposition that the major ministerial responsibility for Indians should have been handed back to this minister. I trust that one can say in quiet, unimpassioned factual tones that it was just a piece of political ineptitude.

After all, whatever the minister may say about his intentions, the fact of the matter is that the record of his intentions was such that we had an explosion of unprecedented proportions within the department with the result that the whole of the Indian affairs branch, or most of the major senior staff of the Indian affairs branch, resigned and left the government service.

After a time of face-saving, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) switched it to the Provincial Secretary, where he hoped we were going to move into a new chapter. Now, in the fullness of time, as we change government, this minister reappears and, heaven help us, Indian affairs become his responsibility once again.

The thing that shocks me about it, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister is an incorrigible sentimentalist. He is a master of superlatives. He talks about getting rid of paternalism. He is almost incapable of operating other than in a paternalistic basis. He exudes paternalism along with this sentiment to the point that it becomes offensive. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you want to know how far this goes, just let me give you a magnificent example.

I have here in my hands a letter—and I trust the minister will listen. It is a letter which was sent by the Hon. John Yaremko, Q.C., 1 Connable Drive, Toronto, Ontario; in other words, a personal letter. It was sent this past year—in fact, it was back in February—to Mrs. Christine Bennett, who happens to

be a constituent of the minister, and it reads as follows:

> This year, I have decided to send my Valentine wishes to you by way of a personal letter to express my thanks for the pleasure of knowing you. For February 14, and the rest of the year, I make the request "Be My Valentine".

It is signed John Yaremko, with a little red heart beside it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of ministerial drip which permeates the whole of the minister's approach to public affairs and, ironically, he sent it out to a woman who happens to be a member of the provincial council of the Ontario New Democratic Party.

Mr. De Monte: She will switch after that.

Mr. MacDonald: The man is not even in reach of the facts to know what is smart to do and what is inept to do. I leave it, because I repeat it is a little short of offensive and we have to contend with it in the House; that we should have to contend with it in relation to Indian affairs, I find offensive. I find it unforgivable on the part of the Prime Minister that these matters should have been handed back.

However, that is only the beginning of my complaint, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: How many Valentines does the hon. minister send out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One hundred and forty-seven.

Mr. Lawlor: Forty thousand!

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): How does the minister pick his Valentines?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact I am going to have that photostated and delivered to the press. I think it is so beautiful that I think everybody should see just what a sentimental drip we have got as a minister. However, let me get on.

An hon. member: I will bet he shoots a little heart.

Mr. Lewis: The incorrigible sentimentalist and the sentimental drip. That pretty well closets the minister.

Mr. Gaunt: I hope the minister does not send those letters to men.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): The member does not have to worry. He will not get one.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is hard to describe it otherwise, but I think it is unparliamentary.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. member is correct. It is hard to describe it otherwise, but he thinks it is unparliamentary.

Let me get on, Mr. Chairman, to another aspect of what has happened in this department. I listened with interest to the minister's report, as found on page 4 of his introductory comments—my colleague from Windsor West has referred to it—that there has now been included in this department:

> First, the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission, which was set up to implement the terms of the Ontario-Quebec agreement for co-operation and exchange in cultural and educational matters signed in 1969;
>
> Second, the office of the co-ordinator on bilingualism, established to implement the government's bilingualism programme in the spring of 1970; and
>
> Third, the office of the co-ordinator for Ontario of the Canada-France agreement, which was added to my office just before the end of the past fiscal year.

Other than the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission, I see no specific estimate for that; so I presume the appropriate place to deal with it is in vote 1701 and in particular under the main office.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I am mystified. The Ontario-Quebec permanent commission is primarily an educational agreement and why it would be taken out of The Department of Education, where the implementation of it will for the most part lie, or at least where the resources and the normal personnel for its implementation would normally lie, again puzzles me.

At some point, when I have made my introductory comments here, I want to find out from the minister what exactly is being done since presumably he has had this responsibility since 1969. Or precisely when did you get the responsibility for its implementation.

But when you carry it one step further and put the office of the co-ordinator of bilingualism and the office of the co-ordinator of the Canada-France agreement in this department, I ask why? Why in the pot-pourri of activities that now constitute this department, would these matters be included in the Provincial Secretary's department? We have got the federal-provincial secretariat, which normally deals with matters of this nature, and why it should be shunted off into this Provincial Secretary's department, I do not know.

Quite frankly, I have another very serious misgiving with regard to this. If my comment has something of a personal connotation to it, I suppose that is what has characterized many of my remarks so far up until now, and I do not need to apologize for it.

We have a real problem in Canada—how are we going to reconstitute a new federalism in this country which will establish better working relationships between the original two founding peoples? Secondly, how can you bring into the picture for the second century of Canada the so-called third force, the so-called New Canadians?

One of the things that has disturbed me immensely as we wrestled with this whole problem is the fact that as the spokesmen for the two founding peoples, English and French Canada—and unfortunately everybody other than French gets lumped into English Canada no matter what may be their racial background—have been discussing at such length over the last 10 or 15 years of constitutional review, the New Canadians, those of other backgrounds, have been sitting on the sidelines—

Mr. De Monte: I said that last year.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean "Said that last year?" For heaven's sake, we not only said it last year, but we put it in a brief to the B and B commission in 1964.

Mr. De Monte: You are always—

Mr. MacDonald: We put it in a brief to the B and B commission in 1964, so do not, Johnny-come-lately, climb on that issue, too.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Watch your blood pressure.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the point I am attempting to make is that one can understand the emotional problem on the part of New Canadians as they appear to be left out of the discussions between the two founding peoples. But interestingly enough, there are some spokesmen in the so-called third force and I mention for example, Dean Tarnopolsky, who in an address when he was at Osgoode and before he went on to the University of Windsor made a very valid point. He said that, as a member of the third force, as a New Canadian: "I have no objections to granting to French Canadians the right to which they are entitled as one of the founding people, because quite frankly a concession of the rights to French Canada has established the rights that I now wish as a member of these New Canadians."

Quite frankly, I am interested to see the minister shake his head affirmatively, because I have never heard the minister express that view and I am saddened when I find the number of people who are spokesmen for the third force who do not recognize that the rights granted to French Canadians are the basis upon which their rights can be built in this country. Indeed, if they are not conceded to French Canadians, then there is less of an opportunity for them to be conceded to other Canadians. You move into the melting pot theory which is characteristic of the United States, where you melt everybody down into the same mould.

Now, the thing that disturbs me is that I do not have confidence in this department, which really does not normally grapple with these issues, and, quite frankly, in this minister, who, as far as I have seen—and if I am wrong I would like to have some documentary evidence other than his verbal assurance—has not manifested the kind of approach that have some of his other fellow new Canadians, like Dean Tarnopolsky, which would be a basis for bringing all of the components of the Canadian family together.

I do not want to go any further into the detail. All I am saying is that I am puzzled about these issues being put into this particular department, but now that they are there, for better or for worse, we have to live with it. So I ask the minister what exactly, when exactly, did his department become responsible for the Ontario Quebec Permanent Commission, and what precisely is he doing? What action is the minister taking to implement the terms of that agreement that was signed in 1959?

Secondly, with regard to the office of the co-ordinator on bilingualism, I have a little difficulty trying to accept the date 1970. As I understood it, the Prime Minister's statement within recent weeks seemed to spell out the role and the intentions of this government in terms of promoting bilingualism and a co-ordinator who would be specifically responsible for it. What happened in 1970, and more important, what is going to happen in 1971-1972, with reference to the co-ordinator of bilingualism?

Third, the office of the co-ordinator of Ontario for the Canada-France agreement. What exactly are you doing, and how does that normally fit in to the activities and responsibilities of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it has been one of the parliamentary phenomena of this Legislature that the hon. member for York South, so adept at debating, is continuously ruining a position by personal remarks. I want to make certain things clear to him and I will do it as quietly as I possibly can. I want to explain to him, and perhaps his colleagues in this House and others will recognize that the transfer of the Indian community development branch was not from a minister to another minister, but from a department to a department. I can document it as a personal record that in the mid-1960's I was in communication with the then Prime Minister, and said, as a member of this House, with no responsibility, that I did not see why matters relating to Indians should be in a department stigmatized by welfare.

Mr. MacDonald: Agreed. I am not complaining about that. I am complaining about you being made responsible for it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You see, the hon. members opposite of the NDP, were those who persisted in saying what a stigma the word "welfare" was. I happen to have had the opportunity of changing that name to Social and Family Services, and I think the hon. member for Scarborough West would have preferred Family and Social Services—I forget what his suggestion was. I was interested, and I would say this in passing, that the present NDP candidate in the riding of Bellwoods refers to me contemporarily as being the minister of welfare. What does she have in mind by that? Does she think she will stigmatize me?

Mr. Lewis: She understands you. She took one look at you and categorized you right away.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that when the opposition, who—

Mr. MacDonald: Are you going to give her a Valentine next February?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking of Valentines, I do not know whether I should feel sorry for Mrs. MacDonald, and feel sorry for Mrs. Lewis—

Mr. MacDonald: You mean they did not get one of your Valentines?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If that is their reaction to a Valentine. They are cold, democratic. Loosen up. The only time I see the hon. members smiling is when they are in this House. They wear the longest faces outside of this House.

Mr. Lawlor: We are the biggest laughers in the crowd.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that only modesty would prevent me from bringing into this House the replies I received from other recipients of that little billet-doux.

Mr. MacDonald: You are too modest.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And you know, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not bring them in? Do not be modest.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The seat for Bellwoods is held not by getting Conservatives to vote for the Conservative candidates. But you know, I really have not given up hope that as a final act of something the hon. member for York South, who is a constituent of Bellwoods, will walk in and perhaps with a trembling hand—

An hon. member: Be your Valentine?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —put an X on the ballot.

Mr. MacDonald: Fat chance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not given up hope.

Mr. MacDonald: It shows what a sensitive person you are.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It may be that Mrs. Bennett will be one of those who will vote ahead of the hon. member. I never give up hope.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, you will notice how germane this is to the estimate.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Some of your remarks were not germane either.

Mr. Lewis: How about dealing with French-Anglo relations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Having dealt with those matters of state raised by the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman, the Legislature, the House as a whole, should grasp the concept of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship as now being involved, having been involved recently, and now continuing to be

involved in the total citizenship concept. I remember that the hon. member for Scarborough West when he was the NDP critic, and I held this portfolio, used to take me to task for the very limited point of view of the department. Now we are embarked upon a total citizenship programme. That is why it is very meet and proper that, in addition to the development programme with relationship to the integration of newcomers, that we now have within that the Indian community branch as part of the total citizenship branch, and three related aspects having to do with the development of the bilingualism programme of this government. They are part and parcel of a total citizenship concept. I want to make myself perfectly clear to the hon. member for York South. I hope that he has paid attention to the last paragraph of my opening remarks. If all else is treated as verbiage by the hon. members, so be it. But the last paragraph—

Mr. Lawlor: All sweetness and no light.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: — the last paragraph is the concept. I make no bones about subscribing to philosophies and concepts. As a matter of fact, the NDP would have the people believe that they are the only party that have underlying philosophies. I say here—

Mr. Lewis: It is quite an underlying philosophy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He means underground philosophy.

Mr. Peacock: The face of Canada should reflect the changing population.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In conclusion I hope that this total citizenship programme will contribute to an Ontario and to a Canada in which all people have an opportunity to participate fully in our social, economic and cultural programme: I underscore "all peoples."

I believe that the face of Canada in all its aspects in its public agencies at all levels of government, and its fundamental business, industrial and social structures should reflect the changing makeup of our population and our society.

Mr. Chairman, outside of this hall we have a nation which is made up in certain ways. We have a province that is made up in certain ways, a province which now has as part and parcel of its makeup, I think it would be roughly 40 per cent — 50 per cent of the British; I will not use the word English-speaking — I will use British, and if there are any Irish men or Scottish men here they might forgive me for that.

An hon. member: When you come to Welsh, you will draw the line.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Forgive me for that, but traditionally that is one sector of the community. We have now all of those who have come. Then there is the 10 per cent, more or less, of the population which is traditionally called Franco-Ontarians, not Francophones, not French-speaking, but Canadians resident in Ontario of French descent — some 700,000. There is now almost 30 per cent, made up of a whole host of cultures and backgrounds and races and nationalities and of languages. I think at last count there were 73 languages spoken in this city. As I see it, what should be the common goal is not to deal in numbers, where we have the figure two, the figure duo. All that is hurtful to anybody who does not feel that he is part and parcel of that duality. It is then you use the word plurality to mean more than two, but, in general, when we talk about diversity as being more than one and more than two, then it encompasses everybody. I look forward to a day and age when Canadians of French descent will be mirrored in all aspects of social, economic and political life, as all others. I think that that was one of the basic problems in the Province of Quebec, that one had a certain population and then one had social activities at the social, economic, political sphere which did not reflect —

Mr. Lewis: Can Hansard record these gestures? Without them it is incomprehensible.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. leader of the NDP pays no attention to any remarks—

Mr. Lewis: I am listening. I just wanted to make sure it was all on the record.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In fact, I have a sneaking suspicion that, having heard me expound this, there will be aspects of this that will be expounded.

Mr. Lewis: So far I have heard of a social activity down there and a social activity up here and the activities are activated. It is preposterous that you are involved in this area of the cabinet and that you, as a minister, should have these responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Preposterous? Preposterous?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get to the third element and if I may ask—

Mr. Lewis: What are these elements that you are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say to the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Dovercourt the use of the term "third force" has no appeal to me. Force has a connotation which I find unattractive. We need terms of—

Mr. Peacock: The minister used it himself.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We need terms of art. We need to develop a language in order to be able to communicate ideas. I have adopted the use of the words "third element" to describe those who are encompassed outside of the historical—and I am now underlining that word—the historical beginnings of this nation. In addition, of course, to the native people, who should have a priority over all.

To the hon. member for York South I say this. There are two concepts. There is the linguistic concept and there is the cultural concept. This government is on record, time and time again, that it subscribes to the basic principle of bilingualism. It also subscribes to the basic principle of multiculturalism and this government was the first to officially use the word "multiculturalism" and it has been in the last three or four years that the use of that word has spread both to the federal level and to the interprovincial level across the country—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —but never becoming a fact of life until recent years. I say this to the hon. member for York South, it is the primary goal of the department in the discharge of a total citizenship concept to raise everybody to make sure that everybody feels that he is a part of the action.

An hon. member: Full and equal citizenship.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Full and equal citizenship. That is the term of reference on the part of the department.

Mr. Lewis: Social, economical, political and cultural?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes!

Mr. Lewis: We will discuss then the Indian branch of the department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Completely!

Mr. Lewis: How the government has achieved it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes!

Mr. Lewis: Right! We will take you through it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those are the goals—

Mr. Lewis: The goals?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and I would ask the hon. member, the leader of the NDP, would he want any other goals for anybody else? Is there any particular sector of which he would say: "These shall be equal in this sector, but those will not"?

Mr. Lewis: I would not promise equality, when there is no substance in the promise.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No!

Mr. Lewis: That is what we heard, but the minister has been a previous disaster in every governmental area.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that—

Mr. Lewis: Indian affairs are totally beyond the capacity of this minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —is that this—

Mr. Lewis: It is a lot of nonsense. I cannot use the words that come to my tongue.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —this government and this department will be judged, not by the kind of remarks—

Mr. Lewis: In fact, I am leaving because I cannot stand it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —that the hon. member for York South or the leader of the NDP indulge in, but will be judged by the people outside of these halls. I am willing to debate that if the leader of the NDP has not got the courtesy to listen to these remarks when I told him they were the most focal point—

An hon. member: They are walking out on the debate. Shame on them!

Mr. Lewis: I have listened to the minister for 23 minutes beyond my intentions and my endurance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —we shall have the opportunity in the year 1971 to debate the proposition to which I hold and the propositions that the member—

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister now answer the question that I asked instead of this mush?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The ministry has had 23 years. They blew it.

An hon. member: Yes, look at this great province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Look at that great cabinet.

An hon. member: It is in good shape.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member for York South asked certain questions about the assignments of responsibility. The Quebec-Ontario commission was assigned in March, 1970.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: If the minister wants it, let him have it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The co-ordinator of bilingualism was assigned in March, 1970, and the responsibility for the Canada-France in March, 1971.

Mr. MacDonald: The department is not even responsible for implementing these items.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Since March, 1970, for the first two, and since 1971 for the assignment of the—

Mr. MacDonald: What specifically has this department done, for example, in the implementation of the first two, the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission and the office of the co-ordinator?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are very significant items, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission, during the past fiscal year, two meetings of the permanent commission were held; the first in March, 1970, in Toronto, the second hosted by Quebec in October, 1970, in Quebec City. The third meeting was held on Monday, May 10, in Toronto and I had the opportunity of attending a luncheon during the course of that meeting. Under the agreement two meetings are to be held this year.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is on that commission?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will have that in a moment for the hon. member.

It is the intention of the permanent commission to prepare an annual report for presentation to the two legislative assemblies and so I cannot, at this time, outline all of the individual projects but rather set out a few of the major programmes which, I think, will give the hon. member an outline as to what has taken place during the past year. As soon as the permanent commission's annual report is ready, I will table it in the House or make it available to the hon. members. My understanding is that it is to be prepared over the summer months.

There are the three aspects, the educational exchanges—

Mr. MacDonald: Sorry! Is there not a full-time secretariat?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. If I may just complete the work, Mr. Chairman. There are the educational exchanges relating first to university fellowships at the first meeting of the permanent commission; a fellowship exchange programme at the doctor and post-doctoral levels was agreed upon. This programme is to continue this year. It provides for 20 fellowships, 10 per province, at $5,000 each and in Ontario is is administered by The Department of University Affairs.

The permanent commission sponsored, on a pilot project basis, a summer student job exchange programme last summer. Eleven Ontario university students worked in Quebec government departments and eight Quebec university students worked in Ontario government departments. This summer the programme has been expanded to include 100 students 50 from each province. A third aspect is the exchange of second-language teachers of elementary and secondary school students, and of university professors, which is in preparation.

In addition, the two provinces are co-operating in studies of audio-visual teaching methods, of translation and interpretative courses of instruction of second language to immigrants and of diploma equivalences between Ontario and Quebec community colleges. I think that will give an indication to the hon. member the ambit of the work and why it fits into the work of the citizenship department.

Another important aspect, of course, is cultural exchange. In this field, both governments agreed to expend at least $50,000 each year and Ontario exceeded that sum

during the past year. The various projects were funded by the cultural and educational exchange programme of The Department of Education.

Then there are the government exchanges under the programme. These are so many and so continuous that it would be difficult for me at this time to detail them. They will be detailed in the report. Then there is again a very continuous exchange between the two governments of senior personnel, visiting each other in order to gain ideas from each other as to how the various departments work, especially in those areas in which there are mutual interests.

Now, the membership of the permanent commission is Mr. W. A. B. Anderson the chairman of the Civil Service Commission; Mr. Roland Berreault, superintendent of the Ottawa Separate School Board; Mr. Bert Kipp, assistant superintendent, curriculum section of The Department of Education, Mr. Steven Davidovich, director of staff development and research department of Civil Service —the hon. members will recall at one time he was the director of the citizenship branch within the department; Mr. Allan Gordon, assistant deputy minister, Department of University Affairs; Mr. Donald Stevenson, executive director, policy planning division, Department of Treasury and Economics, and he heads up the Dominion-provincial secretariat, and of course, we have the executive secretary Mr. Charles Beer, who is seated at this table.

From the Quebec point of view, there is Mr. Yves Michaud, who is the commissioner general for co-operation, departmental affairs. He was at one time a member of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. Mr. Gilles Chattell, director of external services in The Department of Industry and Commerce; Mr. Andre Geroux, assistant deputy minister, Department of Cultural Affairs; Mr. Louis Rousseau, director general for higher education, Department of Education; and Mr. Jacques Jolifebvre, councillor for technical co-operation, Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, is the executive secretary, Mr. Beer's counterpart at the provincial level.

They are the members of the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission. Now, in respect of the Canada-France agreement, just a month and a half ago this was assigned by order-in-council through the department. That agreement was signed by Canada and France in 1965, and previous to that the participation was co-ordinated through The Department of Prime Minister. Mr. Anderson has been appointed co-ordinator for Ontario and the various administrative and financial details under that agreement will be administered on the same basis as the Ontario-Quebec commission.

The province of Ontario has elected to act under the umbrella of the Quebec-Canada agreement, rather than acting as Quebec, as acting directly, I think as provided for under the agreement, and we are acting through the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister could find a spot—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will just conclude this portion, Mr. Chairman. Last year the funds granted for cultural exchanges and educational exchanges totalled more than $40,000, again funded through The Department of Education through its cultural and exchange programme.

Now the bilingualism programme—

Mr. Chairman: I think it being 6 of the clock I will now leave the chair and we will resume at 8.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

Introducing distinguished visitors from Belgium, Mr. Grossman 1703

Review last year of subsidy and loan programme of ODC, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. MacDonald 1703

Programme to create additional housing to include serviced lots, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Deacon 1704

Nine Lake Erie fishing companies assisted through ODC, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Stokes 1704

Vehicle parked in front of garage on Highway 10, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Worton 1704

Audited financial statements by provincially assisted universities, statement by Mr. White 1704

Motion to refer land acquisitions by Lands and Forests to standing committee on resources, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1706

Audited financial statements of provincially assisted universities, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Nixon, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman 1706

Hearings on constitutionality of Manitoba agriculture legislation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1707

Conflicts of interest declared by ODC directors, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. T. P. Reid 1708

Requests for subdivision approvals by Caledon Mountain Estates, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. J. Renwick, Mr. Young, Mr. Singer, Mr. Peacock 1709

Introducing Madame Claire Kirkland-Casgrain, Mr. Guindon 1712

Purchase of land from Caledon Mountain Estates, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis 1712

Making available file No. T-20185 from community planning branch, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Singer 1713

Travel allowance for blind and crippled recipient of family benefits, question to Mr. Wells, Mrs. M. Renwick 1713

Alleged monopoly control of public transportation in Sarnia, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Bullbrook 1713

Status of regional government in areas where studies completed, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Deans 1714

Alleged discrimination of retarded children in provincial legislation, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid 1714

Charges against Canadian Gypsum for failing to meet ministerial order deadline, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. MacDonald 1716

New grant basis for work in conservation authorities regarding dams, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Worton 1716

LCBO markup on price of wines, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Shulman 1716

Use of Mercer Reformatory site as youth shelter, question to Mr. Auld, Mr. Singer 1716

Motion re standing natural and physical resources committee and Caledon Mountain Estates lands, Mr. Lewis 1717

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1721

Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1722

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko 1722

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 1750

No. 42

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(*continued*)

On vote 1701:

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I have covered some of the details of the Ontario-Quebec permanent commission and the Canada-France agreement, both of which come under the jurisdiction of the office of the co-ordinator on bilingualism. The total bilingualism programme of the government was set out by the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) on May 3 in considerable detail, and those three aspects cover the item in the estimates referred to under the Ontario-Quebec commission.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A question, Mr. Chairman: The minister said, "both of which come under the office of the co-ordinator on bilingualism." Do both of these, namely the permanent commission and the Canada-France agreement, come under the direction of the co-ordinator of bilingualism?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Anderson has three separate hats, if I may use that expression. He is the co-ordinator of the bilingualism programme, and he is the co-ordinator of the activities under the Canada-France agreement, and he is co-chairman of the Ontario-Quebec commission.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on vote 1701. Shall the vote carry?

Vote 1701 agreed to.

On vote 1702:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702 is the community services programme. I believe we should stick specifically to the items on this vote.

Vote 1702, item 1, office of the executive director.

Carried.

Item 2 is citizenship branch. The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): You will have to excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I was out of the buildings and I rushed back and I am a bit out of breath.

I just wanted to say a few words on citizenship in relation to the concepts that the hon. minister was trying to put forward, and of course that the hon. member for York South was developing at 6 o'clock. I think the main theme, Mr. Chairman, was, how do we take into consideration the third element, as the minister refers to it, or the third force, or that one-third of the people of Canada that is made up of people other than French or English extraction.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the concept in itself does not lend itself to conceptualization in a few words. I merely think that what we are trying to strive for in this country, and in this province, is a place where a man can develop as an individual to the fullest extent of his capabilities. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that means that if he wishes to maintain the culture and the heritage of his mother and father, he should have full scope to do so.

I think that is what we talk about, Mr. Chairman, when we refer to the rights and the privileges of the third force, or the third element. I do think, as people like myself, who, as a member of that third element, stand back and watch, we are sometimes disappointed in the two founding races of this country. Firstly, because they tend to allow their personal feelings about their personal and historic backgrounds to cloud the issue that we are all Canadians and that, perhaps some day, if they push their sometimes illogical positions to the extreme, that they might be breaking up this great country of ours. It is on that aspect of the situation that I want to address myself for a few moments.

It is disconcerting to see these two great founding people fighting among themselves and, at the same time perhaps, destroying, or attempting to destroy, or unknowingly destroying, the very thing that our precious

country stands for. Perhaps we of the third element are a bit upset. We are upset, and I know that the minister is upset, that perhaps someday, because of the position taken by unreasonable people on both sides of this issue, it might, and perhaps could, destroy our great country.

The people of the third element certainly know that this is a great country. The people from the Ukraine, the people from behind the Iron Curtain, the people that come from the country my father came from know that this is the finest country in the world.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. De Monte: We take exception sometimes, Mr. Chairman, extreme exception to the fact that sometimes these groups take a very selfish and narrow point of view.

It is not that the people in the third element really say that we want our languages enshrined as the English and the French languages have been enshrined in the constitution. That is not what we talk about, in my respectful opinion, when we refer to the multicultural aspect of our country. What we refer to really is that we know that we have the right here to be what we are and nobody will ever take it away from us.

Nobody wants to take it away from us. But we also know that the divisive elements in our country might take it away from us and that is extremely disturbing to the third element. That is what upsets us. That is what upset the Italian-Canadians in St. Leonard, Mr. Chairman, not so much that they had to speak French, or that they did not want to speak French, but they reserved the right to be able to speak whatever language of the two founding languages they chose.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that we never get to the point that somebody tells me that I must either speak French or that I must speak English and that I cannot speak any other language. That is an element that I thought perhaps I might convey to the House this evening.

In connection with Indians—and I would like to go back to that for a moment because I did not have a chance to speak on it in the specific estimate—I understand we are at item 1 now, are we not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: We are at 1702, item 2.

Mr. De Monte: Item 2?

Mr. Chairman: Which is citizenship.

Mr. De Monte: Can I take a minute?

Mr. Chairman: The Indian community comes under item 4 on the vote.

Mr. De Monte: Then I might move over to another aspect of the situation that the minister mentioned in his reply. I refer specifically to his reference to the Indian community projects. I am not saying that these things are not laudable in themselves but a salient point comes out—

An hon. member: Save it for tomorrow.

Mr. De Monte: —from examining the Indian community projects for 1970-1971, and that is the lack of co-ordination. It is my respectful submission that what is going to help the Indians is a co-ordinated effort as I suggested in my opening address. I would implore the minister to look at the submission from the Union of Ontario Indians which is a valid project for implementation in Ontario, which is a co-ordinated and definite plan.

It envisages the area directors. It breaks up the province into areas. It sets down definite things for each officer to do. I must say that what strikes me in connection with this Indian community project is the minister's lack of co-ordination—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member—I will not restrict him from talking about Indians—but I will repeat that it is in the fourth item of this vote. We are on the second item.

Mr. De Monte: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will then wait until the fourth item.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay. Citizenship.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I thought that the hon. member for Dovercourt was going to speak about the citizenship aspect of our first citizens, and this is the only place where it can be properly brought up.

Mr. Chairman: I will permit that under item 4.

Mr. Stokes: No, I want to get in on citizenship. I am not talking about community development. I am talking about citizenship as it affects our first citizens and the only way that it can be appropriately brought up is under citizenship.

The member for Dovercourt was talking about the two founding races as enshrined in the constitution and he started to talk about community development. I want to talk about citizenship as it relates to our first citizens, those who were here before the Anglo-Saxons.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member feel that this can be separated from the fourth item?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I think it is important that it is separated from the community development aspects of vote 1702.

Mr. Chairman: I do not feel too restrictive tonight; I think perhaps the member has a point. He may proceed.

Mr. De Monte: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to let my friend here—who seems to have something in for De Monte these days—

Mr. Stokes: Not at all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. De Monte: If you are going to let my friend speak about Indians in this vote, I then reserve the right to speak about the problem I was speaking on.

Mr. Chairman: You were speaking too about the—

Mr. Stokes: While he is trying to figure out what he was speaking about, I will continue.

Mr. De Monte: I was speaking about Indians; of course, Indians as citizens of this country. If you are going to split hairs and say that you have to talk about citizenship, then I reserve the right to talk about them in this very important aspect.

Mr. Chairman: I must say my name is not Solomon, but I thought the hon. member had a point.

Mr. De Monte: I was under the impression that you made a ruling that I could not speak on this matter and I feel that perhaps my friend should wait.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt, I thought, was speaking about the Indian community in Indian affairs, whereas the hon. member for Thunder Bay wants to speak of the aspect of citizenship and I do detect some difference there.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He has always been a discerning chairman.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want to—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me just a moment. If the hon. member feels that I am being restrictive, then he can go back over it again when we come to the fourth item.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to deal for a few moments, Mr. Chairman, with a concept that the minister has been dealing with all afternoon about the value of a pluralistic society and a multicultural society. I really think the minister, in his eagerness to appear to be the saviour of all of the people that go to make up this great nation of ours, is losing sight of the fact that long before the Anglo-Saxons or those who supposedly found the North American continent we had a very viable community of Indians of every dialect from many origins.

I would like to refer, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to a very good paper that was put out by Wilfred Pelletier who is an Odawa Indian and who works at the Indian institute. He came out with a paper entitled, "For Every North American Indian that Begins to Disappear, I also begin to Disappear." I am not going to quote extensively from it, but I think it is important to start my remarks by quoting a few paragraphs from it just to put things in their proper context.

He said:

> Most Indians have been forced to give up their life because the economy and the ecology have been transformed by the European settlers. If they do not want to integrate with the technological society today, they can choose to spend their days in inactivity on the reserves, holding onto their social order even after it has lost its economic relevance.

He says:

> The first step toward surviving in an alien environment is to feel proud of who you are. Being surrounded by an aggressive and confident majority has made me somewhat defensive. I have spent a lot of years trying to convince myself, after being told all of my life that I was no good because I was an Indian, that I am really all right, that I am a human being like everyone else, and that maybe we Indians did have something to contribute to society, something that was sadly missing in the dominant culture.

He said:

> In trying to do this, I have thought a lot about the Indian way of experiencing the world and the ways in which it is in conflict with white society. Every Indian kid is exposed to these contradictory ways as soon as he begins school. When he has to leave the reserve and look for work in the city,

he can feel the tension between these cultures in his bones. He is caught in the middle and often finds the conflict just overwhelming.

I do not know the statistics, but I know from talking to a lot of people that the number of Indian kids landing in mental hospitals is very high. Some avoid the hospitals by staying drunk a great deal of the time, and then there are those who find that nothing will take away their pain except doing away with themselves. We have the highest suicide rate of any ethnic group in the country. Being educated in white schools was a painful experience for me, like for most Indian kids. I have therefore given a lot of thought to the Indian way of learning. I believe it has a lot to do with the difficulties in your schools.

Now there is a man who is one of our first citizens—a descendent of one of our first citizens—who has had the cruel experience of trying to make it.

I think he did make it because if you look at some of the work he is producing now on behalf of the native Indians and Eskimos that we have in this country, I think that the minister has to take another look at how he and his department regard citizenship in this country and whether or not he is really looking at the culture and the linguistic background of the really first citizens of this country.

I think that in his preoccupation with the other things that we will be dealing with in community development—when we get down to the more specific things mentioned by the minister earlier in the day, I think you will see that in order to understand the kind of programme that will make the Indian people, whether they are status, non-status or whether they are Metis, in order to appreciate their aspirations, their aims and objectives, it is ever so important that you understand the people you are dealing with.

I fail to see just how the minister has come to grips with the kind of people he is dealing with and appreciate fully their sense of values, their way of life, what they hold near and dear. While the minister does, from time to time, travel throughout the province handing out grants, I do not think that he has really taken the time to sit down and talk with these people in a meaningful way to see what they are really about; what they consider to be of the utmost importance to them; what they wish to preserve from a linguistic and a cultural point of view.

I want to demonstrate what I am saying by relating a little story that Mr. Pelletier tells. He says:

Let me tell you a story, a personal experience I recently had which illustrates the two attitudes toward nature. It was summer and I was on top of a mountain in the interior of British Columbia. It was grassland, rolling hills with clumps of poplar and pine as far as the eye could see. I was with a friend of mine; we stood in a little hollow, a sort of pocket of green grass and clover kept that way, perhaps, by an underground spring or even the drainage of land. All around us the hills were brown, the grass burned out and dried by the sun.

We stood there in the hot sun looking all around and my friend said, "Wilfred, try to imagine that we have been appointed by some board, the board in charge of everything, and our job is to improve this place. What improvement would you suggest?"

We stood there and we examined everything with a very critical eye. I thought to myself, "Well, we might take that big cloud over there in the south and move it a little farther to the east." But then I decided against that. Then I thought maybe we could put a few more birds in the sky and I was just going to suggest that when I noticed an old board, a plank, lying at my feet. It had been there for a long time. It was grey and weathered and one end was warped. It had sunk into the ground and the grass had grown up all around it.

But it had been moved, perhaps by a cow who had stepped on it. Anyway it was pushed over at one end and you could see a thin wedge of bare ground where it had been lying for so long. On the other side, it was lying on the grass holding that grass down so it could not grow and I thought, "Ah, this is something we can improve. I can move that board back off the grass which is getting choked out and then the grass can grow again."

So I took hold of one end of that board and lifted it up a little bit to move it over, and under it, right there, under the end of it was a spider and that spider was looking me right in the eye and I was looking back at it. It was stunned; the spider was in shock. Somebody had just lifted the whole damn roof off its world. Then I lifted the board higher and underneath it was a whole insect community;

a thousand ants were scrambling to move their eggs to safety; wood lice were digging to get down into the ground; earthworms coiled themselves up like snakes. The ground under that board was a network of insect paths, and the underside of the board was grooved out too, to form the upper half of tunnels.

Well I set that board back down very gently and I tried to put it exactly where it had been before I lifted it up. I apologized to those insects and thanked them for teaching me a great lesson. You see, the first thing that I realized was that my decision to move that board back to where it belonged was based on good intentions.

Something that the minister often speaks about.

I wanted to help the grass grow. I was making an improvement. Another thing, when my eyes fell on that board I lost sight of the total environment, I made a special case out of that board and my attention was so focussed on only one part of the situation, that bent-over grass, that I had no awareness of all of that whole community underneath. It was invisible to me.

That is what happens to Indian communities over and over again. Whites looked at those communities from the outside, just as I looked at that board, then began to feel sorry for those poor Indians, they wanted to help them. They have really good intentions, but they do not see people, they only see Indians, a special category, different from what human beings are supposed to be.

The organic life in that community, the organization of it, is invisible to them, just as the life under the board was invisible to me. So they tear the roof off that community to satisfy their curiosity to see how it functions, because they assume there is no organization.

I want to suggest to the minister that if he travels throughout this province and this country, and takes the trouble to observe and to listen to our first citizens, there is a terrific lesson to be learned. We take so much pain to watch an Indian who is uprooted from his own reserve or his remote community because it has become less viable, because he is no longer able to make a living based on the resources that once were in such abundance.

He migrates to the fringe of a small community or even a city in a completely alien environment, without friends, and all of a sudden the white man notices certain problems, gives him certain handouts and we wonder why the Indian cannot adjust.

I want to suggest to the minister that before we can institute programmes that are going to in any way, in any appreciable way, assist our first citizens, first of all we have to appreciate just who we are dealing with, what kind of person we are dealing with, what his sense of values are. After we have done that, then we are in a position to decide the kind of assistance we might give to the white problem. .

It is not an Indian problem, the Indians survived here for thousands of years before we ever appeared on the scene. He was getting by, based on the resources. It was a tough life but it was one that they were able to adjust to and I suggest to the minister that that is block one. If you are going to design programmes, you must design them on the basis of the priorities put on them by the people we are dealing with.

I want to suggest to the minister that nothing is going to happen with regard to our first citizens until we accept that they do have their own sense of values, something that is worthwhile preserving and something that is deserving of the respect of everybody in this province and in this country. And in order to do that, in order for the minister's programmes that he was showing around this afternoon to be meaningful, it is going to be done only by consultation with the Indian people, having regard for their sense of values and their sense of direction, preserving the things that they think are important to them.

I want to suggest also to the minister that after the minister has done that—after he has reached the point where he feels that he understands them, understands their aims and their objectives and their aspirations—the only way this province and this government is going to do anything meaningful for the Indian people is by a tripartite arrangement. That is, where we get people from The Department of Indian Affairs—and my friend the member for Dovercourt spoke of the responsibilities of the hon. Robert Stanbury, the Secretary of State, at the federal level—the minister here, along with his interdepartmental committee and the liaison committee between the federal and the provincial authorities responsible for Indian programmes.

When you have some sense of direction having regard for the needs of the Indian people that I spoke of earlier, the only way you are going to get off the ground is by allowing the Indian people to be in on the

ground floor; in on the decision-making process. You are going to make mistakes, but that is all part of the game.

If they have learned to institute programmes that they think are important to them you will lose a few dollars along the way, fine and dandy. I think it is money well spent. But nothing meaningful is going to happen until you have that kind of dialogue having regard—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is straying somewhat now.

Mr. Stokes: I apologize, Mr. Chairman, I was getting a little off the track. But I want to get back to the point I tried to make earlier with regard to citizenship. Does the minister really appreciate the things that Mr. Pelletier mentioned in his book and in his paper? Is there any consultation, any meaningful consultation, with regard to our first citizens at the present time in this tripartite fashion that I mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that everything the hon. member has said—again, too, he has touched on philosophy; he is quite different to some of his colleagues—has brought in emotion. Wilfred Pelletier's story is one of emotion as he was trying to relate to the reality of life, to the feeling of a human being. I may say that in respect to Wilfred Pelletier that, apart from the cranberry bogs and the jogging operations, a very vital part of what we have done in the total community resource programme is to provide funds. I think we granted the Missinaibi Institute, of which Mr. Pelletier is executive director, $40,000 last year and some $32,000 this year. That enables him to converse with you and me and to interpret the Indian way of life to us and I also hope that he will also have some influence on his brothers in this dialogue.

Now I may say to the hon. member that he did say something with which I must agree when he questioned my understanding. I assure the hon. member that I knew right from the very beginning that the first task of anybody responsible in this area, dealing with a particular group of people, must of necessity understand their values, their way of life. Because there is no Solomon that tells any one of us that our way of life is the perfect way. There is no such person. Everybody has his own particular things that he holds dear.

Without wanting to again become involved in a personal way, it is a fact of life that many of the immigrants who came to this country at the turn of the century, some 80 years ago, came over here as illiterate peasants, completely unequipped for society. But they, too, held certain things which were near and dear. They have clung to them and found in this land an opportunity for themselves, but more often, an opportunity for their sons and their daughters and their grandsons and their granddaughters.

To me it has been one of the mysteries of the nation of Canada that we had developed this kind of society quite some time ago—not just last year, but going back for decades. It was a land of opportunity, yet those of us who are our first citizens—and I myself acknowledge that term of primary citizens—were denied or not allowed to be part of this opportunity for one reason or another. That is, the opportunity was not given to them to make a choice whether he would tread a path this way or that way. And if I use the simile of the third element, I could also convert that into the fact of comparing the Indians and Eskimos of Canada as having been the first element, the French and the British as having been the second elementary component, and then all of those who followed and joined are the third. It lends itself to this.

I say to the hon. member that the total concept of citizenship that we strive to give to our Indians is not much different from what we are trying to extend to the refugees who arrive here from Tibet and who have a completely different cultural background, a heritage which I doubt is known to many in Canada.

It is completely different, yet they will find their place, as they have moved into an environment of Lindsay and Peterborough, an environment that 30 years ago was completely heterogeneous; it was a singular type of community. Now we have developed a society in which the Tibetan refeugee will find his place, and is finding his place, as this intergroup relationship takes place. I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member that a primary element in achieving the goals and aspirations of our Indians is the $3 an hour, $4.25 an hour, employment, economics—all of these things are what everybody wants. I have come to this conclusion: A man will go hungry, he will go cold, he will suffer all kinds of things; he will not suffer the indignity of not being treated as a human being. Regrettably, with our relations with the Indians, this is a fact.

It is true that our programme is basically economic development but there is an under-

lying thread as we respond initially to the Indian crafts of Ontario, a very basic thing to enable them to give visible expression to their culture, and we support the union itself as they become articulate and become part and parcel of the intergroup relationship.

In the multicultural aspect, the position of our Indian friends—small in numbers as they may be; 100,000 in total in the Province of Ontario—should be a very bright aspect of our nationhood and of our province. Because I think that in this Province of Ontario that all of our people, and our young people, should be taught to take a particular pride in their own identity, whether it be Italian, French, English, Scottish or Ukrainian.

I think there will come a time when we will all pay special respect to the Indians of Canada—and I do not mention the Eskimos, because they are not part of the Ontario scene—because this special group is something we have that nobody else anywhere around the world has. But until they can walk six feet tall, as most of us try to, I completely agree with my hon. friend that in our concepts of citizenship we have to enable them to take their rightful place without losing one iota of their particular values or their identities. I feel that if my friends on any reserve lose their identity, I will lose a part of my identity, or the identity that I cherish will also be in danger of being chipped away.

Mr. Stokes: Well, I want to follow up one point, and this is where I differ with the minister.

He has likened them to the Tibetan refugees; that is what he did, and that is his biggest hangup. He cannot see the forest for the trees. Here we invaded Indian country—North America, the Dominion of Canada, as it became known, the Province of Ontario—and we took his land for a few beads and a couple of bottles of hooch, a little bit of flour, a little bit of tea. We hived him off away back in the bush some place so that we would not have to look at him and we would not have to concern ourselves with him. The mistakes that we made then have come back to haunt us today. The problem is not going to go away.

The minister mentioned they were a very small group; there are only about 100,000 in the Province of Ontario. Well, they are increasing day by day in numbers. They are not going to go away. They are a very proud people. But the minister stands up and likens them—we are the intruders, not them—to a bunch of Tibetan refugees who have come over here and, if everything goes all right, they will assimilate and in due course take their rightful place in Canadian society.

I do not think the minister really understands what I said at all. We are the intruders, not the Indian people. They had a good life before we appeared on the scene and we owe them something. Look what the government of Alaska has done over the past year or two: set up a fund of $1 billion trying to buy its way back into favour with the first citizens in that area. I do not see anything like that going on here. I do not see any demonstration or manifestation on behalf of this government or the federal government that we really owe our first citizens or their descendants, as we know them today, anything more than the odd handout—you know $15,000 or $20,000 here and there—to try to buy favour with the Indian people.

We owe them this entire country. I do not think that the minister is on the right track when he likens our first citizens to Tibetan refugees. I hope that he really did not mean it in that sense.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is beginning to become unfair. I did not liken the Indians to Tibetan refugees. I pointed out to him—and I cannot see how the NDP fails to grasp this main item of everybody being a human being—that we were talking about cultural values.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister does not think we will grasp that?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member should watch his blood pressure.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I recognize, and I recognized long before—

Mr. Stokes: The minister must have.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —my hon. friend from Thunder Bay, who is the Johnny-come-lately in the field of human relations, that is not my task. But I say that I recognize the special position of the Indian citizen of this province and of this nation more than anybody else.

Mr. MacDonald: Intellectually, perhaps.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And I say this: They created this land and I am delighted that they enabled us and enabled my father to find this land in the condition it was. But I stress again for my hon. friend that it is a matter of cultural values, and I would not want any Indian resident, if he ever became confronted with a Tibetan refugee, that he

would for a moment, as my hon. friend would appear, want to put the Tibetan refugee in some sort of different class.

I have been able to maintain that in Canada there is only one class of citizen—

An hon. member: Who looks after them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and they are all exactly the same.

Mr. Stokes: I suspect our Indian friends would give them a warmer welcome than the minister would.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is this sensitivity to cultural values that is important for everybody who makes up this nation of ours. And remember, it is the members of the NDP who keep referring to the two founding nations, and they are not talking about our Indian citizens when they are talking about them.

Mr. Stokes: The minister should not make a political issue out of the white problem in this country.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My hon. friend and I, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Stokes: We are all equally responsible. The member would have them all living in wigwams, if he had his way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. W. Hodgson: Is the hon. member for Thunder Bay finished?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, and to show the only persons who intruded and who want to make—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Go and watch the hockey game.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —a partisan political issue of this very vital matter to human beings are primarily the NDP.

Mr. Stokes: That is utter nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just to show how far off base the hon. member for Thunder Bay is, he is still thinking in terms—when he mentioned assimilation with regard to the Tibetan refugees. That word no longer appears in my dictionary. Integration—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Horse and buggy.

Mr. L. C. Hendeson (Lambton): The 16th century.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —is the word that this government subscribes to. If the hon. member wants to play partisan politics, I would suggest that before the end of the year, he will have ample opportunity. This is not the place for it.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Stokes: I want to issue a personal invitation to this minister to travel—

Mr. Henderson: The member for Thunder Bay is losing control of himself. He will be sorry tomorrow.

Mr. Stokes: —into Indian communities and reserves in my riding. The statement that he has made in the last five minutes confirms my suspicions that he knows nothing at all about our first citizens.

Mr. Henderson: Does the hon. member remember those telegrams he sent in a couple of years ago?

Mr. W. Hodgson: He will regret it tomorrow.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to issue an invitation to him. In fact, I will even pay for it if he will come—

An hon. member: Do not go too far.

Mr. Stokes: —and visit the communities in my riding and find out the kind of people that he is talking about. If the minister thinks I am being partisan, do not take my word for it, come with me and listen to the Indians who sent me down here to represent them. I issue that challenge and that invitation to the minister right here and now.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Remember those telegrams a couple of years ago?

An hon. member: Who sent the member down?

Mr. MacDonald: They will send him back next time, too.

Mr. Stokes: After we have done that, come back and tell me is he still feels the same way about this issue.

I am not being partisan; the Indians are not being partisan. I suggest that it is the

minister to cover up his inexperience in the field of looking after our first citizens.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You know those three over there, see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt, on citizenship.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, may I ascertain where the language training is situated in this vote?

Mr. Chairman: Language training?

Mr. De Monte: Yes, would it be in citizenship?

Mr. Chairman: Right in this item, item 2.

Mr. De Monte: Then may I ask where the salaries are situated? Are they situated in that first item, $743,000?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member will find the details of each item on page 239.

Mr. De Monte: I have that, but I do not think there is anything in there, Mr. Chairman, as to language training and I would like to ask a few questions.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that is in citizenship, and the salaries include all aspects of the teacher-training programme.

Mr. De Monte: It does include the teaching of English as a second language, does it? In that aspect?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. De Monte: How much was paid to teachers who are teaching English as a second language?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have that, Mr. Chairman, it is a total of $488,000. All of the programmes in the citizenship branch classes.

Mr. De Monte: I think I did not ask that question, Mr. Chairman, I asked how much money was paid to teachers for teaching of English as a second language, and was it paid to teachers and to organizations, or was it paid solely to teachers?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The teaching costs were $35,000 to the teachers, which are included in a host of organizations, I would say some 30-odd that I have listed here.

Mr. De Monte: Those are the organizations set out in the public accounts under miscellaneous—Costi, the Italian Community Educational Centre, International Institute—are those the organizations you are paying this money to?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, they would be. For example, perhaps I could read the list to the hon. member.

Mr. De Monte: I can see the list in the public accounts from last year, but I am wondering, how about the language and citizenship classes and the places that are set out in this book, "Directory 1970-1971, Language and Citizenship Classes." Are these paid for by the department or are these paid for by The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those are paid for by us and we recover, in turn, 50 per cent from the federal government.

Mr. De Monte: I see. In other words, out of the $488,000, $35,000 goes to teachers who teach English as a second language. Is half of that recovered from the federal government, or whatever percentage?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No—only a part of the percentage.

Mr. De Monte: How much is that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Fifty per cent of the teaching costs.

Mr. De Monte: So the cost to the department of teaching English as a second language is $17,500, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would you repeat that figure again, please?

Mr. De Monte: Since the federal government is paying 50 per cent of the cost of teaching English as a second language, then I take it that the cost, instead of being $35,000 is $17,500.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not follow the hon. member's question.

Mr. De Monte: I understand the hon. minister said, Mr. Chairman, that half of the cost is recovered from the federal government. The hon. minister also told me that the cost for paying teachers who are teaching English as a second language is $35,000. I took it from the minister that half of that is paid by the federal government, therefore

the remaining total to this department of the provincial government is $17,500.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I may, for the forthcoming year the amount in salary and wages totals $743,000; $420,000 of that is for teachers' salaries and half of that is recoverable from the federal government.

Mr. De Monte: Yes, but I understand that the hon. minister said—and I am not trying to cross-examine—but I think the hon. minister said of the $488,000 in this sum $35,000 is for teachers who teach English as a second language and the balance is paid to organizations. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The $35,000 is part of the $420,000, that being moneys which are paid to certain groups of people.

Mr. De Monte: And of that amount the federal government pays half? Is that correct? What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has pointed out to the House that $35,000 is paid to teachers who teach English as a second language. It seems to me that taking that away from $488,000 gives a total of $453,000 to administer a department that only—not a department, an office—that pays out in effect, $35,000 in teachers' salaries for teaching English. What would the balance pay for? What would the balance be used for?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The $35,000 is for a very selective group. I was looking at that figure for the month of February, 1971. The $420,000 is what is paid in total for teachers' salaries in all of the programmes that are under the department. That is, the figure of $35,000 was for the month of February, 1971.

Mr. De Monte: I see. In other words, out of this amount, half of it—approximately half —is paid out to teachers of English as a second language. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The $420,000 is for salaries and the total programme will be $488,000, so that you have $69,000 for rentals and teaching aids.

Mr. De Monte: In other words, the whole cost of half the amount set out for salaries and wages is paid to teachers plus equipment to teach English as a second language? I am sorry, I do not get it, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. De Monte: Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. De Monte: And they would be paid out to the organizations I have mentioned here—the International Insitute, and Costi Italian Community. In the 1969-1970 public accounts there are certain sums paid out to the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto and Costi. For what purpose are these grants, transfer payments?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Rentals. Perhaps it would be of interest to the hon. member to have the list for the month of February.

Stephens Community; West End YMCA; Costi; International Institute, evening and day; National Council of Jewish Women; Northeastern YWCA; Gateway Community Church; Thorncliffe Park; Earlscourt United Church; East End; St. James Town; Victoria Village Library; Bloor-Bathurst Project; Workmen's Compensation Board—

Mr. De Monte: What would the Workmen's Compensation Board be?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no charge for rental. We pay teachers $700.

Mr. De Monte: These are all payments for rental?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Rental, plus teaching costs.

Mr. De Monte: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And then there are a host of others.

Mr. De Monte: How about the item under citizenship, the $129,400 for services? What type of services does that cover? I notice it is not set out in the public accounts for 1969-1970.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are purchases of services—the increase of services that we are purchasing, such as reception services, and any help that we acquire from outside agencies and professional services and then supplies and equipment such as the reception kits which we have brought forward during this past couple of weeks. It is the material that is necessary to back up the work of the department, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. De Monte: I did see those reception kits and they are very nice, Mr. Chairman. Are those reception kits going to be in languages other than English for the immigrants who come in?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, there are six other languages. There is English, French, Italian,

German, Greek, Serbo-Croat and Portuguese, and languages which are geared to the flow of immigration at the present time.

Mr. De Monte: One other question: The transfer payments—assistance for voluntary agencies serving newcomers—I noticed from the public accounts that no grants or transfer payments have been made for such organizations as the Portuguese Immigrant Aid Society, the Greek Immigrant Aid Society, the Italian Immigrant Aid Society.

I notice also, Mr. Chairman, in the last couple of years that these societies do a very laudable service to the immigrant service such as advising the immigrants as to where they should go if they had a legal problem, setting them up with legal aid; if they have a welfare problem, to The Department of Social and Family Services.

I noticed that two or three of the societies are in dire need of financial help, and there is no doubt that they do a good service to the immigrants of Toronto. I note in the public accounts that nothing has even been given or, perhaps, in that year, it was not given.

Have any grants ever been given to these societies, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I may, in answering the hon. member's question, this is a very interesting new development that I think the hon. member will be particularly interested in.

The purpose of these grants is to ease the problems of newcomers in Ontario and to assist the interaction and communication amongst all the ethnical-cultural groups in Ontario. And it is divided into two portions—the integration, and intergroup development of about $80,000, and a multiculturalism programme of about $60,000, for a total of $148,100, which is an increase of $133,000 over last year. As a matter of fact the increase is so large it almost can be considered as a new programme.

I might just indicate some of the criteria. The grants are extended where financial need has already been shown and where an appropriate level of financial support is not available from private or community sources. The supporting grants will be given to umbrella-type organizations, and I think it was within that context that we made a grant recently to FACHI, which is the federation, the Italian umbrella group—

Mr. De Monte: Yes I know.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to be used to assist the Italian Immigrant Aid Society which has been doing this work for a considerable period of time.

Mr. De Monte: The only question, I might have—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps I might just give the hon. member a list of last year's grants—the International Institute, two programmes; Travellers Aid International Services of London; the Italian Immigrant Aid Society got $22,500.

Mr. De Monte: It did, Mr. Chairman, $22,500?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, $2,500.

Mr. De Monte: Oh, $2,500.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is for the past year's programmes.

Mr. De Monte: I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Co-ordinating Committee for Citizenship; the National Black Coalition in Toronto got $2,500—and we are dealing with them at this time for this year's grant; the University Settlement, $5,000; the Caribbean Cultural Committee received a grant of $1,000; the Dante Society received a grant of $500.

Mr. De Monte: A nice man.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They had a conference here at the university on language at OISE—language for children. Then we have—

Mr. Lewis: The minister subsidized an OISE programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it took place at OISE. It was held at OISE.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): They just used the OISE Hilton for that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is interesting to note the number of people who are using OISE for these purposes.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, a great many, some of my best friends.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The total grants programme last year was $31,700, but this year there is a considerable increase.

Mr. De Monte: I was hoping that the minister might tell me that he does consider increasing some of these grants to these very laudable organizations like the Portuguese

Immigrant Aid Society and the Italian Immigrant Aid Society which do real service in the community. I notice that the minister is now attempting to give some grants to these people and these organizations. I trust that perhaps he will increase the grants simply because they do a vital work right within the immigrant community that has to be done, and they have been doing, Mr. Chairman, for, I think, the Italian Immigrant Aid since 1952—and, I guess, the Greek Immigrant Aid Society since 1964 or 1965. They do valuable service, services that probably the minister's department would have to do if it did not have these organizations to assist the immigrants. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, I just want to assure the hon. member that that is a new development within the branch. We are getting into partnership with all of these groups, many of which have been in the field on their own, to assist them in the integration of newcomers' programmes as well as what we call, for lack of a more euphemistic term, intergroup relationship.

Mr. Peacock: Would the minister always look for a euphemistic term if another word was not available to him?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are going to come up with a new word because that word does not lend itself to the kind of projection we want to have.

Mr. Peacock: Neither does "intergroup relations."

Mr. Lewis: The minister has a little touch therapy in his department perhaps.

Mr. De Monte: If the minister will look particularly at the Italian immigrant aid and services. It serves a large community in Toronto and is most of the time working very close to the line. I recommend that society to him because it does do good work. Perhaps the minister would consider a grant to them in the very near future.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, on page 2 of the minister's introductory remarks, in connection with vote 1702—the second item, citizenship—he made this statement: "The first phase of the total citizenship programme has been completed." But nothing further was said as to what the first phase comprised; what was comprehended by it, or what was achieved by it. Could I ask the minister that question. What was achieved in the first phase; what was it; how many other phases are there and what is going to be proposed for them other than the increase in the appropriation under the item of some $480,000? Have we had any word from the minister as to what the first phase was and what the later phases are to be?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There has been a reorganization of the department which reflects itself in the estimates as the hon. member will see. This section comes under a total picture of community services programmes, of which we now have the three component parts: Citizenship, community development and Indian community.

Then we have a reorganization of the department, completely restructured in that to the community services division has been added a financial and administrative services division, headed by an executive director. A new research branch has been established to be headed by a director; and a communications branch headed by a director. We now have within the department the framework through which we can develop and expand our total citizenship programme, because without communication, without research, without these component parts, we have not got the vehicle with which to travel.

Mr. Peacock: All right, then. Why are those three items that the minister just enumerated—research, financial and administrative services—I can understand why financial and administrative services are under item 1. But why not research and communications and special services under citizenship then, if this is a total programme as the minister puts it? It says "citizenship," not "community development." It is item 2, so why are we talking about a total citizenship programme, the first phase of which has now been completed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those component parts service the whole of the department and it is necessary to have a viable department that we do have these component parts. I might say no doubt, with respect to the financial administrative services—their work is very important, I guess—it services in an equal way all of the aspects of the department whereas with community service, the research branch and communications branch, perhaps a good deal of their work or an emphasis of their work will be in citizenship. They could be placed in here and be extended into other areas.

Mr. Peacock: All of these items—financial administrative services, research, communications and special services, the office of the

executive director of the community services programme—would be all in support of the citizenship programme? They are all part of the development and completion of the first phase, even though they are just being introduced for the first time in this estimate. The minister is telling us that the first phase now completed is a new item in research; a new item of office of executive director; a greatly expanded item of financial administrative services; and a greatly expanded item of communications and special services. That is the first phase.

All right. What are the intermediate phases? In the ultimate, the minister says that the focus of his ministry has been further broadened to include the needs and aspirations of all groups that make up our multicultural society. There seems to be a confusion of tenses there.

It appears to me that is the final objective of the citizenship programme, and yet the minister says last year the focus of the ministry has been further broadened to include this objective of including the needs and aspirations of all groups that make up our multicultural society.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. member will review much of what I have heretofore said, he will see that the language of the last hour could not have taken place four or five years ago because we did not at that time—our path was quite narrow. Now with the addition of all aspects of the bilingualism developments within the government transferred to the department, comes this emphasis that I have just touched upon to the hon. member for Dovercourt, to include the participation of, co-operation with, all of the groups within the community and expansion of our citizenship branch programme.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister—I am still unclear what he means by the phrase "the needs and aspirations of all groups that make up our multicultural society." We know what the first phase of the citizenship programme is. It would appear that the second sentence of that paragraph describes what has been and continues to be the ultimate objective of the citizenship programme, the fulfilment of the needs and aspirations of all groups that make up our multicultural society. What are the needs? What are the aspirations? Dare I ask the minister to explain?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is part and parcel of the total philosophy that I have been expounding this afternoon—

Mr. Peacock: So it is a fulfilment of your philosophy?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —which is: To enable everyone to fully participate in all aspects. Now, citizenship can be divided or viewed in several ways. It can be viewed from the purely ethnic cultural aspect where the person has his own unique set of values that he is trying to ensure has a place in the sun. Then when you come to community development programmes, you may have a community organization that cuts across all cultural backgrounds and strains as they are participating in a community development programme from the viewpoint of citizenship, viewed from a different angle.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, further on in the next paragraph, on page 2, the minister says:

> The considerably enlarged citizenship branch offering a whole new range of reception and orientation services for newcomers to the province, as well as an intergroup development service for established residents, and the Indian community branch—

And so on, have been encompassed in the new community services division. I understand what reception and orientation services for newcomers are. What is an "intergroup development service for established residents"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The intergroup development programme functions as follows:

To study and conduct research on the ethnic cultural communities that comprise Ontario's peoples in order to provide the branch and government with an in-depth knowledge of their structures, attitudes and needs.

Two, to advise assist and encourage these groups in interacting with each other and with society as a whole.

Three, to advise and assist groups in acquiring the necessary skills to communicate with government and society at large, the needs, aspirations and problems of their particular members.

Four, to increase public awareness as to the multicultural nature of Ontario society and the social, economic and cultural contributions made by all the groups in the development of the Ontario of today.

Five, to devise programmes which will assist in preserving and developing the rich cultural heritages existent in Ontario today.

In carrying out these functions the section's staff works with ethnic cultural communities as advisers, consultants and resource persons —that is one aspect. In addition, grants to agencies and organizations are available to support developmental activities and cultural events.

Perhaps I would assist the hon. member by just touching on some of the activities of last year. The Ontario Folk Arts Council received a grant of $1,500. In May 1970, there was a conference entitled Canada Multicultural Conference held at the university here under the auspices of students from the Dante Society, from the Ukrainian students' club, and it was, I must say, a most interesting conference, participated in by the hon. Mr. Stanbury and the present Provincial Secretary, although he was not Provincial Secretary at the time. There were new Canadians in the schools. The Dance 1971 was a community Folk Art Council project of $1000. The Ruhr Learning Association, who had an intercultural dialogue, a grant of $2,500; and the Toronto Chinese community held a conference and we made a grant of $200.

Mr. Lewis: What is an intercultural dialogue?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Intercultural, that is when you have people—

Mr. Lewis: The minister means that people get together and talk for a while?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: People get around and talk to each other. The hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: It is like the multicultural monologues the minister has with himself.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —for Thunder Bay, if he would be good enough, might explain to his leader what is meant by the expression "an intercultural dialogue."

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, that means if I go to dinner in the basement of the Prosvita Hall in Windsor, I am engaged in an intergroup development service. What was the other expression the minister used?

An hon. member: An intercultural dialogue.

Mr. Peacock: Eh? An intercultural programme?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Astronomical.

Mr. Peacock: The jargon of this minister—

Mr. Lewis: It is not astronomical; it is drowning in jargon.

Mr. Peacock: —the jargon is just beyond my grasp, Mr. Chairman. Is this the same area of activity in which the minister proposes to hold a congress this coming year? Let me get on with the rest of it.

Mr. Lewis: The full throat for that name.

Mr. Peacock: What does the minister refer to it as, a multicultural congress as forecast in the Speech from the Throne. Am I ahead of myself, or ahead of the vote? Does that come under citizenship.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That will be a significant example of intergroup dialogue.

Mr. Lewis: Dialogue. Right. It will be the MCC of our time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And I may say this to the hon. member, he should not be so condescending when he talks about having dinner in the basement of Prosvita Hall. I can assure him that having dinner in the basement of Prosvita Hall is just as significant as any cultural dialogue in the most palatial of dining halls.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: That is a bilateral, gastronomical delight.

Mr. Peacock: I enjoyed my meal there with my hosts in the basement of the Prosvita Hall in Windsor. I did not embellish it by referring to it in the terms of what I think only the Provincial Secretary can manage to do. At this congress which is to be held this year, the object, according to the minister's introductory remarks, is to the end that our people may express their hopes, their views and their aspirations about the type of life they want to see preserved and developed in Ontario.

What will there be about that particular forum that will enable all our people to express their hopes, their views, their aspirations? What format will the congress have? What stimulation or motivation will there be? Who will be invited to it? What will there be about it that will enable all our people, to use the minister's words, to express their hopes, their views, other than through all the other forums available to them? Is this a congress or forum which takes the place, or fills the gap which now exists? Does it take the place of some other institution not doing

the job adequately, or fill the gap which now exists?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, it will provide a public forum in which much of what has been discussed at various times and various places, will find one significant forum. It is intended to bring together as many of the facets of our multicultural society and it is intended to bring together as many of the facets of our multicultural society as possible. And what we hope to do is to involve all of the groups right from the beginning with the planning, the developing of the programme, so that it is not something that the branch of the department is going to prepare and then invite people to as spectators, as it were, or even to participate. We are hopeful of providing a forum which will well up from genuine participation of all the elements of our society, and it will not be restricted to those whom we have referred to as being once the third element. When we talk about a multicultural contrast in this term it includes all aspects all elements, of our society.

Mr. Peacock: What will it do? What will it do in a concrete—as the minister once used the term; I was surprised to hear him use it—what will it do in a concrete way? What is the agenda? He says perhaps he is waiting to hear from the representative groups that will come together. What are they being asked to do by the minister or his department? Who will he invite?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: First of all they will have an opportunity of expressing their ideas and their aspirations in a very forceful way. There will be highlighted an occasion where this will take place—

Mr. Peacock: What will then give force to their expression?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and then what will no doubt emerge out of that congress is that there will be stated by those assembled in some form or other either a summary or resolution, recommendation, so that it will be recorded after they have gone home what their hopes and aspirations are, and no doubt how they should be implemented and what should be brought about—a guide to governments: federal, provincial especially, no doubt municipal, and boards of education as to what should be done.

Mr. Peacock: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious the minister has not the vaguest idea what the objectives of the congress are, any more than he has the vaguest idea what the total objectives of the whole citizenship programme are.

Will the congress talk about the difficulties of new Canadians coming here and finding employment? Will it talk about the difficulties they have in getting referrals to jobs outside their own ethnic community in Canada Manpower Centres? Will it talk about the trend or tendency of officers of Canada Manpower —at least in my own community—to say that if you are of particular origin or from a particular country and you do not know English, there is the occupation, there is the section of industry or the service trade that you go to? Will it talk about the difficulties of children in the downtown schools learning English? Will it talk about the difficulties in finding adequate accommodation? Just what will it talk about besides the hopes, the views, and the aspirations?

Mr. Lewis: Do you ever get embarrassed, Mr. Minister? I mean talking such rubbish endlessly to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, when I talk about hopes and aspirations I never get embarrassed.

Mr. Lewis: I know you do not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not the least bit, and probably the reason why the leader of the NDP will never reach anything is because he has no hopes or aspirations in this regard.

I may say to the hon. member for Windsor West that we do not intend to set out the rigid guidelines for the participants. They will discuss all aspects—and I have no doubt but those aspects which the hon. member has touched upon will be discussed, because they are part and parcel of hopes and aspirations.

Mr. Lewis: What a phrase.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A man wanting to be able to use the talents that he has either been born with or that he has been trained to, is a very integral part of his hopes and aspirations. That he too might have a place to speak his mother tongue is also a part of our hopes and aspirations. But the range of what can be discussed at this conference is without limits. I may say this, that if the hon. member for Windsor West thinks that I do not have a conception of what this congress can be, it is unfortunate that he and I will not be able to debate this in the same position a year from now, because when

I say that this congress will be a focal point, that is exactly what it is intended to do.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I do not dispute that the minister has a concept—chances are it is entirely within his own dream world, his own mind, that particular verbal universe which only the minister occupies.

Mr. Lewis: Right. And comprehends.

Mr. Peacock: When will the congress be held? Can he tell us its duration, its location?

Mr. Lewis: He needs a lot of time for all the hopes and aspirations of his people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would think, Mr. Chairman, it would be held in the early fall in Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe before the next election perhaps? Is that what the minister had in mind? Just on the eve of the election?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, referring to the question of teaching English as a second language, I would like to ask the minister who determines the qualifications of teachers who are engaged in this very important phase of introducing immigrants to their new country? Does his department set the standards? Does his department offer any kind of examination? Are teachers ever dismissed from their job because they are incompetent? Who accepts responsibility for their qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The local school boards. They have the jurisdiction over the hiring of the teachers.

Mr. Bolton: This may be true at such places as Fanshawe, but what about the various other agencies like International House? Are the teachers there also tested by the local school boards? There are 30 different agencies involved in this training, and I have some reason to believe that some people have no more knowledge of how to teach a second language than Adam's off-ox.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Department of Education sets the standard and we run the courses in the summertime and, after having taken those courses, the teachers are certificated to teach English as a second language.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, is it not true that these courses are voluntary and not all teachers have certification?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a voluntary course; they do not have to take the course.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if he is satisfied that this is sufficient, that people are just given an opportunity but are not required to take training or certification in such an important area of citizenship? Is it good enough?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To answer the hon. member, it is the position of the department that these teachers should be certificated—that is, that all of them should pass the test—and we are presently working with The Department of Education in order that this process be recognized and set up and formalized so that we are ensured that every teacher who teaches has passed some standard.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister about a report made, I understand, by R. A. Hellen, social research group of the University of Windsor. It is called, "An Appraisal of the Community Information Centre Study Project."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I may just make a point, that would come under the next item, community development.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2?

Item 3 then; the member for Dovercourt might continue his conversation.

Mr. Stokes: Before you pass item 2, I want to know if, under the community development item, I can get in the dialogue I mentioned earlier between the federal and provincial authorities regarding the white paper. The white paper envisages that the responsibility for Indian people will be vested in provincial agencies, and I want to know whether I bring it up now under citizenship of whether I bring it up under Indian community.

Mr. Chairman: Under item 4, I am informed.

Mr. Stokes: Item 4; thanks.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Item 3 can properly be brought in now, can it, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, item 3.

Mr. De Monte: I was asking the minister about the report of a report, which report is

not yet finished. I would like to ask him first why he needs a report of a report that is not finished yet and how much did that report cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this report relates to the new development which is taking place in our department. Back in April of last year, the government initiated a $50,000 action research project to investigate a possible role for the province in the operation of community information referral centres. Many private agencies and community groups have established such centres to help people find their way through the maze of government services. So, at the local request, we set up 11 demonstration project in different parts of Ontario. These are all experimental; the $50,000 was on an experimental basis. This was an interim evaluation report and we expect to have a final report at the end of a full year. This report cost $1,000. I could have kept it as a departmental report, but because it was part of an on-going youth programme, I thought that the members would be interested in seeing it.

Mr. De Monte: Firstly, may I ask, Mr. Chairman, the department has sponsored a couple of studies. I think one was held in—I cannot think of the place; out in Bowmanville was it? Yes, in the eastern part of Ontario, by the department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have held a series of community awareness conferences.

Mr. De Monte: That is right. Is there any report or final summation of those studies yet and what has been the result of those studies and what did they cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There were six conferences held, Mr. Chairman—Windsor, Thunder Bay, Cornwall, Brockville, Ottawa and Hamilton. There have been reports published and an evaluation of the latest one which was held in Hamilton. We distributed questionnaires—600 questionnaires were distributed to those who were present and we received the replies, the judgments, of the individuals on participation and the value of the conference. Then we follow up these conferences by getting a report of the day's events and then there are results.

For example, the East Windsor citizens' committee emerged about a year following the conference and has served as a stimulus for downtown Windsor. In Ottawa, there are five committees that came out of the conference—housing and tenants; immigrants; welfare and poverty; information; senior citizens. I may say that, as Minister of Social and Family Services, I became very acutely aware of the success of this kind of a conference vis-à-vis an articulation of local problems to the government.

Mr. De Monte: What has been the result of these conferences? Have these community groups actually started operations or was it a report back to the department as to what the views and aspirations are or were? What further action was taken by the department to initiate the recommendations that came out of these so-called seminars?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The programme effectiveness with groups was that a group of citizens—for an evaluation of one of the programmes here is a letter addressed to the previous Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) from Hamilton:

> Just a few words to let you know that I was favourably impressed with the citizens' forum organized by your department. In the first place it seems a very good thing for a democratic system and a little surprising that a government would be so enlightened as to think it is worth doing to spend money on it. Secondly, I was delighted with the citizens' response.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You know that is self-aggrandizing platitude really, and you are a past master.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is not addressed to me. It is addressed to the hon. Robert E. Welch.

Mr. Bullbrook: But you read it, and you authored it to begin with. These are nothing but Tory programmes. You know it. I know it. You involve all the Tories on a local level. Why try to fool us? We know. We might look stupid but we are not. You must understand that.

Mr. Lewis: It is worse than that; it is organized by your department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, let me continue:

> I hope you will make it an annual event. I can see where we could improve on our performance.

Mr. Bullbrook: It must be the president of the local Tory association.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Continuing with the letter:

The politicians were too defensive and not open and friendly enough. There were exceptions, amongst whom I would include you, John Smith and Ian Deans.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Very perceptive soul.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Very perceptive. Partisan politics? No. As the hon. member for Sarnia—

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. member for Wentworth saved your conference. How come you did not take any Liberals?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Yes. This is discrimination of the worst kind.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The last paragraph, to lessen the sensitivity of the hon. member for Sarnia, the last—

Mr. Lewis: Who wrote the letter?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —paragraph reads:

In any case, I was so impressed by the event that I shall write a little piece for publication in Australia where I have never seen anything like it.

Mr. Bullbrook: And who was it written by?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was written by a professor in the department of political science at McMaster University.

An hon. member: What was his name?

Mr. Lewis: Does he have a name?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, he does.

Mr. Gisborn: What is his name?

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister put it on the record?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Tom Truman.

Mr. Gisborn: Who?

Mr. Lewis: Now there is a name to conjure with.

An hon. member: He sounds as if he is out of a children's review.

Mr. Gaunt: He is a close relative of Harry Truman.

Mr. Lewis: This is better than Spring Thaw.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask the hon. minister for a statement as to whether it was viable. I asked him what were the results of these meetings, and what were the recommendations of these meetings. If there is a report of these meetings, will he table them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did give two examples, of an East Windsor citizens' committee emerging and the committees that have been working in the Ottawa area.

Mr. Lewis: They were generated in Ottawa before the minister's conferences. Tell us about Brockville, the opposition would be interested to know.

Mr. De Monte: Are these committees and groups still in existence, and have they carried on recommendations made by these meetings and seminars?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer is yes.

Mr. De Monte: Can the minister then tell me what they are actually doing now?

Mr. Bullbrook: Probably having euchre parties. I think that is normal. They are big on euchre parties over there.

Mr. Chairman: While we are waiting for the answer, you might be interested in knowing the score, 1-0 for Chicago.

Mr. Deans: Dennis Hull scored on a power play.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Earlier I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the conference in Brockville. As a result of the conference, an information centre manned by volunteers was established in the local fire hall. A Zenith telephone number makes the centre available to Brockville and the surrounding district.

Mr. Lewis: It takes a conference to have that—quite an achievement for government. Tell us about the constitution that citizens' committee is trying to draft at this point.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am completely amazed at the—

Mr. Lewis: Well, the conferences are a farce.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —at the inability of the leader of the NDP to grasp the idea of community participation.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I will grasp it before this vote is over let me tell you. We will talk about community development and

this nonsensical masquerade that the minister throws about as community development.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to hear the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: It is absurd. We will be sure to speak on it. There are others ahead of me.

Mr. De Monte: Undoubtedly, the minister has not really answered my question. I think perhaps that he should tell me what these groups are doing. Also, I asked the minister what these conferences cost.

Mr. Deans: Now there is a good question.

Mr. Bullbrook: The one thing he cannot answer is the cost. You notice that—no consideration of the cost.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I touched briefly upon that Ottawa conference and after the conference a one-day session was held called, "Action 70," organized by the welfare recipients and the poverty workshop was held some four weeks after the original conference and was attended by 400 persons. I happen to have been the Minister of Social and Family Services then and I participated at that time together with the hon. John Munro who was there together with the social services administrator of Ottawa. As a matter of fact, it was immediately following that conference that I returned to Toronto and I think it was a month or two months later that the family benefits programme of increases was revised. I would say that a good deal of the credit for the amount of that increase resulted from the very articulate way in which this particular group made their position known.

Mr. Peacock: No. That is an aspersion on the group.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is not.

Mr. Peacock: It is too, Mr. Chairman. Does the minister attribute the increases of May, 1970, to the suggestions of that conference—that less than 10 per cent increase in the income-maintenance programme of his department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Chairman, that group made a very articulate position on an increase. I do not recall that any stipulation was made as to the amount of the increase.

Mr. Peacock: No, but you say that shortly thereafter, upon consideration of the articulate representations of the conference or group, as Minister of Social and Family Services the minister raised the benefits under the general welfare assistance and family benefits programme.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say that they were part of the articulation of the need for an increase at that time.

Mr. Lewis: That is a rather—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say that I give credit to that one-day conference of that group of people who, in a very articulate way, presented the problems.

Mr. Lewis: You are a condescending fellow. You are the most patronizing minister in the cabinet.

Mr. Peacock: Then why did the credit not at least get recognition in an increase in benefits that kept pace with the cost of living since April, 1967?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To continue with my hon. friend, the East Windsor Citizens Committee was funded by the three governments, federal, provincial and municipal, and it has served as a stimulus, in turn, for the creation of a downtown committee and the Windsor West committee.

Mr. De Monte: What is the downtown committee? What is the function of the downtown committee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a citizens' group that would be concerned with all the issues that confront any citizens' group living in a downtown area. This group in particular put an emphasis on a summer course for teachers of immigrant children—a programme all of their own—so that the teachers who teach in the schools would be familiar with all of the cultures of the children of Windsor, which is becoming perhaps the most—

Mr. Peacock: Not the downtown committee.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the most cosmopolitan community in Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Minister, you are completely confused, but I will not bother talking.

Mr. Lewis: They are giving you the wrong sheets.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will pose a question to the hon. member who has just stood up.

Does he agree that the programmes of the conferences have value or not?

Mr. B. Newman: The value is beside the point.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The value is not beside the point. That is exactly the point that the hon. member is questioning.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister has not a clue—and he will not admit that he has not a clue—as to what is going on.

Mr. De Monte: I did not say that. I am merely trying to find out the values that the minister places on these projects.

I still do not know, Mr. Chairman, how much they cost. I know that some groups were formed. I want to know what costs we are willing to put into these things to form some groups that possibly could get their impetus in some other way. I want the minister to answer my question. How much do these meetings cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The cost for Windsor was $3,000. The hon. member from Windsor can judge whether that was a worthwhile contribution.

Thunder Bay—$3,000 from the branch, and $350 from the federal government. Cornwall—$2,000 from the branch. Brockville—$2,000 from the branch. Ottawa—$5,000 from the branch, and $750 from the federal government. Hamilton—$2,600 from the branch and $2,700 from the federal government.

A total of $17,700 from the branch and $3,800 from the federal government for these committees.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the nice comment of Mr. Truman, I have to say that I attended that Horizon '70 conference in Hamilton. Frankly I was not impressed. I do not think there was anything said at that conference by anyone who attended it that had not been said publicly previously by the same individual at least 50 times.

The majority of the people who attended the conference were activists in the community, and they were there to express the views that they had been expressing over and over—views about Ontario Housing and its inadequate policies; views about the health programme and its inadequacies; views about the—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): You mean you think we have something that is adequate?

Mr. Deans: There are not many things, but I will think of something if you will give me time. If you want to read the report of the conference, it was recommendations dealing with the problems of government. This is the purpose of it. The purpose was that people in the community could get together to express their views about some of the problems that they have seen and they did that.

Unfortunately, it did not attract, for the most part, people who just came to watch. The majority of people who attended—and I spoke, I went to I think, four of the workshops during the course of the day, plus the panel discussion that was held. There was nothing that took place there that could not have happened in a constituent office of any member of the Legislature. There was nothing said there that has not been said by any number of individuals on television, on radio and in the newspapers, in the published reports of the experts. In actual fact, all that happened was that for the sum of $7,400 or something in that order, if I recall what you said—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was $5,400.

Mr. Deans: For the sum of $5,400, we provided a forum for people to express yet another opinion. We could have done the same thing by renting a high school auditorium for $50, and inviting the people to come and express their opinion.

That is not taking away from the intent of the programme; I am not taking away from the intent of the programme. I want to talk about what actually happened. There was nothing that came from that that has in any way changed the manner in which people in Ontario Housing are being dealt with in Hamilton. There was nothing came from that conference that in any way changed the plight of the people who do not get adequate coverage through their health programmes.

There was nothing in that whole conference that in any way altered the difficulties faced by the aged in Hamilton, although it was expressed. There was nothing that came from the conference that improved the situation in regard to a relationship with the youth of Hamilton, although that was expressed. The problems there were expressed.

These conferences are not nearly enough to give people the opportunity to stand up and tell you what is wrong, because for the

most part we did not get to the conference the people who suffered the most. All we got were the experts and I can speak to them any time and so can the minister. You can meet with them anywhere, any time and they will tell you the same thing time after time after time.

The $5,400 was not well spent in the city to hold a number of public meetings to deal with specific issues out of which would have flowed recommendations which the government might ot least beforehand have said they would implement. To know what is wrong is one thing. To know what is troubling people is fine, but to have the will to do something about it is an entirely different thing.

Unfortunately, the will is lacking in the government to make the changes that are recommended by the people who were there and this is what worries me. There is no point in spending $17,000 or $20,000 throughout the province in what really becomes an exercise in futility. You have people showing up, in good conscience, prepared to try to make changes, but there is nobody there who can make any changes.

There is nobody there who can make any changes; there is nobody there to listen to their complaints. The whole discussion, the letter that you read, the panel discussion had about what, 10, 12, 15 politicians sitting on a platform—

Mr. Lewis: It is called community development—you dare to call it that?

Mr. Deans: The room was perhaps one-third full. All that was permitted were questions from the various groups asked by the chairman of the group. Each group got a chance to ask perhaps two questions. Any person who came there with the express purpose in mind of standing in his place and asking any particular politician his opinion of what should or what can be done to alleviate any particular problem went away empty-handed. Because he was not given the opportunity to ask those questions.

I think that the people who organized it, and I know some of them, I think that the people who organized it tried to organize it in a way that it would have been useful. The only difficulty is that if you have half-a-dozen or a dozen workshops—I do not recall how many there were, but there were a great number, perhaps 10 workshops—in the workshop there has to be someone who is responsible to government; not someone to tell them how wonderfully well the government operates but someone to listen to the legitimate complaints and to bring them back to Queen's Park. That cannot be done by politicians; it has to be done with an openness that will enable the people who are there to know that the suggestions they put forward will become an integral of government policy, that out of what they are saying will flow changes to the various pieces of legislation that govern them in order that the changes will affect them.

What has happened? The member for Dovercourt asked—and I have looked—what has really happened as a result of any recommendations coming from that conference in Hamilton? What could the minister show us in a tangible form? I am not talking about some tiny things; I am talking in terms of actual citizen participation.

What has taken place? Have there been any meaningful changes to the structure of the Ontario Housing board in order that Ontario Housing recipients can be a part of the decision-making so that they can get their views across? I have not seen them if there have. Has there been any meaningful change to the welfare structure in Hamilton —and this took up a great deal of the time —has there been any meaningful change to the structure of the welfare committees in order that the people who are most affected can take part?

Has there been any meaningful change to the problem of the aged not being able to get subsidized hospitalization as a result of this meeting, because I have not seen any. Has there been any recommendations from The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship to the other departments, to which the recommendations ought to have been made in the first place? Have there been any recommendations from this department to The Department of Trade and Development or to The Department of Health or to The Department of Social and Family Services to try to bring about the changes that the few people who had a chance to speak suggested were necessary?

If those things do not happen, then it is not community development. It is a little game. It is like a stage and the people are the actors. They play the game through and it is directed by the government and paid for by the government and they say their piece. Their piece. Their piece may be meaningful but, unfortunately, the audience is the government and since they direct and

pay and are the audience, then obviously they control the whole thing and nothing happens.

I want to ask if there have been any concrete proposals in written form, sent from The Department of Citizenship as a result of the meeting in Hamilton. To whom did they go? What has been done with them, in order that we can see that community action and participation is a worthwhile endeavour?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I seldom use the expression but most of what the hon. member says is completely nonsense. He has deliberately misconstrued the whole approach. This is not a conference run by the government or by the department. It was a conference run by the local people and perhaps Professor Truman will have to evaluate it. I will read for the hon. member the conference planning committee evaluation.

Mr. Deans: I know it; I have got it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will read it into the record. Mr. Richard G. Lepert, chairman, president of the Ralston Manor Ratepayers Association—and I have before me from the Ralston Manor Ratepayers Association a request for a grant which is under consideration at this very moment for implementation of their programme—Boris S. Chemers, head of social services, Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology; William Freeman, a sociology graduate student; Mrs. Murray Hogarth of the Junior League of Hamilton, Dr. Henry J. Jassick, an assistant professor, political science, McMaster University; Miriam Cramer of the Consumers' Association; James R. McLaughlin, president of the Mohawk Gardens Tenants Association; Befis E. Miles, chairman of research and information of CHOP, Clear Hamilton of Pollution; Jim Hastie, Hamilton and District Labour Council—by golly, if that man can be manipulated, if any of those—

Mr. Deans: I know him well. He is a very close friend.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is why I said to the hon. member that most of what he said was nonsense.

Mr. Deans: We will find out.

Mr. De Monte: Answer the question. Tell us what recommendations were made.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Sichowski, chairman of the Parkview Ratepayers Association—

Mr. Bullbrook: Why does the minister not answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —Alderman James Stow; Alda Gibb, community development consultant; one person, from our department —now there are two—Mrs. Elizabeth Shelowski—she is a consultant; Edgar Eastman, regional liaison officer from the citizenship branch of the department and Mrs. Lynne McLaughlin.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am answering the question. The hon. member likes to hear questions put. He does not like the answers that I give him because they are correct.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is not answering any of them. He knows he is not and I know he is not.

Mr. Deans: Let me be more specific.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let us turn to the evaluation of the participants, not the hon. member, sitting there as a politician on a platform, as he considers himself.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): A super politician.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He made a remark about the value of the workshops. Structural conference! Workshops were the most important part, according to 78 per cent of the replies.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Seventy-eight per cent of nothing is nothing.

Mr. Deans: What page is the minister on?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am on page 57.

Mr. Deans: What does that matter?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is an evaluation of the participants of their view of the programme, the participation—

An hon. member: Do you disagree with that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —of the respondents who helped in planning the conference, fourteen per cent of respondents were interested in organizing another conference; 40 per cent felt actively involved in the sessions; 88 per cent got value from the conference; better awareness between government and citizens, 26 per cent.

An hon. member: That is great stuff. That is beautiful.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —information and education, 15 per cent; communication and exchange of views, 14 per cent participation in community affairs, a chance to meet elected representative, 10 per cent; formation of citizens groups, seven per cent.

Now these are—

Mr. Deans: Let me be specific, because we are obviously talking about—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say this, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I conclude my remarks?

Mr. Deans: We are talking about two different things.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What the hon. member does not seem to understand and they do not seem to grasp is that these are citizens' conferences. What we do is we pick up the tab and we supply whatever consultant supportive services. But from beginning to end—

Mr. Gisborn: What is the objective?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —from beginning to end, it is the local community that plans it, that carries it out. Ask them what their objectives are and they are the ones who will tell you. If the hon. member wants to make that kind of speech the next time there is such a planning conference, he should make that kind of a speech to them and see what happens.

Mr. Gisborn: I know everybody who was on it better than the minister does.

Mr. Deans: All right. Let me then go back to what I said, so that the minister does not misconstrue what was said by me. I said that the people who worked on the conference tried, and they came up with recommendations. I now ask, what recommendations have been channelled through the department to the various other departments involved? Let me be specific.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): And active.

Mr. Deans: Let us begin with the workshop on The Landlord and Tenant Act. They made recommendations.

(1) A standard lease for both private and public use should be drawn up for the Attorney General's office to be passed as law. Has this been passed on to the Attorney General for his action?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just to shorten this question. This report has been sent to every member of the House as well as the hon. member. It was circulated to all departments so that the views expressed there are placed before the relevant departments for their consideration.

Mr. Deans: No! That is not true. If community action is to have any meaning, then the recommendations that flow from the meetings surely must be directed for action to the appropriate ministers by the department in charge, and the minister is in charge. Not for discussion, but for action, if community action has any meaning. Let me read the minister the recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is nonsense. That is utter nonsense.

Mr. Deans: What is the purpose of it then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the government is still running the government. It is not going to accept everything that anybody recommends.

Mr. Deans: What is it? An advertising effort?

An hon. member: That is it exactly.

Mr. Deans: A big PR job? A big con job?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course they are not going to accept everything. That is nonsense.

Mr. Deans: What is it, a con job How many has the minister accepted then? Let us find out how many of these the minister has accepted.

Mr. Bullbrook: Nobody asked the minister to accede to anything. That is not the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not what the minister said.

Mr. Martel: Now the minister is changing it.

Mr. Deans: Which of these recommendations have been accepted by the departments and passed on to enact?

Mr. Bullbrook: They were passed on to begin with.

Mr. Deans: How about the standard lease form?

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the member not pass that on?

Mr. Deans: Or, the bureaus be given powers to subpoena landlords and tenants to appear before them answering charges? Or that each municipality should have a landlord and tenant bureau which is subsidized by the provincial government to 50 per cent or more of its operating expenses? Or that the Attorney General's office should publicize through the media the locations and functions of the bureaus on a monthly basis?

Or the Ontario government should undertake the task of educating the people, both tenant and landlord, as to their rights concerning and explaining the Act? Or how about for the handicapped? Have the handicapped recommendations been passed on? Those on disability retraining schemes who are paid below the minimum wage level should have their wages raised to a minimum level. Has this been acted on?

How about the second one? It is the responsibility of government to ensure that employers assume responsibility for those retrained after disability suffered while in their employ and to give jobs commensurate with their ability. This is particularly applicable under workmen's compensation that was discussed yesterday. Has there been any effort made by your department to get the appropriate department to take action to bring that about?

How about under the welfare recipient recommendations? The entire personnel and administrative structure of the Hamilton social welfare department should be reviewed as to its effectiveness. Have there been meetings to that end? Has this been discussed with the appropriate minister in an effort to have this recommendation that came out of your community brought about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member read that again? Would the member just mind reading that last paragraph for me?

Mr. Deans: It is on page 11.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member do me a favour? Would he read that last statement again?

Mr. Deans: I am reading it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member did not like it, I guess.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read it again.

Mr. Deans: The entire personnel and administrative structure of the Hamilton social welfare department should be reviewed as to its effectiveness. I asked whether the minister has met with the appropriate people to discuss this or to bring it to their attention so that they understand and that this was one of the genuine concerns of the people who attended the conference.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would expect that the local people would have paid attention to it.

Mr. Lewis: The minister might say that it was a hope and an aspiration.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not within the purview of any department here. It is a purely local matter directed to the local agency.

Mr. Deans: Since the recommendations were made and sent to the minister, under whose auspices the conference was held, has the minister seen fit to read the recommendations and to send, by way of mail, those recommendations that are appropriate to the various departments and agencies that are affected, and to ask them whether or not they will comply, since they are obviously the concerns of the people who attended the conference? Have you done this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the report is circulated to all who would be interested in the—

Mr. Lewis: That just sums it up. That about sums up how serious you are.

Mr. Deans: I can then assume that those people who attended in good faith and who put in of their own time, who put forward their own feelings on the matters which concerned them most, these things have really been ignored? The recommendations have not been passed on nor have they been recommended by your department to other departments—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have repeatedly told the hon. member that the recommended reports have been passed on, too.

Mr. Lewis: You have not read it yourself. How do you expect your colleagues to?

Mr. Bullbrook: Let me speak to the point of order. Are you telling the members of this

House, in effect, that as far as your responsibility is concerned in connection with this programme, that as long as you diffuse and disseminate this report to the 117 members of the House your responsibility ends and you have no direct responsibility as the minister to pass on these recommendations to your colleagues in the cabinet? Is that what you are telling us?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member was probably muttering in his beard earlier. I made clear that these are distributed to the 117 members of the Legislature and to any department to which any portion of this has any relevancy for their consideration. We are a communicating department, we are not an implementing department, and the matters are placed before the relevant department and the departments consider them in the light of their own priority.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well then, in connection with the point of order, I take it from the hon. minister's comment that he believes that his responsibility ends in connection with this programme once he disseminates his information to the various departments concerned. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not completely. It does vis-à-vis the department, but if there is any further participation in a dialogue we can still be part of that continuing dialogue, and then we as a branch respond to whatever emerges out of the conference which affects our jurisdiction. Specifically, the Ralston Manor Ratepayers Association were one of the groups that participated in it.

Mr. Deans: Where is that recommendation in here?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no such recommendation. They have—

Mr. Deans: Well then, let us deal with the recommendations that flow from reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They participated and as a result of the conference they have approached the department for assistance from this department within our field of jurisdiction, and that matter is presently under the consideration—

Mr. Peacock: So have others without going to a conference.

Mr. Deans: Let me ask you then, assuming that you have more than a passing interest in the affairs of the community branch, assuming that you do, and assuming that you are genuinely concerned about making sure that these conferences are fruitful and that the matters that are discussed at the conferences and the recommendations that flow from them are indeed at least given consideration, has there been any answer back from any of the departments that you communicated with, in regard to what action they contemplate taking about the matters that were raised and recommended for change?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not disputing the member's point. It may be that because our department would have been involved in the actual conference, part of the action that we, emerging from it, would be able to evaluate would be what the urgency of any particular matter is or the priority is as seen from the local level. And this is something that perhaps we might put more stress on, but I want to give again a concrete example—

Mr. Peacock: So you do make a judgement though? You do make a judgement as to which recommendation should be passed on?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was a conference held in Ottawa, the first one I believe—

Mr. Deans: Would you please talk about the Hamilton one.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The third was in Ottawa. After the conference had been held and the officials of The Department of the Provincial Secretary returned here, I as Minister of Social and Family Services, was the recipient of considerable dialogue which emerged between this particular group which was very articulate at that time, on behalf of those who were receiving social services and social assistance. I went down there.

My presence in Ottawa was really brought about by The Department of the Provincial Secretary bringing to my attention what had happened in Ottawa and in turn, the Ottawa citizens' group responding with letters and telegrams until a date was set, a conference was held. I repeat again that one of the significant factors that emerged out of there was the increase. A second one which still has not been resolved—and a very vital one—was a blueprint for a programme of supplementation for low income earners.

Mr. Deans: Well, I can assume from the minister's answer he did not—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We also gave the Ottawa information group $5,000 to carry out their work at a local level. It is a completely

autonomous organization which is doing a worthwhile job.

Mr. Deans: Let us be specific again. In the book that you publish there are a number of questions asked. Have you answered them? Have you answered the questions to the people who participated?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member be specific?

Mr. Deans: Okay. Questions under handicapped. Why does not Canadian industry employ its share of the handicapped as is done in Britain and Sweden? Are you prepared to write back and answer these people? Why is The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act geared only to those who are physically fit or physically able to produce goods? Has there been an answer sent to the questions?

Under agencies. Is it possible to set up a technique of review whereby academically unqualified people, otherwise suited, can gain entry into services positions normally held by people with certain academic qualifications? In other words, is there going to be a change in the training structures? You know, there is question upon question upon question.

I am not going to pick them all out but all the way through the book there are recommendations and questions. The recommendations have not been acted on. You have not seen fit to send the recommendations to the appropriate departments. The appropriate departments obviously have not seen fit to read the book and thereby find out what was required of them in order to meet the expectations of the people who took part. You have not seen fit to answer the questions that were asked. What is the purpose of the exercise?

Mr. Lewis: You know what happened. The former minister knew what the purpose was and then you inherited the portfolio and look what has happened.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 3 carried?

Mr. Lewis: No, it is not carried.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the minister said that the downtown community citizens organization of Windsor had something to do with language teaching but, as pointed out by several members in the House, it has not. That organization received grants from the department. I do not believe any of its members attended the first community unity conference, as they were styled similar to the one just described by the member for Wentworth, at Horizon '70. They got a grant nonetheless even though they did not participate.

I do not recall if it was a recommendation of that first community unity conference that they got a grant but they did get one. The West Windsor citizens organization has received a grant. The East Windsor community citizens organization has received a grant under community development. At Horizon '70, at Kingston or Brockville, Hamilton or Ottawa, I assume that tenant organizations were represented, like DCCO in Windsor or WWCO in Windsor.

I ask the minister if he has received requests from any of these to finance the attendance of delegates to the forthcoming national conference on tenants' housing problems to be held in Ottawa. Grants from the community development programme have in the past financed delegates' expenses to the meetings of the steering committee for this conference in Toronto, in Thunder Bay and perhaps some other locations and conferences. I understand the federal government has put its share of the money into the financing of this conference regarding the aspect of community development, the role that tenants—particularly tenants in public housing projects—can play in the development of resources such as recreation, information and referral, better relationships with public housing landlords such as DCCO has done in Windsor through its action centre. Has the minister received such a request? Is it part of item 3 that moneys required for the financing of delegates to the conferences, such as the one coming up in the near future on tenant problems, will be paid?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I had answered in the House the other day that the grant request for the national conference of public housing tenants was not approved because our grants are comparatively small and are intended to support newly emerging local and neighbourhood groups on an individual basis and they are intended for the activities of the citizens of Ontario within the province.

It was the conference planning committee that approached us and not individual groups, and since the conference was national in nature, we came to the conclusion that it was clear that this group would not qualify for a grant as we had considered them.

With respect to tenants' groups, we have had a number of contacts and I think these

will indicate that we consider them on merit and potential for development and whether or not they satisfy our criteria. For example, the Ontario Housing Tenants' Association received a grant of $500. The Metro Tenants' Association received a grant of $150. Glengarry Court, a public housing project in Windsor—perhaps the hon. member is familiar with it—received a grant. Bloomfield Development, a public housing project in Windsor received a grant.

Mr. Lewis: How big were those grants?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have the figures—oh, it is $3,000. And the West Windsor one got either $1,000 or $1,500.

Mr. Peacock: No. Bloomfield and West Windsor are the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. One of them received $2,000 and the Downtown got $3,000.

Mr. Peacock: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I complete? Just let me complete. The Ontario Federation of Citizens' Association, which has participation from Ontario Housing people, received a grant and other support. The Ontario Tenants' Association, which held its annual meeting in Hamilton in June, 1970, got a grant of $500. The Metro Tenants' Association received a grant of $150 for a public meeting at St. Lawrence Town Hall on The Landlord and Tenant Act. I think this amply illustrates our emerging involvement and interest in tenants' groups.

Mr. Peacock: If it was possible last year to grant $500 to the Ontario Housing Tenants' Association and $150 to the Metro Tenants' Association, why is it not possible this year to grant money sufficient, if need be, on the basis of an individual delegate or an individual project or a community organization, to make sure that delegates of each of those community organizations get to this forthcoming conference on tenant problems and tenant affairs?

I note that the minister, in reading off some of the figures, referred to the grants and the organizations receiving the grants by the name of the public housing project—for instance, Glengarry Court and Bloomfield, both in the city of Windsor—when the organization receiving the grants do not style themselves by the name of the project as Windsor Housing uses it or as OHC uses it. Both regard themselves as community organizations, not exclusively public housing tenant associations. The Glengarry group of tenants is part of the Downtown Community Citizens' Organization. The Bloomfield tenants are part of the West Windsor Community Organization. They are not exclusively public housing tenant organizations. As such they would probably not qualify.

The minister might find some way, as perhaps the Minister of Trade and Development has found, to exclude them from participation in this programme and from assistance from his department. They have involved people other than public housing tenants in their programmes, particularly in their programmes of recreation and in their action centre work through programmes of information and referral.

They are not exclusively tenant-oriented organizations. But since such a large proportion of the membership tends to be drawn from the public housing projects, given the fact that large numbers of people are brought together in a densiy that no other residential neighbourhood in the community enjoys—or suffers under, it is perhaps more appropriate to say—it is natural for them to wish to attend a conference such as the one coming up in Ottawa.

I ask the minister how he distinguishes between the right or eligibility of the organizations to apply and receive grants this year as against their right and eligibility to apply and receive grants last year, particularly when the emerging programme that he talked about is just now coming to fruition at the national and provincial level. It is just at this point that these organizations are aware of the others' existence, that they can get together to discuss their common problems and find out by talking together, to follow up the minister's analogy about all of these other congresses and committees on Horizon '70 and the Community Unity Conference and so on.

If he wants to follow through on the same logic that he used in financing and establishing those conferences under community development, then surely he can find, out of the $120,000 he has listed here for transfer payments for community projects, the few hundred dollars, perhaps thousand dollars, to finance all of the delegates from all of the projects and all of the community organizations that are entitled to be in attendance at the forthcoming housing conference.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be understood that our programme is a community development programme, and

the very word should give an indication of the yardstick of the community. In the community interests there may be an emphasis on those concerns of tenants, or the tenants may be only a portion of the total community development, and I think that is the situation in Windsor. Our grants were to the mother organizations, the West Windsor and Downtown community groups. But a very important part of their work related to those two housing projects, and the two housing projects were beneficiaries of our grants to the mother project.

With respect to the national conference, there is nothing that is impossible. There is nothing that forbids me from giving a grant. It is just that we still have a limited number of dollars, and I am very sure the number of dollars we have will not meet the needs from the local level during the coming year, and that is where our emphasis is—to provide SEED money at the local level to help the groups get started in the community. We do not envisage the terms of our reference as meaning involvement on the national scale, and perhaps it would assist the hon. member if I might just read the process for these particular grants.

A grant request is submitted to the minister of the branch once one of our consultants meets with the group and gets the background information, the history, objectives, membership structure. He prepares a group and makes recommendations based on his assessment of the group and its relationship to our criteria. He also indicates other potential assistance we can be to the group.

Then it goes through the machine of the department and ultimately to the minister. And generally the criteria are these:

> The aims of the neighbourhood or community group are to increase participation of citizens in the affairs of the community or to improve communications with other bodies both public or private; absence of political party affiliation or single-issue orientation; membership is representative of all segments of the community. Grant is required to assist in the initial establishment of the group.

And I see here that we have the word "initial" underlined.

> It is a developmental grant and the grant is required for a specific project by the group. No financial support is available from other sources, public or private, and that the grant will be in this instance non-recurring.

I think that gives an outline of the kind of role we are playing vis-à-vis the communities.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with those criteria because I followed one of the Windsor groups I just mentioned through the process of application for such an initial grant, and I say to the minister that the particular group with which I was in touch with The Department of Provincial Secretary about exemplified the kind of community development that can be carried on even though to some observers it might have been something of a surprise to find it succeeds so well because its membership was so largely based on tenants of the Ontario Housing Corporation.

When the Bloomfield unit was opened in January, 1967, I received a large number of complaints by letter and telephone about the large numbers of public housing tenants moving into that community. There were all kinds of objections. The garbage cans were going to be dumped, emptied and smashed. The aerials were going to be broken off. Car windows were going to be broken. Bicycles were going to be stolen. There was going to be noise, foul language and all kinds of other aggravations and irritations.

Property values were going to drop, and well they might have, Mr. Chairman, because of the overcrowding and high density of the particular project, the lack of any kind of amenities around it; absolutely none. It was sandwiched between a major traffic route and a railway track with no open space whatsoever, one unit looking into the other. It was only through the initiative of the people in that particular project themselves, making contact with families in the private accommodation of the neighbourhood around them that they succeeded in cooling off an awful lot of that aggravation and tension, and they did so successfully.

They did it long before this minister or his predecessor came by with the $3,000 to assist them and that saw them through 1970. Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust that in regard to that specific organization it is not the end of The Department of the Provincial Secretary's assistance to the WWCO because it still has within its sights the achievement of another objective which will be of service to the entire community. Perhaps it would be appropriate to discuss that at a later time.

I want to ask the minister—I think time permits this—of the $120,000 of transfer payments for community projects that we voted,

how many of these dollars are now committed and how much remains to be committed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will have to get the hon. member that figure. I have not got any particular sheet in front of me because the current year has just begun from April 1.

Mr. Peacock: How does the minister know he cannot afford to finance the delegates—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Because I know from long experience that when you have X number of dollars you had better not spend them in the first two months as you have 10 other months and this programme is the kind of programme which snowballs. As people become more and more aware of the programme, then the demands get greater.

I would ask the hon. member this. Did I get the impression from the hon. member that the Windsor groups could get along without our financial assistance?

Mr. Peacock: I made no such suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is the inference I started to get from the—

Mr. Lewis: No. He just put your contribution in perspective.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be interesting to see where the groups themselves place our position. Very often the position of the department is that it is the department, having once decided to give the SEED money, which gives the strength to the organizations. I do have the individual sheets for this here. The Don Vale committee for a community centre has been approved. The Moss Park apartments community association, approved. The Scarlett Wood tenants' association, approved. There is a workshop on leadership training for citizenship leaders in Windsor receiving a grant of $120. I am beginning to think the hon. member should be the most knowledgeable person on these community—

Mr. Peacock: What does that total?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is a total of a little over $5,000 committed.

Mr. Peacock: That is, $5,000 committed out of $120,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on item 3? Are there any further discussions?

There will be further discussion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report concurred in.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, we will continue with the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary. I would hope that we might find an opportunity to deal with those items under present order paper No. 3 before the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of a question, will that be before the estimates? Are we going to do bills first?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think we might attempt the committee work first, but I would hope that it would not make too much difference if we get at it somewhere in the course of Thursday's proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, continued 1755

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 1783

No. 43



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1971

The House met 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we are to have as visitors, in the east gallery, students from Centennial Secondary School in Windsor; and in both galleries from Parkside High School in Dundas and Woodlands Centennial School in Dunbarton.

Later this afternoon we will have students from Queen Mary Senior Public School in St. Catharines, from St. Richard's Separate School in Scarborough; and from Dorset Park Public School in Scarborough, who are hosting students from Pembroke Senior Elementary School in Pembroke. This evening students from Blitheswood Public School in Leamington will be with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I informed the House that the government was undertaking a thorough review of the matter of government activity in the Niagara Escarpment area.

This arose, of course from questions and allegations which have been made in the past few days. I have asked for and received a considerable amount of information bearing on this matter; and I am sure hon. members will recognize that the scope of the area involved, the number of properties affected and the complexity of the transactions are very great indeed. In fact, one thing that has impressed me most to date has been the magnitude of the government's efforts in terms of preserving the escarpment for public use.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of detailed information that I have requested and which has been brought forward to date is so great that it may be another day or so before it can all be brought together and adequately assessed in the manner in which the government and I can deal with its report to the House and determine what further action, if any, would be justified.

I will say to you, sir, and to the hon. members, that I am treating this whole question as one of highest priority and anticipate making a definitive statement to the House within the next few days.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have replies to several questions raised on April 30 following my statement announcing the rent supplement programme. With your permission, sir, I will give them because there are five or six of them.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAMME

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) asked at that time:

> I wonder if he could explain why it is necessary to involve the municipalities directly on a cost-sharing basis when the responsibility for finding the accommodation and the decision on who gets them will essentially be a provincial decision?

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to involve the municipalities because this is an agreement that has been reached by the three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal.

The hon. member also asked:

> What information has gone out to the municipalities already which would enable the city of Kitchener to be prepared to take part in this programme at this stage?

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that during discussions between OHC officials and Kitchener officials on the public housing programme in general, the municipality expressed an interest in rent supplement. This is why Kitchener, like Metropolitan Toronto, was prepared to enter the programme as soon as the subsidy arrangements I announced on April 30 were finalized.

OHC officials have explained or are in the process of explaining, details of the programme to the municipalities and local housing authorities involved.

At that time the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) asked how this programme differs from the earlier rent supplement programme.

In 1970 OHC received approval only in principle from the federal government for the rent supplement programme. Under this programme we conducted a pilot project in Metropolitan Toronto to test techniques and market with advertisements for units. November 30, 1970, and March 4, 1971, were the dates.

What I was announcing on April 30 as a result of that test was specific approval of 1,100 units under the same programme in 20 separate municipalities.

The hon. member for Windsor West also wanted to know how many units, in fact, have been leased.

As I mentioned on April 30, more than 400 units were offered in Metropolitan Toronto in the two calls of the pilot project. I am informed that about 300 of these units appear to be suitable and agreements for them are being drawn up.

A small number have already moved in. Most are scheduled for June 1 and July 1 as people need to give notice to move while some other units are still under construction.

STUDENT HOUSING

Mr. Speaker, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) asked a question of the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) which was referred to me for reply. He asked why students in married quarters, living in housing built by the Student Housing Corporation on the campus at the University of Western Ontario can get rebates from the municipality, while those living in married quarters on campus at the University of Waterloo cannot.

The city bills the University of Waterloo, Mr. Speaker, for services provided with respect to the married student housing on campus. This payment is considered to be a payment in lieu of taxes.

When the University of Waterloo applied to the city for the municipal tax rebate, the city referred the matter to the Ontario Municipal Board.

On March 31, 1971, the Ontario Municipal Board ruled that because the university made a payment in lieu of taxes the municipal tax rebate would not apply.

The University of Waterloo is meeting with the city in the near future, at which time this matter will be pursued further.

In the case of the University of Western Ontario, the University pays full municipal taxes on the assessed value of the married student apartments, thus a municipal tax rebate is applicable and is passed on to the student tenants.

INCOME REQUIRED OF CONDOMINIUM PURCHASERS

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) asked some questions concerning income required of condominium purchasers and I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has asked this question three or four times of my predecessor and obviously the question never should have been put on the order paper, particularly in view of the amount of detail involved; and following the practice which I started the other day on these lengthy answers, Mr. Speaker, I will take the liberty of tabling the answers to these questions so the honourable member can read it.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I mentioned last Tuesday that I would inform the members of the assembly about a new programme for providing grants to conservation authorities for the construction of dams. The hon. members know the federal government last year withdrew from the joint federal-provincial flood control programme which had provided 75 per cent grants towards major flood control structures.

Under our new policy, the conservation authority will be responsible for the acquisition of the necessary land and this expenditure will be eligible for a 50 per cent grant from the province. The first $30,000 of the cost of the dam will be shared equally by the conservation authority and the government. When the contract amount is $30,000 or less, the authority will award the contract in a normal way and the work will be eligible for a 50 per cent grant. When the contract amount exceeds $30,000, my department will receive from the conservation authority $15,000 towards the cost of the works and the department will pay 100 per cent of the balance.

The department will normally be responsible for receiving tenders, awarding the contract, supervising the construction and turning the finished work over to the conservation authority. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, that small conservation authorities with a low tax

base, will be able to proceed with substantial dam projects when they are of high provincial priority.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT PURCHASE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question that has been made available to him with regard to the land acquisition procedures in the Niagara Escarpment, can he inform the House precisely what he is looking for? Is he looking for a justification of the ministerial position or is he looking for indications that an impartial investigation would be necessary?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am looking for the facts.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, would it not be proper to assume that all of the material presented to the Premier would be factual and that he must surely be looking for some policy conclusions as to whether it would be in the public interest that further investigation of this matter should come about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think I made it very clear in my statement that I am assessing this and will be making a definitive statement as to what may or may not happen as a result of that assessment.

SPADINA EXPRESSWAY DECISION

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Can we expect a statement on the government decision on the Spadina Expressway tomorrow? Last week, you said your statement would be made this week.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that we might have a statement on it by the end of this week. It is doubtful if there will be a statement tomorrow morning.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There has been a lot of voluminous and complex material to sort through, I would think; many submissions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is that, too. As a matter of fact, the member is quite right.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I understand the Premier is going to make a compromise. He is just going to use the southbound lanes!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the northbound lane I am interested in.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier will have to go over that one for another week or two, as well.

Mr. Lewis: With this government, that is possible.

PRIORITIES FOR POSTPONED RESOURCES PROJECTS

Mr. Nixon: I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Further to the statement by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the system for grants payable that the minister has announced will depend upon provincial approval, but it must be assumed that many of the works that have been postponed for many months, in fact years, would have provincial approval already. Can the minister explain how the dam structures, if I may use that word as an adjective, will be—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not parliamentary.

Mr. Nixon: —placed in a provincial priority referred to in the last paragraph of his statement?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, most of these projects, as the hon. member implied, depend on or require provincial approval—

Mr. Nixon: Most of them have provincial approval.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, but if the member is talking about existing projects that have approval, certainly those projects would be high on our priority list. There are one or two authorities—the hon. member knows of one, of course, the Grand—which have—

Mr. Nixon: And the minister knows of another.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —yes—which have a number of projects which are all considered of high priority by that authority, but it is going to take time. It is going to have to be done over a period of years but we feel with this new formula they will be able to advance the completion dates and there will be lower costs, really, against the member municipalities.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary, would the minister not agree that while the formula appears to be an excellent one we might be

heading for increased and extended delays as the minister's advisers go over the voluminous compendium of additional factual material that will be necessary in order to establish these priorities?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. The projects that have been approved, will go ahead. Actually they will go ahead on a priority basis but they will go ahead. We have indicated, for example to the Grand authority and they have agreed to this, certain projects that we feel should be undertaken right away. Land acquisition is going on now for those particular projects. I would think that with negotiations between the authority and my department on those projects that are approved, there should not be any disagreement really.

ALLEGATIONS OF CHARGES FOLLOWING KINGSTON RIOTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Is he aware of allegations that have been made that prisoners presently held in Millhaven as a result of the Kingston riots have been threatened with charges being laid because of their activities in the riots? If he is aware of these allegations, is he going to take any steps to see if this is stopped as an unusual means of extracting information from those who had been participants in the riot?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I am aware of the allegations solely because they have appeared in a Toronto newspaper. I cannot help but express my concern that these allegations are made first of all through the media rather than through a responsible minister in this Legislature. Number two, immediately upon reading these allegations, I have immediately attempted to track them down. To no avail, I may say. However, in gathering evidence of crimes as, I am sure, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, a caution has to be given to persons who are under investigation, a normal caution respecting what people may say which may be used against them. When you deal with people who are serving penitentiary sentences you are obviously dealing with people who know the score as far as that caution and that warning is concerned.

As far as I have been able to determine, this is the only manner in which certain persons in the penitentiary are now aware that there may be possible charges pending against them. As far as I am concerned, and I have as I say, made an attempt to find out the truth of the matter, the guards have not been utilizing any threats. The Crown attorney's office has not been using any threats. The Kingston police department, under which the investigation is taking place, has not used any threats. So I can only assume that the only way that people are concerned are aware that they may be charges against them is that they are being cautioned during the course of the investigation.

APPOINTMENTS TO BAR

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Attorney General. Does he normally consult the local bar association before making appointments to the provincial bench?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is right!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The practice of the Attorneys General, I am informed, has been to consult everybody they can possibly consult in these matters. I think there have been three appointments that I have recommended to the executive council since I have been here, one in northern Ontario and two in Toronto. On the two in Toronto I did not consult the local bar group because there is more than one local bar group in Metropolitan Toronto. In respect of the appointment in Timmins, I believe there were representations made to us from the local bar group there; I would certainly have to check that.

Mr. Stokes: And the local member.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And the local member, you are perfectly right. I might as well make that clear too, that certainly I consider—

Mr. Nixon: Whatever his partisan politics.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I consider political experience—

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister discuss it with the member for Cochrane South?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In the recommendations that I make to the executive council I consider political experience to be a very major factor in a comprehensive all-round experience that people on the bench should have. Not necessarily political experience as far as this party or any particular party is

concerned, but I think it is a very good idea to have people on the bench who have had some form or other of political knowledge and political experience in this province.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the minister not think that there should be a clearly understood procedure of consultation, particularly with the professional organization, the local bar association, that should be undertaken as a matter of course as it now is in federal appointments of this type?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It is not necessary.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I would not agree to that. Is my hon. friend saying that in federal appointments to the bench there is a recognized procedure? I have not been able to determine what that is up until now.

Mr. Lewis: Ask him about the fellow from Brantford.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Certainly the Attorney General of this province is not consulted about any federal appointment to the bench in this province—believe it or not.

Mr. Nixon: Local bar associations are consulted.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Cochrane South a supplementary?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Then he has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: In making the appointment of the new judge in Timmins, is the minister not repudiating the policy previously announced by the Premier in not appointing a bilingual judge for that area, since there are so many French-speaking people to be served by that particular court?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, not necessarily. If there was going to be any worth in that submission in a French-speaking area, everybody connected with the administration of justice in the area would have to be bilingual. Unfortunately—and it is a personal view when I say "unfortunately"—unfortunately this is simply not possible in some of the predominantly French-speaking areas of the province, due to the lack of personnel who may be available. Therefore, if there is going to be translation service provided anyway, which there is in a predominantly French-speaking part of the province, I frankly see no need at all that the judge should be bilingual.

Mr. Ferrier: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Attorney General aware of the recommendations made by a Toronto judge, who was serving in the area in the absence of the judge who was sick, to the effect that the translation services were deplorable and that the civil rights of certain French-speaking people were not being guaranteed by the present translation services? I believe the judge made representation to this minister's predecessor on that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I am not aware of that. If my friend would shoot the date and details over to me, I would be glad to take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has a supplementary?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General could tell us what his difficulty was in locating a representative lawyers' group in Toronto, when there are such groups as the County of York Law Association, or even the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada, or those members who come from Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I just said that in the Metro Toronto area there are a number of bar groups and lawyers' groups and advocates' societies and what not. In all cases, as my friend is aware these recommendations go to the judicial council for approval or objection, as the case may be, by that judicial council. For the benefit of my friend, the judicial council is made up of such political figures as the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, the chief judge of the county court, the treasurer of the Law Society. These appointments are cleared with that judicial council before the recommendation goes from me to the executive council of this province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney General elucidate why he would have found it difficult or impossible to speak specifically to the County of York Law Association about the two recent Toronto appointments, not necessarily to accept their veto but just to get an opinion from them?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I did not say it was impossible, I said I did not.

Mr. Singer: Why did the Attorney General not?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I did not because I did not think it was necessary in that case.

Mr. Nixon: It was not a representative group?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Yes Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain his comment in today's Toronto Telegram—I guess his alleged comment in today's Toronto Telegram—that Judge Harold Gauthier's appointment in Timmins came about because the minister knew Mr. Gauthier's brother who lives in Elliot Lake? Is that the normal channel of judicial appointments?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No; I am glad the member asked that question. When Mr. Matte was interviewing me yesterday about Mr. Gauthier's appointment—and Mr. Matte obviously had formulated the general tenor of the article that he was going to write respecting the need for Conservative Party affiliation in these things—he indicated to me, or asked me about Mr. Gauthier, and I said I really was not aware whether Mr. Gauthier had had previous political affiliations or not, and that I knew Mr. Gauthier's brother—

Mr. Stokes: Why did he not ask Wilf?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I well knew Mr. Gauthier's brother in Elliot Lake, who by no means could be termed a party hack, and perhaps some of this had rubbed off on his brother, Mr. Gauthier in Timmins. I now find that Judge Harold Gauthier of Timmins, as he now is, did have a very well-known political affiliation in the Timmins area but this was not known to me at the time.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, having then appointed Judge Gauthier, the second unilingual English appointment, as I understand it, made by this government in an area with a 40 per cent French-speaking population—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will place his question.

Mr. Lewis: How does the Attorney General reconcile that with the Premier's statement on bilingualism on May 3 last, when he said:

> In the field of judicial services, in considering a more extensive use of French in Ontario's judicial services, we must bear in mind that relatively few members of the judiciary and bar are bilingual. This is an important limitation on the steps the government can take. But we intend to introduce certain measures—

Does the Attorney General not think he might better have lived up to the spirit of the Premier's announcement by finding a bilingual judge? Was there no such judge available in Northern Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My point—and I guess I did not make it well enough because the hon. member has failed to grasp it—is that in these areas simply by putting bilingual judges on the bench; number one, is discrimination in reverse really, in respect of these appointments—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —Number two will —I am sorry, am I interrupting the member.

Mr. Lewis: Was the Premier discriminating?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor and will carry on, please. If other members wish to ask questions, they will in due course.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Come on. Wipe the sneer off and stand up and say it. Do not sit there. Stand up!

Mr. Lewis: I will wait. Why does the minister not take his shoe off and pound the desk?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only socialists and other Marxists do that.

Mr. Lewis: Go ahead!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member is comparing, is he?

Mr. Lewis: Just go ahead.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Second, the appointment of a bilingual judge in the total administration of justice, especially in the administration of that court, would not in my mind guarantee any rights, or guarantee any better knowledge as far as the individual who has to come before that judge is concerned, even if the parties before the courts were bilingual in themselves. It has got to go a lot deeper than that.

Mr. Lewis: I will leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition completed his questions? Has the member for Scarborough West any questions? It is his turn.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT REPORT

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Would the Premier now table the unexpurgated version of the Gertler report on which was eventually based the glossy document which has been the subject of much discussion in the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this moment to table that report.

NIAGARA FRUIT BELT REPORT

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the Premier, having read the Niagara fruit belt report which emanated from the Gertler report, now table that document in the House as being germane to the discussion of the Niagara Escarpment and peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this moment to table that report either.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier how it is possible to conduct enlightened public discussion without the government willing to reveal all the basic documents? Why is he sitting on these basic documents?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course I am not sitting on any basic documents. There are documents that are confidential to the government and I said in my statement earlier this afternoon that I am personally assessing the situation as it relates to the Niagara Escarpment area, and I shall be making a more definitive statement very shortly.

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the minister the answers to the questions I asked him on Tuesday about the subdivision application approvals coming before his department and his department's staff?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): I informed the hon. member at that time, Mr. Speaker, that I would take them under notice.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, how long does the Minister of Lands and Forests think it will take him to acquire information which should be at his fingertips? Does he know when he will give an answer to the questions?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will give an answer, Mr. Speaker, in the fullness of time.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of another question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Were the facts and figures as detailed by The Department of Public Works yesterday, which appeared in the various papers today, based on his press release about escarpment land? Did all of those facts and figures fall within the priority Gertler acquisition areas?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that in view of the Prime Minister's statement today, all these questions should await further announcements.

Mr. Singer: Everybody is dumb from here on in; which is not much of a change from last week.

Mr. Lewis: Reverting to form; only the Premier can answer.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker? Why is Ontario one of only two provinces which has yet applied for none of the $17 million available to it from the federal government for the creation of jobs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I believe the government has applied. Part of this relates to the applications by the individual municipalities which were late in arriving due to reasons that I stated in this House regarding the chronological order of the determination of the policy by the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: How is it that another eight provinces have made full application and Quebec has received over $20 million already? Does the government of Ontario intend to take advantage of that money or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot account for the total that Quebec receives or the procedures they used. In Ontario we

insisted that consideration be given to the interest rate and to the length of time for the loan. We will, of course, be recovering somewhere between $16 and $17 million through the loan programme.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is the member saying that every other one has applied for the loan?

Mr. Lewis: Eight of the 10 have now applied, and some have received their funds. Unemployment rises in Ontario, and nothing happens.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West is on his feet to ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Unemployment has nothing to do with the rate of application.

ASSISTANCE TO HOUSING CONFERENCE DELEGATES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: At this, the eleventh hour prior to the opening, not of Ontario Place, but of the national housing conference, will the minister's department consider assisting, by way of finance, delegates to that conference on low-rental housing, which is national in nature?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the practice of our department to do this. Any grants of that nature would come from The Department of the Provincial Secretary and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) has already replied to that question during the course of his estimates.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary; why is it that only in the Province of Ontario, and for this government, that finding money to assist delegates from low-rental housing communities to attend such a conference is denied? What is it about this government that denies such applicants support?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I already replied to that. It is a matter for the Provincial Secretary's department.

Mr. Lewis: And he too has refused.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then the member must ask the Provincial Secretary why! Obviously this is a policy of the government.

Mr. Lewis: It is a policy of discrimination, that is what it is.

Mr. J. Renwick: In reverse!

JAMES BAY POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Lewis: In reverse!

Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Has the Premier been involved in discussions about the environmental effect of the major James Bay power development undertaken by the Province of Quebec? Have we in any way been consulted in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not been personally consulted with respect to the James Bay development of Quebec Hydro, I believe it is. I have discussed a number of things with the Premier of Quebec and I anticipate that we will be discussing this within the next three or four weeks, perhaps even in Victoria if we have an opportunity.

Mr. Nixon: All right. A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Premier could add to his statement whether or not there has been consultation on the disposition of the power when it has been developed? In fact, have there been any discussions as to the sale of the extra power from Quebec to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment as to whether there have been any informal discussions between Hydro Quebec or Ontario Hydro. I have had no discussions.

Mr. Lewis: One final question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry. No, it is not.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary? The member for Scarborough West has the floor. I thought there was a supplementary.

AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS

Mr. Lewis: Can the Premier indicate to the Legislature a date by which the answer to the question of extension of aid to separate Catholic schools will be given to this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South has a question?

POSSIBILITY OF QUEBEC COUNTY SECEDING TO ONTARIO

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Has the Prime Minister or any official of the government of Ontario had any overtures or contacts from anyone at the local or county government level in the county of Pontiac, Quebec, with regard to the possibilities of that county seceding from the Province of Quebec and joining the great Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for all officials of the government. I can only say that I have had no respresentations made to me nor has it been a source of any discussion between myself and the Premier of Quebec. With great respect, I regard it as something of an academic question, in that Ontario has no extraterritorial—shall we say—ambitions whatsoever.

Mr. Stokes: No ambitions in the north now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, we have moved out into Lake Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has answers to two questions asked the other day.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, both questions are from members who are not in the House.

Mr. Speaker: I think we have adopted the practice of having the answers given in any event and they appear in Hansard.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, they are not such good answers, anyway!

BREAK AND ENTRY INCREASES IN SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On May 14, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) asked the question:

> Has the minister or his department been made aware of the increase of break and entry infractions in southwestern Ontario, and the increase in such.

The answer is yes.

Mr. Lewis: The minister really conjured that.

Mr. Singer: He should reserve that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have a question—

Mr. Lewis: He has really mastered his portfolio.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am learning. Look out now, or I might throw my boot!

SCHOOL FURNACE EXPLOSION

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On May 7, a question was asked by the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), of which I took notice. The question was regarding the furnace explosion at St. Daniel's School in Ottawa on February 23, 1971. "Is the fire marshal's report now complete? In connection with the soot"—that is, s-o-o-t—"buildup, which was attributed"—that is "soot," excuse me.

Mr. Nixon: Where was the minister last night?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I had a few—I could have said "sot." To continue, "which was attributed as the cause of the fire, has it been determined when the furnace was last cleaned?"

I am now informed, sir, that investigators from the fire marshal's office investigated the explosion. "It is their opinion that it was of accidental origin and appeared to have occurred with the natural gas-fired water boiler which supplied heat for the building.

After careful study, it was their opinion that the explosion substance was a cloud of carbon dust—I suppose we could call it soot, sir—within the boiler, and was probably ignited by the pilot or main burner flame. The boiler controls were tested and found to function properly after the explosion, and there was no evidence of a natural gas leak.

However, our investigators, together with the inspector of the energy branch of The Department of Labour, have been unable to find any evidence that the boiler had been cleaned since it was installed in 1962. An employee of the school board was notified by the Ottawa gas company in October, 1970, that the boiler needed cleaning, and on examination of the work orders, the investigators have now ascertained that the boiler had not been cleaned during the year 1970, or up to the time of the occurrence.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

REDUCTIONS IN WELFARE PAYMENTS TO YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. In view of the statement in today's

Globe and Mail that the provincial government is planning tougher regulations to reduce welfare payments to young people living away from home and attending school, will the minister answer question 7 on the notice paper before bringing in specific regulations, specifically those questions on the notice paper having to do with the family background of the 16- and 17-year-old young people who are in receipt of welfare payments?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the situation is this. We are in the process of getting the answers for that question. I do not imagine we will have them before these regulations that I am proposing are presented and I do not intend to hold those up until this information is available.

I think the facts that have been presented to me are sufficient to indicate moving ahead. My friends opposite say, "All we ever do is study things and do not take action." We do not think that we should wait and study this. I think we know the action that needs to be taken.

I might point out to the hon. member that we are not suggesting action that is going to deprive somebody who is deserving of welfare, merely to give the discretion back to the municipality to handle this situation.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question: Does the minister then say that he has absolutely no knowledge about the parental background of the 16- and 17-year-old young people currently receiving such assistance? Is it not possible that most of the 16- and 17-year-old young people are, in fact, from single parent families, families that have very low incomes and so forth? Is the minister simply prepared to change regulations without knowing who he—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has now asked three questions.

Mr. T. Reid: —is affecting?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think we have some pretty fair knowledge of some of these. I think that some of the children in this category are perhaps in the situation to which the hon. member refers. It is certainly very obvious to me and to those municipalities that have come in and talked to me about it—or what is very evident to all of us—is that there needs to be some additional discretionary power in the hands of the person who hands out that welfare to get in and make these determinations which they feel they do not have the right to do now.

This is the kind of change that we are suggesting be made so that those who deserve welfare can get it, but so that a young person who decides he just does not want to live at home and still go to school cannot just thumb his finger at his folks and go out and expect to live off the public trough.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Do I understand then that the changes in the regulations which the minister is contemplating will give discretionary powers to local welfare officials, which will give them a right to grant such welfare payments if the family background of the young people is a low income background or a single parent situation? Is that correct or is it not correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, when we bring in the amendment to the regulations in a week or so, the hon. member will be able to see. I am not suggesting that perhaps the discretion should go so far as to say, "If this is there, you then have to grant the welfare." What we need is the discretion for the person to do the investigation and let him make up his mind whether he should grant welfare to this group or not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A supplemnetary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that not all municipalities considering the resolution of the city of Kingston on this matter, accepted Kingston's proposal? And in considering the new regulations that the minister proposes to draft, will he take into account the refusal to accede, by at least the city of Windsor, based on the brief of Mr. John Sheehan of the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I might point out that in the drafting of anything in our department we try to listen to as many people as possible. We do not do anything in this department by just thinking that we have all the answers here, and in drafting these things we have considered all these various submissions—from the municipalities that have endorsed the city of Kingston resolution; those that have not. We have discussed certain procedures with the Welfare Officers' Association and we are arriving at the consensus. As I say, the consensus that we are going to present, basically is one that gives more discretionary power to the welfare officer.

Mr. Peacock: A new question?

Mr. Speaker: A new question! Yes, the member for Windsor West.

ACQUISITION OF PECHE ISLAND

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests regarding Pêche Island. Is it the intention of the minister or the Parks Integration Board to enter a bid with the Supreme Court of Ontario for the acquisition of Pêche Island before the May 26 deadline set by the court?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member that this matter was under active discussion and that it would be discussed at the next meeting of the Parks Integration Board.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the next meeting of the Parks Integration Board—with Pêche Island on the agenda—conclude its consideration before the closing of the bids on May 26?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These matters will be fully discussed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, when is the next meeting of the Parks Integration Board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. Lewis: Fine!

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries? The member for Essex-Kent.

E. C. ROWE EXPRESSWAY

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways: Would the minister inform the House if The Department of Highways has approved the purchase of land from Marentette Brothers in Windsor for the E. C. Rowe Expressway, and if so, the price that was paid for same?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): My minister has left his seat, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

INCREASE IN COLLECTIONS BY EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS BRANCH

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour in respect to the almost $1 million in unpaid wages and other benefits collected by the employment standards branch during the first four months of the year.

Does the increase of about $345,000 in this amount represent improvement in the collection of these amounts, that is, increased efficiency of the department, or does it represent an increased pilfering of the labour force by certain unscrupulous employers?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): This is a most difficult question to answer, Mr. Speaker. I would like to think it is the increased efficiency of the department.

Mr. Young: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. The minister would like to think, but does he consider then—to give him a chance to think—whether the penalties are high enough in respect of this matter, because it looks as if these pilferings are going up?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I will look into this matter but insofar as the penalties are concerned I do feel that they are presently high enough, and we are taking steps and we are doing a good job in the collection and remitting it back to the employees.

Mr. Young: One further supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: Does this increase of $345,000 in the total of about $1 million in four months partly represent a back collection or is this just simply the amount that has been withheld from the employees during those four months?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to point out—it just occurred to me too—that, in addition, with the changes in The Employment Standards Act there would be new areas in which we would be; I am thinking of The Women's Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

Mr. Young: Then we will have an answer?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Right.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Energy and Resources Management has answers to two questions.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question asked by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) on May 18 regarding Canadian Gypsum of Weston.

I am now informed that three informations have been laid against that company for alleged violations which occurred after the expiration of the ministerial order, and one of these cases will be heard on May 25.

The other question was from—

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me. Any supplementary on that? Next answer.

AIR POLLUTION IN HAMILTON

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The other question, Mr. Speaker was from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) on May 17. He asked me a question regarding coal dust or smoke in Hamilton harbour.

I am informed that there were two violations which were noted involving ships in Hamilton harbour. These violations are now in the hands of our legal branch to determine whether charges will be laid.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

LAKE ERIE SHORE EROSION

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is the minister aware of lake erosion caused by high water in Lake Erie which is threatening cottages and homes at Erie Beach, which area is not included in the conservation authority? Is there any financial assistance through any of his offices that would assist these homeowners and cottage owners for lakeshore protection?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, this has been a problem, as the hon. member knows, not only on Lake Erie but some of the tributaries. We have no programme at the present time to assist, particularly where it involves an area that is outside an existing conservation authority watershed. It involves, of course, the federal government because of shipping, as well as the unusual high-water level in that area. But we have no programme at the present time to assist.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: Would this not be about the same type of work that has been done along Lake Erie, like in the Marentette Beach area?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am not sure if the Marentette Beach area was eligible for assistance from us.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

WARNINGS OF RADIATION FROM NUCLEAR REACTORS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Speaker: In view of the report in the May 12 New York Times concerning the discovery that low-level radiation from New York State nuclear reactors has significantly increased infant mortality in the nearby areas, are special precautions or warnings being given to the people in the area of Pickering.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, no special warnings have been given to people who are in the area of Pickering. As the hon. member knows, we have certain standards and requirements that are laid down by the Atomic Energy Commission of Canada. These standards are being adhered to, certainly at Pickering and we feel that they are more than adequate to protect anybody living in that area against radiation.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that the amount of radiation being emitted from Pickering is exactly the same as in the New York reactors? In that case is the minister not worried about the experience that has already developed in New York?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would be very surprised at the present time if the radiation, or any alleged radiation, from Pickering was the same as exists in New York in respect to the plant referred to by the hon. member. The standards and the requirements may be the same, but certainly the operation of those two plants is not the same. As I have indicated, we are satisfied with the procedural methods that are laid down by the Atomic Energy Control Board, and they are well within the tolerable level, I am told, regarding radiation emissions.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Town of Mississauga.

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported, and that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted:

Bill Pr35, An Act to incorporate The Association of Natural Resources Technicians of Ontario.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills, having been withdrawn, be not reported:

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting Morton Terminal Limited.

Bill Pr37, An Act respecting the County of Halton.

Your committee would recommend that the time for presenting reports by the committee be extended to Thursday, June 10, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Before we move into the routine order of business, "Motions," I perhaps should deal with a matter which was raised last Tuesday. I shall do so as follows:

On Tuesday last, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) attempted, under the routine proceedings, to move a motion to refer certain matters to a standing committee. I ruled that this motion could only be accepted as a notice of motion for the notice paper to be called in the usual way in the private members' hour. The member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) suggested that this did not apply to motions moved under the routine proceedings.

I have now carefully examined—and I may interpolate here that the matter has been very carefully looked into on my behalf also by the Clerk's office—our standing orders and had the opportunity of comparing our procedure in this area with that of the House of Commons of Canada.

I find that their procedure is identical with ours in that, as the word "routine" implies, only routine motions with respect to the management of the House can be moved under this routine proceeding. As a definition of such routine motions is not specifically covered in our standing orders, I find the Canadian House of Commons standing order 32, subsection 1, clause (p) helpful.

It refers to motions and I quote:

> —made upon routine proceedings as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House and the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment.

I was also very interested to discover that my ruling of Tuesday last is supported completely by a ruling of the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada on Tuesday, May 2, 1961. In that case, Mr. Martin, member for Essex East, seconded by Mr. McIlraith, moved:

> —that the annual report of the governor of the Bank of Canada to the Minister of Finance and statement of accounts for the year 1960 be referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce for study.

After reviewing the standing orders and the precedents found in Bourinot and Beauchesne, the Speaker ruled that the only course open to a private member to bring in such a motion is to use the notice of motion procedure which involves the giving of written notice—48 hours in their rules. The notice would then appear on the order paper to be dealt with in accordance with their standing orders.

Two of Mr. Speaker's quotations from Beauchesne I found to be particularly helpful, as follows: Firstly,

> It is a fundamental rule that with the exception of certain matters dealt with under routine proceedings, no question can be considered by the House unless it has been previously appointed either by a notice or a regular order of the House.

Secondly,

> All motions referring to the business of the House should be introduced by the leader of the House.

For these reasons, I find that my ruling on Tuesday was correct and that only routine motions, as described, can be moved under the routine proceedings by the government and should be moved by the House leader. It is true that on two occasions recently motions by ministers to refer matters to standing committees were accepted under this

procedure, but I have no hesitation now in saying that that was incorrect. Some justification might be offered as they were quite brief motions in general terms, moved by the ministers whose departments were concerned, in answer to requests from the opposition.

However, I now serve notice that in future such motions, even from the government, will require the usual notice, will be placed on the notice paper under the heading, "Government Motions," and, of course, called in the discretion of the House leader, as provided in standing order 24. In any event I do not consider the two recent cases, to which I have referred, as forming a precedent for the introduction by a private member of a lengthy and complex resolution, such as that posed by the member for Scarborough West, and I confirm my previous ruling that this must go on the notice paper as provided by standing order 32 (a), and could only be called in the private members' hour, as provided in standing order 26 (a).

While it has been generally understood in this House that the routine procedure "Motions" was available only to the government, and then only for certain types of motions, there has never been a very clear line drawn between motions movable under this procedure and motions which require notice.

I am hopeful that the foregoing explanation and this ruling will clarify this situation.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a point of order sir, your ruling is indeed well considered and I fully appreciate its intent. I am sorry that the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) and the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White) were given the right, in effect, to transgress the rules of the House which is not now granted to a member of the opposition. But I gather you assert that that will not happen again and that all government notices of such motions will have to go on the order paper about any committee business.

It presents the dilemma that, the Premier (Mr. Davis) not having given his statement today, these things are under the carpet over the long weekend and will recede from public view, which is precisely what the government would have wished to accomplish. But I leave that, sir, and ask you to consider perhaps discussing with the House committee the possibility of rule 43 in the federal House of Commons, which says:

> A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having been given under standing order 42.

This would be equivalent to our standing order 26 or 24, and perhaps that might be considered by our standing committee of the Legislature as an alternative procedure for this House for private opposition members to use.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, may I speak further to that point? In the event that the Prime Minister today, during his statement, had indicated that on motion today he would make such and such a referral to a standing committee of the House, then I am sure that it would have been before the House whether or not to give unanimous consent to the waiver of the rule requiring notice, and the House may wish to do that.

That is why I think in your consideration of the remarks of the member for Scarborough West, the leader of the New Democratic Party, that this House take into account the practice in Ottawa which follows upon the ruling that you have relied upon, that in the event that, at least in respect to a motion by the government which has not first been put on the notice paper, the House may wish to give unanimous consent to proceed with it forthwith.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is no question but that in such an instance, even in our own rules as they are now, what the hon. member for Windsor West has been suggesting following the member for Scarborough West would probably be quite possible; but I will be glad to discuss it with the Clerk, our authority on these matters, and if necessary suggest to the chairman of the committee, which I believe has been reconstituted, that this might be looked into.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE SECURITIES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, the purpose of these

amendments is to give legislative effect to short-term recommendations made in the report of the committee of the Ontario Securities Commission on the problems of disclosure raised for investors by business combinations and by private placements.

For example, Part IX of The Securities Act, which deals with takeover bids, is being amended to clarify and set out the rights and obligations of the parties and provide for timely and more complete disclosure in relation to takeover bids. Part XI of the Act is being amended so that additional financial information is disclosed in a more meaningful way.

And there are certain housekeeping amendments, including those which are necessary to bring The Securities Act into conformity with The Business Corporations Act.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

Mr. Jackson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend section 1 of The Statute Labour Act to allow commissioners elected to take a declaration of office before a justice of the peace or a commissioner for taking affidavits; in section 2, it amends the Act so that six days' notice would be increased to 14 days to allow a greater length of time for delivery. In section 3, subsection 1, the salary for the secretary-treasurer would be increased to bring it into line with present wage practices; and in subsection 2 the amendment would allow the secretary-treasurer to take the declaration of office before a justice of the peace or a commissioner for taking affidavits.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I think it might be well if I reported very briefly on two matters which were referred to me on Tuesday last by the Leader of the Opposition and other members and that was the non-sitting of certain committees on Wednesday.

I have taken the matter up with the chairmen of both committees and I must say that the explanation which I received in each case appears to be reasonable under the circumstances as I can judge from here, having no authority in any event.

One committee was to have heard the Health estimates and was also to have interviewed or heard the Health Insurance Registration Board officials. My understanding from the clerk of that committee—and again this is just my understanding—is that the committee agreed that while they were dealing with the estimates of that department, the committee would not sit on Wednesdays and Fridays. Apparently there is a minute somewhat to that effect. That is the information which I have received and that would account for that committee not sitting on Wednesday.

I am further advised by the clerk that the committee has now decided to sit on Wednesdays and Fridays, as well as on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday while hearing the estimates, to deal with the estimates.

The other committee I understand had the difficulty that the Milk Marketing Board, I believe it was, which was to appear before them could not appear, and there was not sufficient time apparently to arrange for some other board under jurisdiction of the department concerned to be called before the committee, and therefore the Chairman, I believe, felt that there was nothing to be gained by calling the committee.

That is the report which I have for the House. I would say to the members of the committees concerned that their recourse in these instances of course is to take it up at the next meeting of the committee, and I am quite sure, as was pointed out the other day, that the committees will meet and that if the complaints are as they have been this time brought in to Mr. Speaker in the House, they will be noted by the House leader and if any action is necessary to have a committee sit I am sure it will be taken.

So I say to the members of those two committees, they can investigate these matters themselves when the committee sits; but the first committee apparently has the matter well in hand.

Now the second thing I would like to say is that Mr. Speaker is always delighted to have guests on a certain evening and I would be delighted if the guest who went home with a hat and came without one, would return it. A Glengarry with a very valuable badge went home with the wrong owner last night and I would be very appreciative if anyone knows anything about that and could have it returned to my office.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, might I ask you if you have taken the opportunity to investigate the situation which

created the damage to some of the members of this House in their personal property of their cars outside, in their proper parking place, and whether there has been anyone found at fault in this regard, or charges that might be laid to retrieve some of the loss of this damage to the members?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, first of all, Mr. Speaker has had nothing of this sort reported to him by any member. He has other information in respect to it. Secondly, Mr. Speaker's jurisdiction does not extend in that area. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker has always found it very difficult to understand why the policing authority—and apparently this caused the trouble the other day—as divided between the municipal police force, and the provincial police force and stops at the bottom step of our building. It is something which is quite impossible, and I will be taking it up with the Attorney General to see if we cannot get it changed. I am advised that—

Mr. Nixon: Change the Attorney General!

Mr. Singer: We are going to change the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: I have not discussed it with him yet, but I am advised that what happened that day—and this has not come from the members concerned, I have been waiting for them to get in touch with me; I have been making some investigations. The munipical police came and the crowd left, so the police left. The crowd came back first, before the police came back. I have not seen what damage was done. I have only heard about it. And our own police force who police this building could not interfere because they would have been in the wrong area.

It sounds very silly to me, and I am sure that something will be done about it. I will be glad to pursue the matter further because I feel that this is an occasion and an occurrence for which our members should certainly not suffer any loss.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Change the Attorney General. Send some of your guards down there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Quit talking, I cannot hear.

Mr. Ruston: The Attorney General better resign.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the damage to my vehicle was in the order of $300.

Mr. Lewis: And the Speaker will please compensate the member.

Mr. Speaker: I would hope that the hon. member would give me full particulars of it. This is the first notice I have had from the hon. member of any damage. I trust that he will let my office have that information and I will endeavour to see that it goes to the appropriate place.

And also, insofar as the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson) goes, what he has mentioned certainly needs to be investigated. It is under way.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 3rd order, Committee of the Whole House.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

House in committee on Bill 24, An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill? If not, the hon. minister has an amendment himself to section 9.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 1 of section 9 be amended by striking out "the government of Ontario represented by the minister" in the first and second lines, and inserting in lieu thereof "the minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. MacNaughton moves that subsection 1 of section 9 be amended by striking out the words "the government of Ontario represented by the minister" in the first and second lines and inserting in lieu thereof "the minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." Shall the amendment carry?

Carried.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Bill 24, as amended, reported.

MINING TAX ACT

Mr. Chairman: Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to any section of this bill? The hon. member for Lakeshore—which section?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Section 1, subsection 4—definition of the term "output." I would be—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The hon. minister is not present.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): He will be right back; I will get him.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I wonder if, in the circumstances, perhaps we could proceed with Bill 27 or Bill 37, either one.

Mr. Chairman: I think under the circumstances the committee will agree to defer action on this bill. We will proceed with the next one.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Mr. Chairman: Bill 27, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act. Are there any questions, comments or amendments? The member for Lakeshore—on which section?

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On section 2 I would be grateful—

Mr. Chairman: Is there any comment or question on section 1?

Mr. Lawlor: No.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2 has to do with preferred beneficiaries and the motion—I suppose we can call it that, even if it happens to be somewhat backward—is in the form of an erosion of the base by which succession duties are gleaned in this province.

First of all, I would like the minister to explain what categories are involved in the preferred beneficiary category which is the first of three categories under our present Succession Duty Act; secondly, as to the motivation and reasons for so reducing the take, the reduction not necessarily being under this section but under the bill itself, in the scale of $12 a day and in all subsequent years—$6 million this year. And what portion of that loss to the revenues of this province is constituted by the altering of the surtax from $50,000 to $100,000 under the terms of this particular section?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, the elimination of the 15 per cent is consistent with our thinking, because it was applied over and above the succession duty tax itself; you will then note in the following subsection that it remains as it was before. Therefore it is consistent with what we were doing so far as reduction is concerned.

Where the hon. member refers to the loss I regret that I cannot give him those figures off the top of my head. I will get them for him. However, we do believe that with the advent of greater co-operation at the federal level, the loss that the hon. member refers to will in fact be eliminated by some agreement that will follow, possibly the federal budget or certainly negotiations, after we see what measure of tax reform in this regard is brought about by them.

In regard to the beneficiaries, it remains pretty well as was. It involves the spouses, of course, and children, and does not—and this is what the hon. member was getting at—it precludes brothers and sisters, so one does not get into the next proliferation of family succession. There may be some little inequity there, but generally speaking we believe this to be a fair way to apply the reduction.

Mr. Lawlor: Just in continuity with that, it also goes up as well as down. It goes up to fathers and mothers and down to sons-in-law and daughters-in-law. I do not take too much exception to the going up, although passing it back to the previous generation may have some questionable features philosophically as far as the passage of money from generation to generation is concerned.

Would the minister not agree with me that the daughters-in-law and sons-in-law notion more properly really should fall within the second category? There are three categories—the preferred class, the collateral class and the stranger class. I would have thought that they should have fallen into the collateral class. Has the minister any thought on that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not particularly. The preferred beneficiary is the one that we are mostly concerned about, and has, as the member will well understand, quite a bearing, particularly in the small family business area and also in the area of the family farm. This may be, or it is, the basis of why we are doing it this way, and then those people that the member refers to will be involved. I am now informed that one full year of tax in regard to the elimination of the 15 per cent amounts to something in the neighbourhood of just over $4 million.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, if we may jump down, it is a very long section with numerous subsections. I have nothing further with respect to the subsection which is really subsections 2 and 3, but I have a question with respect to subsection 4, if no one else wishes to come in on this.

The alterations that were debated just a few years ago—two or three years ago—I think the limitation on moneys passing to spouse free of tax completely was $50,000. As I recall, we in the select committee on taxation thought that was much too low, particularly with the Canada Pension Plan operating, and that with inflation on the cost of property estates, it could very easily go to the amount of $100,000. We felt, and this party I think can say in consistency with what the committee felt in this regard, that widows and spouse, including common law, as we altered it a year ago, ought to be protected and ought to be the beneficiaries of an estate free of estate tax, or rather succession duty in the case of Ontario, in a protected way. So we raised that figure substantially. As a matter of fact, the amount that was brought into being here last year, I think, went from about the $50,000 figure to—I think our figure was $75,000, while the government went to $125,000, and we took no particular umbrage with that. Now, mysteriously, and for reasons I do not understand, the government wants to double that figure again; it wants to go to $250,000 exempt. I think the figure is too high. I think that doubling the amounts again will be a considerable loss of revenue to the province, and again I would like to know the figure that is being lost in the process.

The third thing that rises to my mind is what I mentioned before, the loophole, if you will so put it, worked into The Estate Tax Act whereby one gets a visitation back of moneys from the federal government, where, if one is raising the figure in Ontario to $250,000. Under The Estate Tax Act it is completely free, passing between spouses. That widow under the federal Act departs this country with a bundle, goes off to the tax havens of this world, takes it with her. The government may not, if it is in liquid form, certainly at the federal level, ever recapture a dime of moneys earned in a socially responsible way.

I think the minister will agree with me that Smith talks conclusively, conservative though he may be in his general mentality, of the debt and responsibility and the social conscience involved in people who have made their fortunes in this country, through the participation they have had in the community; and, reciprocally, from what the community has been able to confer upon them.

People do not get rich, you know, in isolation. The Horatio Alger types, as we learn by our income tax this year, are few and far between. It is through the aid and instrumentality of other human beings, off whom sometimes they feed, that they grow bloated, rich and affluent, and are able to dismiss the responsibility by fleeing to foreign jurisdictions which do not tax.

The minister is aiding and abetting that process in a minor way, a secondary way, within the terms of his present legislation. There is no reason in the world why, having derived the usufruct from this constituency, they then should be given gratis a leave to take out $250,000 without doing something. I do not understand the rationale, in other words, to subsection 4. I want to know the social justification that this government has for so lifting that figure. Is it based upon a monetary estimate? Precisely how did the minister arrive at the figure of $250,000 under this head?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, the member's points are extremely well taken and I can see there is reason for his question in this area. In fact, it may be that we would aid and abet someone to leave the country with that sum of money. To some people, of course, that would not be considered a great fortune. In my humble circumstances, as I should imagine there are others, it is considered a fortune but then, the sociological—

Mr. Lawlor: And 90 per cent of the minister's constituents would like to see it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Quite! We would like to get our hands on a few just like that, I can tell the member, but that is not the point.

The social justice involved here is a very great one, as far as I am concerned. Let us take, for instance, the lands in the shadows of the great urban centres of the Province of Ontario which are in actual fact, still involved very actively in farms. I can name quite a number of them and because of municipal changes and so on, and because of the possibility of appreciation in land values—a vast appreciation of land values; we have been discussing that in the last few days—one can easily see that their taxes have increased at a tremendous rate. At such a rate that there are cases now where the widow involved with

a particular farm land, is there maybe with a few children after the husband has passed away, in fact, has to sell the farm in order to pay the tax.

We do not think that is fair. It also happens in smaller businesses where an industry is involved and the money is all tied up. It does not take much for the capital of an estate to reach $250,000 in a small secondary industry. We want to keep those people in business. I know very well neither the people in the NDP nor in ours want to force them into the hands of, possibly, Americans, just because there is money involved.

I think there is some social justice in that particular regard as well. The amount of money that we are going to forfeit for a very short time in this regard may seem substantial. But I hope the member will accept the sincerity of my statement when I say that I believe, on negotiation with the federal government, and with the advent, as the Treasurer clearly put it the night he presented his budget—the explanation is there—of moving into an area where unquestionably there will be tax on capital gains, there will be sufficient revenue, if we receive the co-operation and the proper tax reform programme from the federal government, into which I think all this money will flow back. With a little bit of good fortune, and if the Prime Minister of Canada were to feel as munificent as we would like him to feel, we might even come off with a few more dollars into our revenues rather than a loss that we are going to suffer in the short term. Therefore I believe that is the social justification for us raising the limit of $250,000. I hope that explanation, Mr. Chairman, will be sufficient for my hon. friend.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment on a personality. You know, it is a remarkable thing how cabinet position changes the personality of a man, whereby previously he was a stinging creature with a bit of a bite in his tail, he has almost achieved statesmanlike status under the umbrella of his new department. I congratulate him. He has become almost rational in the process.

If I may take just a moment of your time on that last point that you made. You seem to be holding out two contradictory or inconsistent doctrines, that you are prepared to throw over Ontario succession duties in return for the federal, provided what?—provided that you earn the same increment, you have the same flow-back into the Treasury of Ontario as presently exists? Or are you prepared to do that in face of having substantially reduced return on it, because in my calculation you are going to lose $30 million if you did it this afternoon without reservations and all kinds of hedging qualifications, certainly about $24,000 plus another $6,000 that you yourself are giving away in the course of your figures here.

Which one of those two positions is the government's position? That you will not enter into that agreement without making sure that you are going to derive the same return to this Treasury, or that you are so fed up with the administrative cost, which is about $1.3 million to the province and to the administration process and to the archaic, labyrinthine features of that existing Act which the Smith committee, and Smith himself, said was the most chaotic, the most deleterious piece of legislation on the books of the province? You will remember the remarks he had to make about it. Which one of those two positions do you intend to take?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, again I will say, and I will reiterate here, I think that you will notice we are not relinquishing the field, and I believe that my hon. friend will agree with me in regard to our position there.

Mr. Lawlor: Halfway.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Indeed, we are by no means ashamed of the administration of this particular Act in the past. We have the most efficient people. I would suggest to you, in the Dominion of Canada functioning in this particular branch of my department and indeed I understand in many cases I think they are ahead of the type of service they render vis-à-vis our federal counterparts. But we are going to retain it as we have it now, not to use as a lever, but just so that we do not vacate the field.

And as I said before, we will do everything in our power to be co-operative with the federal authorities because we do not like the thought of double taxation any more than you do or any other citizen of Canada, as a matter of fact. But for the people of the Province of Ontario, we think that we can render a very good service to them by the elimination of this tax and by bartering, if one would like to use that term, our position with the federal people to see that the revenues of the Province of Ontario are at least maintained at the present level, and that I will give to you as my thinking for this particular part of the Act.

Mr. Lawlor: If I may just comment on that, Mr. Chairman, my heart rises like a hawk—as the chief said in the picture of another name—because it comes down to this, that your position is pretty much in practical terms the same as ours. In effect, you will not get what you want, you cannot get that 75 per cent largess to bring in the same revenue, you will fall short of considerable millions of dollars and so we will remain, as far as I can see, indefinitely in the field; which is to the good, because you need this kind of flexibility in your tax structure and terms of equity of tax too, your tax mix, the tendency to give it away.

I wonder if the minister has any figure before him as to what the revenue loss under that particular head with respect to doubling the exemptions to a spouse would be?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I regret that I do not. I will endeavour to supply that to the hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: I just have one other point to make with respect to the whole bill. This is the only other section really except the wind-up section.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the hon. member that there is an amendment to section 3. If he has anything beyond section 2 perhaps he would save it.

Mr. Lawlor: There is? Well, I will abide that.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on section 2?

Section 2, agreed to.

On section 3.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The hon. minister has an amendment to section 3 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment on section 3 and it is to this effect: I move that section 3 be amended by striking out the figure "26th" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof "27th." I think you will realize that as it was presented by the Treasurer we could not very well make it the "26th" because of the hours as were prescribed by the minister for the application of the total terms of the bill. Therefore I would ask that this motion be put.

Mr. Chairman: Does the motion carry? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): I understand the problem, but is it not possible since this is of benefit to the taxpayer that you can make it come into force a day earlier rather than penalize those persons who happen to die on the 26th of April? It would appear to me that it has been published and made known that it was the 26th. Surely if the minister is going to move a change in that date he should move it to the 25th, even though it would be in a sense retroactive, so that persons would have the benefit of the ameliorating provisions of the section?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why can it not be the 26th?

Mr. Lawlor: They do not want them to have the benefits—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, while the minister is considering that, I do not understand the reason he gave why it could not be effective on the 26th. He talked about the hours concerned. It comes into effect when the Legislature decides it comes into effect, not when the Treasurer was speaking.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I suppose that the reason being that the budget itself was brought down on the 26th, and I suppose there would be maybe nothing wrong with that, although these seems to be something, fiscally, there is concern. It was meant to become effective at 12:01 a.m. on April 27 and according to the bill the exemption is 12:01 a.m. April 26.

Mr. Nixon: I understand now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is the point. Minor as it is, I would ask the members to facilitate the passage.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 3, as amended, carry?

Section 3, amended, agreed to.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to the bill? If not, shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

Bill 27, as amended, reported.

MINING TAX ACT

Mr. Chairman: We did defer Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act. Now that the hon. minister is in the House, we will proceed with Bill 25. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to any section of the bill? If so, which section? The hon. member for Lakeshore.

On section 1.

Mr. Lawlor: In section 1, regarding the definition of the term "output." What is the effect of this redefinition of the term "output"? What effect, for instance, does it have upon the way in which mine assessors reach their determination of what is taxable coming out of mines? I understand that their assessment ends at the first crusher. Has it any reference to that sort of thing? In short, what effect does this new definition have in the mining picture?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): I think what it does, Mr. Chairman, is to outline and put into writing exactly what output really means when it comes to assessment. It is an administrative practice to clarify the situation—a very simple amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments to section 1? Any comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister why it is, in section 2, clause 2 of the bill, that the moneys should not be payable to the Treasurer of Ontario rather than to the minister himself? It seems to me that every other payment of moneys due or owing to the Province of Ontario that I know of is paid to the Treasurer of Ontario. It would seem to me that if for the time being we are going to leave the question of the assessors in the hands of this minister rather than again to transfer it to the Minister of Revenue—where I personally think it should be—it would appear to me that a minister of the Crown would be well advised to give up the collection of taxes and leave it to the single member of the government charged with the responsibility of looking after the revenues of the province.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I think we have to realize that the assessment for a mining tax is a very complicated one and is handled totally by this department. Therefore, I think it is only right that payment of that tax should be directed to this particular department.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think there are other taxes that are complex in calculation. I can understand, for the time being, the proposition that the complexity of that assessment requires it to be or there is some merit in saying that traditionally it has been in that department. I happen to think the whole of that assessment operation should not be in this minister's department and he should not be engaged in assessing taxes and taxing as a minister. But I do not think that alters the fact that sales tax, for example, which is quite complicated, is administered by the Minister of Revenue but the tax is payable to the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. And that is true of many of the taxes levied by this province.

Now, it does seem to me that for the moment, while I think the assessor should be in the department of the Minister of Revenue, that is a different question from saying that because the minister makes the assessment the actual physical payment of the tax should go to the minister and go into a different account.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It does not go there; it is just handed over.

Mr. J. Renwick: All right then, if it does not go into a different account then he must have to endorse it over to the Treasurer for deposit in the consolidated revenue fund of the province. If that is the case, then it would seem to me to make very good sense that that step should be eliminated and that the tax should be payable directly to the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. It is consistent with sound financial administration in the tradition of the province.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can add anything further except to say it is purely protocol and the cheques I receive in this particular department of course, are just transferred over to the Treasurer and put in the consolidated revenue fund. The setup is there, the structure is there, the assessment is there, so it seems at this particular time until major policy changes are made that we should continue along these lines.

Mr. Lawlor: A darn cosy arrangement, that is what the minister has.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, I have one other question. Is there not any method by which the government can have the benefit of the moneys rather than to wait for the expiration of two months after the end of the year?

It may be that I am not as familiar as the minister with the collection procedures, but it does seem to me, as is the case with corporate tax, that there should be some procedure by which as moneys accrue during

the course of the year, as taxes become due, that on a quarterly basis the mining companies should be required as corporations are, to pay their tax in instalments. The government then has the continuing use of the funds as they accrue rather than to leave the funds in the hands of the mining companies and allow them to have the use of the money for this additional period.

I am pleased to see that it is cut down to two months, I think it was a longer period beforehand. But I think the minister should give serious consideration to requiring some form of estimation by the mining companies and a payment of tax, not by way of prepayment, but a payment currently as it becomes due during the course of the taxation year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think the member has a very good point here. It is certainly something I would be pleased to look into; I think it does make very good sense. But I notice he made reference to the shortening of the particular period, which this Act certainly brings in. I think we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister said he will look into it, either later on during this session or certainly during the next session—well, of course, in the next session we will introduce it anyway.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I will look into it.

Mr. Nixon: Do not let down that way.

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps in this session the minister could consider making that kind of accrued payment.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments on section 2?

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments to other sections of the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 3.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

On section 3.

Mr. Lawlor: This is repealing the tax on the production of natural gas. First of all, I would like to know precisely the loss of revenue involved in this. My colleague the other day, looking at the Smith recommendations under this head, indicated that the sum was about $41,000 which, because of the nuisance nature of the tax may, in some measure, justify its removal from the books of this province. Although Smith himself, as the minister well knows, Mr. Chairman, does not recommend that situation at all. He recommends a substitute flat rate tax.

I think the sums involved may be somewhat greater. If we look at page 369, it says:

> The natural gas wells of southern Ontario have been producing a modest quantity of gas for many years. In 1965 the total production was 12 million thousand cubic feet with a wellhead value of $4.8 million, production figures vary from year to year. Revenue derived by the province for this production has, in the four years ending March 31, 1965, averaged over $370,000 annually.

Is that precise sum under attack in this particular legislation? Will that be lost to the province?

I may as well ask the second question while I am on my feet. There are two different derivations. One of them is from the land end of the thing and the other one is from the certain amount of natural gas production under Lake Ontario, which is owned by the province and therefore necessarily leased to the owners, from which certain licensing fees accrue to the benefit of the province, and The Mining Tax Act is applicable in that instance too, along with an offshore levy. Is there an alteration in that particular regard meant in in this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this particular tax, of course, was applied to gas produced from private properties at about, I think the figure was a half-cent per thousand cubic feet, and the amount of revenue that will be lost by the province this year we estimate to be $60,000 to $70,000.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments to section 3 of the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: If I may ask the minister: Does he look upon that loss with equanimity? It is money that, in terms that would be an awful lot of taxpayers' accumulative value of $60,000 or $70,000. Is the administrative cost so outdistancing the revenue? What is the point?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think I pointed out in the second reading of this particular bill, Mr. Chairman, that this particular tax as it is applied now is ultra vires to the province. It is unconstitutional. This is the reason that we have had to repeal it. For this reason, the

amendments are being introduced for this particular Act at this time.

I think I pointed out at that time we were notified that one of the companies would challenge us in the courts, and we had Crown counsel look into it in some depth and it was on their advice that the amendments were introduced.

Mr. Lawlor: Then finally, why does not the minister abide by and follow the Smith recommendation to substitute it? If the minister is going hung up on purely legal grounds on the exportive proposition, surely the company has got enough common sense to know that he has it within his means to move into a flat rate tax, direct tax situation, which they could not possibly challenge?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is certainly something that the government could look into following those certain recommendations. I will be glad to follow up a little further on the member's advice.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on section 3? Will the section stand.

Section 3 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further to any section of the bill? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have a —oh, sorry—my comments are on clause 8.

Mr. Lawlor: Go ahead.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have a comment. Again, it relates to the comment that I made earlier about the—

Mr. Chairman: What is the section, if I might ask the hon. member?

Mr. J. Renwick: Clause 8.

Mr. Chairman: Clause 8 of section—

Mr. J. Renwick: Which amends section 27 of the Act.

Mr. Chairman: What section of the bill, might I ask?

Mr. J. Renwick: Clause 8.

Mr. Lawlor: I have something before that.

Mr. J. Renwick: My colleague, the member for—

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments or questions to any section prior to clause 8?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Two points, in section 5 on page 3—

Mr. Chairman: Just section 5 of the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 5 of the bill, Mr. Chairman, yes.

On section 5.

Mr. Chairman: Right. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to know the practice of the department with respect to this business of $50 a day, the leviable penalty for failure to provide the returns. What do you actually do? Do you ever hit them for 50 bucks a day, or how do you saw it off? What kind of a deal do you usually make?

Mr. J. Renwick: He has never collected the $20. He wants to frighten them with the $50.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, we have to have, of course, some protection and some penalties applied and they must be spelled out. To my knowledge I do not think that we have ever been forced to use this particular penalty, but it is certainly there if the time comes that we need it.

Mr. J. Renwick: That will frighten them, that $30.

Mr. Lawlor: The second point, when you listen to some of the legal rigorism over there on occasion, you know, over against what the literal text of the law does and what is actually done in terms of enforceability—and I am in favour of the second school, the non-enforceability school, in terms of just straight humanity—but I have to listen to an awful lot of talk about how rigorous you are in the enforcement of your legislation.

I think, you know, that it should be reviewed if you do not intend to levy this in any instances, no matter how flagrant the abuse and failure to file the return, and no matter how they disregard appealing letters with the minister on his knees saying, "Please file the returns, we have not seen them for five or six years." If I took it as $50 a day for seven years, well you could close up the gaswell could you not? I am saying that this should be brought into some kind of common-sense situation and the minister's discretions under this particular section written into the legislation.

The second thing is under section 7.

Section 5 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Anything on section 6?

Mr. Lawlor: Six is okay as far as I am concerned.

On section 7.

Mr. Chairman: Right. On section 7 of the bill; the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 7 refers to a special lien. Does the minister think that this government is so taxed with the lack of money, considering how much we have been giving away here this afternoon—hundreds of millions—to have requisite against the ordinary citizen of the province to assert a lien in priority of title, whether the right or title of the ordinary citizen has accrued before or accrues after the attaching? I still take umbrage with that. I still find it somehow runs against the vein of civil liberties in a sense of the fair distribution of equities between the citizen and the very powerful government.

Here is the very powerful bully of a government coming along and saying, "Well, your rights may have accrued previously, the money may be owing to you by some mining operation, but we are number one on the list, we are at the top of the totem pole. While the debt due to you accrued several months ago, we want to be first, and whether there is anything left over for you is just too bad." The lien on machinery, the lien that was worked out with respect to lease arrangements and the like all take a back seat to the assertion of the strong left arm of the government in this particular instance."

I would like to hear the minister's thoughts about this assertion of priorities and should the minister not consider the deletion of the business of "before"? Certainly if the lien accrues after, that is justifiable; we come in in a priority position in any event with respect to that. But under the bankruptcy legislation, under other forms of mechanics' lien legislation we do not assert and garner to our breast that sort of high-grade priority. Why should we do it in our Mining Tax Act?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very surprised that the member for Lakeshore would take an attitude like this with regard to this section of the bill, because in my capacity as minister of this particular department I have heard him expound at great length that we on this side are not strong enough and not forceful enough against the mining companies and we do not collect enough tax.

We are putting a section into the Act that will give some protection to the general public and will make sure that our taxes are collected. Now he finds fault with it. I just fail to see his reasoning and, as far as I am concerned, it is a protection and it should certainly stay there for the protection of the public.

Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to labour this and I will not, but I am simply saying that adequate protection was written into it in terms of lien; the taxes unpaid, I think stand, but they ought not to be asserted in priority over ordinary creditors who are also taxpayers in this community, and that is what he is doing in terms of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 7 stand?

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore on section 8.

Mr. J. Renwick: For Riverdale.

Mr. Chairman: For Riverdale, I am sorry.

Mr. Lawlor: It all has to do with water in one way or another.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a compliment.

Mr. Chairman, on clause 8 the same point arises that my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, made in connection with clause 7, that there comes a point when the brandishing of the club is never used and at that point the penalty is so stiff that in fact the operator or the owner or the lessee has nothing to concern himself about. We dealt with that ridiculous section a minute or two ago where the $20 a day was changed to $50 a day and it has never ever been used. But here we have a section which indicates that the minister is going to sue for the tax, and the point that I made earlier is that the minister should not be the one who makes the suit. If the suit is going to be laid, it should not be in the name of the Minister of Mines, it should be in tht name of the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario or it should be laid by the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice in the province. I just disagree with treating the mining operation and its taxing implications in some separate pigeon-hole.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If I may interrupt here for one moment, Mr. Chairman, section 5, subsection 24—that particular increase in

penalties from $20 to $50 is with regard to filing the tax; it has nothing to do with the tax at all. We have had very little trouble—none to my knowledge—with the late filing of these companies. The other section we are dealing with now is the collection of the tax itself.

Mr. J. Renwick: I realize that. I say that the raising of it from $20 to $50 for failure to file the return is not very much of a penalty, because it was never used anyway.

Mr. Chairman: Are we talking about section 8 of the bill?

Mr. J. Renwick: We are now back to section 8 of the bill and I—

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me the only amendment here in section 8 is to remove the words "or well" from the Mining Tax Act.

Mr. J. Renwick: Oh yes, but Mr. Chairman, it is a well understood rule that if they are amending a section you can comment on the section.

Mr. Chairman: But I would not think on the entire principle of the section, it would pertain to the removal of the words "or well."

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, it would be quite in order for me to move an amendment to the section if I chose to do so. It could not be ruled out. Simply because the minister is deleting only two words surely, Mr. Chairman, does not preclude comment upon the clause itself?

Mr. Chairman: I say it does, because The Mining Tax Act itself is being amended under section 8 of this bill only to the extent of omitting two words. That is the sum total of the amendment before us, in this bill.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, then within the limits that you set, my point is very simply that I do not think this minister should be suing in the courts. I think the minister should take that up under advisement when he gives a thorough overhaul to this particular statute.

Section 8 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments or questions on any part of the bill?

On section 9.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, on clause 9, Mr. Chairman, I want to make again very briefly that here is a situation for the appointment of a receiver for the property. Now, again, I do not know of any instance where that club has been used. I am simply saying it is much too brutal a club and therefore everybody knows that it does not maintain enforcement. In fact, persons in this province know very well that it will be a long time before—with all the other weapons available to the government to protect the tax—they move in on a mining company for the purpose of appointing a receiver in order to collect the funds which are required from that company.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As you have very correctly pointed out, Mr. Chairman, these amendments in section 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are all complementary to section 3 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. In my opinion, we are not talking about receivers here.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Chairman has let the minister off the hook. Still it goes back to the principle.

Mr. Chairman: No; we are not talking about receivers here. That happens to be part of subsection 1 of section 28 of The Mining Tax Act itself. We are not changing that. Shall section 9 stand as part of the bill?

Section 9 agreed to.

Any comments or questions in connection with any other section? Shall the bill be reported?

Bill 25 reported.

THE WAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 37, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any sections of the bill? If so, which section? The hon. member for Riverdale. On section 1.

Mr. J. Renwick: I made a comment on second reading so I assumed the minister is able to give us now the calculation. I do not understand the first amendment proposed in clause 1. I do not know whether it assists the wage earner or deprives him of some portion of the exemption. I would appreciate it if the minister would give us the actual calculation.

It would appear to me that the removal of the words at the very end of the proposed amendment saying:

> That a portion of such debtor's wages not exceeding the sum of $2.50 for each working day represented by the wages seized or attached is in all cases exempt from seizure or attachment.

My point simply is that, if that is being deleted, it seems to me to remove part of the protection which a wage earner had. Now that may well be consistent with what the minister intends to do, but I would like him to say that he is removing part of the protection of a wage earner, as he is in the next subsection of clause 1, where he is repealing the exemption from seizure where the debt is for board or lodging, or where the debtor has no dependants.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Chairman, as I understand the situation at the moment, up to 70 per cent of the debtor's salary or assets are exempt from seizure and, as well, there was a base limit, that one had to leave the grand princely sum of $2.50 per day income free—

An hon. member: That is correct.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —from seizure. All we are doing here—and it is a very simple one—is removing that $2.50 bottom basement on the thing, simply because it is meaningless today. You know what $2.50 is today. At the time when the Act was originally brought in, I suppose it had some meaning. It has no meaning today. All we are doing is removing the $2.50.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, that is the calculation. The calculation, as I understand it, if one takes the example that the debt owing for wages is $100 and that it represents six days work, then, under the present statute six days times $2.50 is $15. Deduct the $15 from the $100 and the portion which can be seized is 30 per cent then of the remainder, which is 30 per cent of $85, which is one figure. If the minister is removing the $2.50 per day, then the 30 per cent which can be seized of the $100 is $30 and, instead of being 30 per cent of $85, one has 30 per cent of $100. Therefore, the wage-earner is being penalized to that extent.

I recognize that $2.50 a day is not perhaps an adequate figure—certainly it is very far from being an adequate figure—but I would have assumed that if the minister really wanted to protect the wage-earner in the province, he would have raised the amount from $2.50 a day to some more adequate modern figure, and maintained the protection for the wage-earner. This is the part that concerned me about the bill.

I do not pretend that I really understand it that clearly, but if I am correct, you are removing a portion of the exemption of a wage-earner in the province on the grounds that $2.50 a day now is not a meaningful exemption. The point which we tried to make without too much clarity on second reading is that we think that $2.50 if my understanding is correct, should have in fact been raised and the exemption left in the bill. Instead of $2.50 a day perhaps it should have been something in the neighbourhood of, say, $10 a day or $12 or $15 a day as an exemption, in which case the wage-earner would have been fully protected.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I appreciate my hon. friend's views on it. They are views that I had at the beginning, too, and I questioned my officials on it. It was felt, and I certainly go along with this, that the protection is still there in the 70 per cent figure.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill? Any comments, questions or amendments to any part of the bill?

Bill 37 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole House reports two bills without amendment and two bills with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 24, An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport.

Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Bill 27, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill 37, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(*continued*)

On vote 1702.

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. We are on vote 1702 and considering item 3. The member for Windsor West. I would suggest we give the minister a chance to get settled first.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): I would ask the minister to inform me in connection with community development—the next item —where are the expenditures for 1969-1970 located in the public accounts?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): It would be in with the citizenship figures. In the last accounts, the organization was not shown as split into three branches which it is now.

Mr. De Monte: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Now the member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): on that same point, Mr. Chairman, in the Treasurer's budget statement. When we get some kind of estimate of the actual portion of the previous year's appropriation which has been expended. With the form of estimates for 1971-1972 before us, we can look at the amount to be voted this year, $378,300, in respect to item 3, community development, the 1970-1971 estimate of which was $136,300 and the amount actually spent in fiscal 1969.

Does the minister, in respect to these various items—and I will ask in regard to community development, in particular—know now what the interim expenditure for fiscal 1970 is likely to be or has he closed his accounts so that he can tell us what the actual expenditures for fiscal 1970 amounted to?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was just wondering what the hon. member wants. We are dealing with item—

Mr. Peacock: Three.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Item 3 is community development. That was part and parcel of citizenship in the last public accounts.

Mr. Peacock: I understand that in respect of public accounts, it was shown as part of citizenship. But in the preparation of these estimates, Mr. Chairman, there is a figure of $136,300 which the Legislature was asked to vote, and did vote, for fiscal year ending March 31, 1971. Presumably that was separated out of citizenship for the purpose of reporting into it this year, but that was the proportion to be spent on community development.

But I would like to ask the minister if he can now tell us the figure actually expended for community development as of March 31, 1971—to compare the figure actually expended with the figure which the Legislature voted last year for 1970-1971. Usually there are eight or nine months actual expenditure and then some kind of estimate for the last three or four months which gives, at least, the Treasury Board or the taxation and fiscal policy planning branch—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We can get that figure. It will take a moment or two to get. We are in this position that we have this reconciliation and then we have a Treasury Board order which came in the middle of the year and a reorganization of the department. That is why these figures are not as readily available.

Mr. Peacock: So it is likely, then, if there were—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps I might tell the hon. member—this may be the answer he is seeking—all of the money was passed.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that, basically, was what I was seeking—whether or not all of the funds voted by the Legislature for the community development programme had been expended. The minister did mention a Treasury Board order so presumably something in excess of $133,300 was expended.

I go back then to the point we were at upon adjournment Tuesday evening, which was a discussion of how much of the $120,000 transfer payments for community projects in item 3 had been committed. The minister, I believe, just as we closed indicated that something over $5,000 had been committed. That leads me to ask, of the balance of the $120,000, can the minister not find room for the funding of the expenses of delegates to the forthcoming—this weekend—conference on tenants' affairs?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In conjunction with that $130,000, $50,000 of that will be going to community information centres which leaves a balance of $10,000 which is shown as going to the Ontario Conference of Local Government. That leaves $70,000 which will be available for community development projects. I have explained to the hon. member at some length, the last time these estimates were up, the fact that particular request did not meet our criteria.

Now as I say to him there is nothing to prevent us to giving that kind of money but our responsibility at the present time is to the local level. We have gone beyond that to have a regional support and a provincial support, and we feel that that is as far as we should go at the present time.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I know that other members will want to speak to that particular item. It has been raised in question period as it was, last Tuesday evening. May I ask questions about the nature of the Ontario Conference on Local Government, for which $10,000 is to be granted? Is that a conference of persons active in community development?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think it would be of interest if I gave this in some detail. You will recall that this was raised by the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), and he made reference to the Throne Speech about the reorganization of the department, and that as part of the reorganization the municipal education function of The Department of Municipal Affairs was, in fact, transferred to this department. This programme has been involved in planning and offering courses and seminars designed to acquaint the public, as well as elected and appointed officials, with the functions and responsibilities of municipal government.

One of the important aspects of this programme has been its involvement in a series of public courses sponsored by the Ontario Conference on Local Government. Now this conference is a—it is not really in the layman's language what a conference is—it is a non-profit organization, comprised of several provincial bodies encouraging more understanding and participation in municipal affairs in a threefold manner: To interest citizens generally in local government, by increasing their knowledge and understanding in this area; to provide knowledge to those who would serve on public bodies, either elected or appointed; to encourage citizen participation in local government.

This particular conference is made up of the Association of Counties and Regions of Ontario, the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves, the Bureau of Municipal Research, the City Engineers Association, the Community Planning Association of Canada, The Department of Municipal Affairs, our own department, The Department of Treasury and Economics, Municipal World, a publication, the Ontario Association of Rural Municipalities, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, the Ontario Jaycees, the Ontario Municipal Association and the Institute of Local Government. This is an outright grant of $10,000 as requested by the conference to assist them in responding to increased demands for courses, to expand and improve programme content and to investigate new approaches to reach new audiences—that is, newcomers, the young, the uninvolved and similar groups.

Mr. Peacock: I am sorry. I may not have caught it, but who is enrolled in courses sponsored by the conference?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Anybody and everybody within a community who seeks participation to become more familiar with the workings of local government. Everybody is invited but my understanding is that the conference is going to have an outreaching programme—that is, it is going to reach out to the newcomers and to the young people, to have them as part of the conference.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask the minister how a person, resident in a neighbourhood subject to redevelopment, would find his way to enrolment in a course offered by the conference, so that he could learn how to deal with the rigmarole of redevelopment, rezoning and so forth, to successfully fight it off, if that was his wish? Would he have any access to the courses? How would he get them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are advertised in advance and he would just apply.

Mr. Peacock: Are they offered in the evening courses of the local boards of education?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, they are not. They are offered in the evening.

Mr. Peacock: But where?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But not through the schools.

Mr. Peacock: Where are the courses given?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be in a variety of places. The local community college; I would imagine in a hall; wherever the sponsoring group felt that it was feasible and the best place to hold such a meeting.

Mr. Peacock: Which of that long list of sponsors, Mr. Chairman, have, in fact, put on courses in awareness of local government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are partners. They are participants in the conference which is I guess, a technical term. It could be an association. It could be a committee. It could be a council, but for their purposes they adopted the term conference—I guess because their activity is generally based.

Mr. Peacock: By conference, the minister means a meeting; the congress of people or delegates. It means an on-going organization.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is an on-going organization which has taken unto itself the name conference.

Mr. Peacock: Like the mid-western conference of Teamsters?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right.

Mr. Peacock: The minister will be familiar with that analogy, no doubt.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are the religious conferences too.

Mr. Peacock: If it is an on-going body then with some kind of secretariat or executive, there must be in its possession, among its records, a list of courses and where they are offered; and whether or not the courses are subject to an admission fee or charge for those who enrol. Does the minister have that information? The names of the courses?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is $15 per person The course runs for six consecutive weeks with each session of two hours. The History of Local Government in Ontario; Forms and Structures of the Municipal Government of Ontario; The Role of the Province; How the Municipal Corporation Operates; Functions and Special Services of the Municipality; Local Boards and Commissions; Municipal Assessment; Municipal Finance; Parliametary Procedure in the Council Chamber; Community Planning; Participation in Your Local Government; Local Government in Ontario—Its Future Is Yours—

Mr. Peacock: Can the minister tell us something about the background of those who enrolled—who took the courses? Are they drawn from local government, local agencies, from service clubs or where?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I thought I had answered you. Did the hon. member want to know who actually takes the courses? There could be a whole range. It could be a housewife. It could be somebody who wants to enter into the elected field or perhaps somebody who is very active in a community group who wants to acquire certain expertise in municipal services, in finding his way around.

Mr. Peacock: I heard the minister's answer, Mr. Chairman, but given the $15 enrolment fee, I want to know who actually enrolled in the past when such courses were given and there was a $15 fee. I want to know why the $15 fee is charged when the government is giving a grant of $10,000 with a view to encouraging skills on the part of people engaged in community development.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not have that particular information at present. I have a good deal of information at present about the conference. I would be glad to send the hon. member, in due course, a copy of this and perhaps we might make it available to all members of the House.

With respect to the registration fee of $15, if the hon. member thinks that that might be something that prevents people from participating, our participation of membership in the conference, we hope, will alleviate the necessity of the continuation of a fee of $15.

Mr. Peacock: Sure, I think it should, Mr. Chairman. The amount of the grant is very large in relationship to the prizes that the minister is giving to individual community development projects in the other part of this item—$120,000.

It strikes me that in the past the membership in the courses has tended to come from persons already engaged in government directly as full-time employees. Or perhaps they are members of service clubs, like members of the Chambers of Commerce, who are assigned by their organization to attend council meetings and want to upgrade their knowledge about the workings of the local municipal councils and government agencies.

It does not seem appropriate that there should be a $15 charge for enrolment in such a course when, within the same item, the minister is handing out such a small

sum of money, seed money as he terms it, to the community organizations made up largely of people who, perhaps, have had no contact with government at all in the past; and whose object is to find out how to make that contact and who may go first to their federal member if the problem is a local municipal one, or go to the local municipal alderman if the problem really has something to do with the federal government. When the people seeking enrolment are ordinary members of a community organization or an association of persons seeking to achieve some local residents' objective, it is rather inappropriate that a $15 fee should be charged.

The minister's colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), who reports to the Legislature for the Ontario Housing Corporation, has got an organization or a conference similar to this, The Ontario Housing Authorities Association.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let me just say to the hon. member that the purpose of this grant, which is the first grant of its kind, is predicated on the fact that the Canada conference will make its courses more readily available to those who want to become better versed in municipal government.

Mr. Peacock: That means the elimination of the fee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know whether it will eliminate it. We are only one of the 15 partners involved. As I indicated to the hon. member, they have indicated and we share with them, the necessity of an outreach programme; that is, to reach out and bring into the conference, or as participants in the courses, those who have not been heretofore participating. That is the rationale behind the grant.

Mr. Peacock: Right, surely it is. That is why the minister's advisers nod their heads, that the fee will not be charged to such persons. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Trade and Development's (Mr. Grossman) comparable conference or organization, the Association of Ontario Housing Authorities, does exactly the same thing.

It has an outreach programme to its tenant clients and it charges them a $25 registration fee when they arrive at the conference in London, or elsewhere. It is always the case that the professionals or the businessmen or the politicians representing their organizations get their fee paid for them. But chances are that the person going there is an individual who wants to take advantage of the courses or the proceedings of the conference or whatever and pays the fee himself.

It surely acts as a deterrent to whatever purposes the minister conceives for this particular grant. May I ask—we must not touch on that either, Mr. Chairman—that use of the world outreach. I understand it is an on-going programme with one of the religious denominations in Canada, so I do not presume to comment on that when it is used by the Provincial Secretary.

May I ask the minister, in regard to the involvement of his branch with the Windsor West Citizens Organization, what has become of his recommendation—or that of his director—to Ontario Housing Corporation regarding the request of the WWCO for assistance in the acquisition of a property on St. Josephs Street in the west end of Windsor for recreation and other purposes, such as an action centre?

I know that the minister's branch in January, 1971, prepared a report in regard to this request of the WWCO. It was seeking to acquire this property itself. Instead an alternative suggestion was made, I think, in the report to the minister by his staff and I want to know if the minister has sent that on to OHC and if he has heard back from the Ontario Housing Corporation in regard to that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we have sent that on.

Mr. Peacock: Has the minister heard back from OHC as to whether it accepts whatever he has recommended?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not as yet.

Mr. Peacock: Did the minister recommend that the OHC should either purchase the lands in question, or assist WWCO with the acquisition of the lands?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think the tone of our communication was to encourage them to look upon the matter with favour.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, in connection with community development, I understand that in the budget for 1970-1971 the department intends to make grants in the total amount of $130,000. Are there any other grants in that department that are made under that heading?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As the hon. member will see, each activity has its own list of transfer payments, and this $130,000 is broken down, as I said, into $10,000 for the conference on local government, $50,000 and $70,000.

Mr. De Monte: Yes, I appreciate how it is broken down, and I also understand that you gave out the names of other organizations that are collecting under this $130,000 or possibly will collect under that.

The only thing that seems to me to be completely out of the ordinary and a bit illogical. It takes $248,000, made up of salaries, wages, employee benefits, transportation, communication services, supplies and equipment, to hand out $130,000. That seems to me to be a bit much. Can you explain how many employees it takes to hand out $130,000, and why it costs $248,000 to hand that money out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are 14 employees. But I wonder if I can just outline for the hon. member—

Mr. De Monte: No, no, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. minister to answer my question. I want to know why it takes $248,000 to hand out $130,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, it does not take $248,000 to hand out $130,000. I would like to explain to the hon. member where that $248,000 goes to, because as a matter of fact, the grants programme is really an incidental to the resource programme that the branch provides. The 14 people involved are people who are trained in community development and they provide information, advice and consultation to individuals, to citizens' groups and to other government departments.

We initiate, as we were discussing the other day, community awareness conferences to facilitate community dialogue of priorities and goals and to stimulate action programmes to meet identifying needs. The branch also provides the planning material and resources these may require and we have had six conferences and are planning three more for this year.

The grants last year, totalling $35,000, were distributed to 33 different community groups, in addition to the organizational resources, booklets and consultations. I can assure the hon. member it is not just a question of somebody writing in and asking for a grant, there is a whole procedure and we have outlined these procedures in the book that is placed on every member's desk, which indicates—

Mr. De Monte: It takes 14 men or one man to write that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —which indicates the scope of the work and then we produce the services resource pools, such as audio visual aids, and other techniques.

We have prepared discussion leaders' handbooks and books on conference planning for involvement. The hon. member may think that these things are readily available, but the interesting thing was that they had not been readily available to community groups.

Then we have such things as this one, the most recent, a book—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Can you withdraw this from circulation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —a book called, "Getting People Together" resources available to neighbourhood and community groups, director of citizen and community groups, branch film. I would just say to the interjection of the hon. leader of the NDP, I almost feel that if we had not prepared this we would be compelled to prepare it very specifically for his information because he seems to have a unique unawareness of it.

Mr. Lewis: But not such gobbledygook as this. Surely it was written by the hon. minister.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: I just wanted to make a point, Mr. Chairman, about this so-called information pamphlet. I goes on with a lot of gobbledygook for at least five pages, and at the end it says something like "We are willing to hand you money but only on the basis that you get no financial assistance anywhere else." Is that the policy of the department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is not completely the policy, except that our staff are aware of other sources where the jurisdiction properly lies and often we will refer people to that source. For example, we were just discussing a referral to the Ontario Housing Corporation. A very important part of this branch activity is the community information services, and this staff provides a back-up for these 11 information centres scattered around the province which we are in the process of experimenting and evaluating.

Mr. De Monte: I understand you have one in Toronto now, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have several in Toronto.

Mr. De Monte: You have one down near College and—what is the other street off College Street?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The one at Major Street is an office which is under the sponsorship of The Department of Labour, with whom we work very closely.

Mr. De Monte: Can I have, then, the names of the people who are employed in that office by yourself?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No we do not have that.

Mr. De Monte: What is the purpose of that information centre? How much does it cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would ask the hon. member to direct those questions to the Minister of Labour, during the course of his estimates, who will have all of the details I am sure with respect to that office. Our relationship with them is, they are contemplating an extension of the programme and they turned to us to see how any expansion would emerge, whether it would be theirs or a joint programme.

Mr. De Monte: May I ask then where the department's information centres are located?

Mr. Lewis: In other words, your department is of no consequence at all to these information centres? All this is nonsense you are taking us through?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member has asked a question. Brockville—

Mr. De Monte: In Toronto I mean, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I just give the House the details? In Brockville, Dial Aid; in Hamilton Central Information; in London, Information London; Orillia Information Centre; Ottawa Community Information Service; St. Catharines Community Information Services and Health Care; Sault Ste. Marie Community Information and Referral Centre and in Toronto there are four community information centres: Earlscourt Information Services, Lawrence Heights Information Centre, Thorncliffe Information Post—

Mr. De Monte: How many people do those information centres employ from your department directly?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: None!

Mr. Lewis: Oh none!

Mr. De Monte: None?

Mr. Lewis: That is a pretty powerful programme the minister has got going there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of the House that this is a partnership programme in which we are engaged. We are in partnership with community agencies—

Mr. Lewis: Of what consists the minister's partnerships?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and municipalities which have a great deal of autonomy. We have embarked upon this programme which is fairly unique. That is why there was tabled in this House an interim appraisal. We look forward to a final report in the fall and, based on that final report, we will know the direction in which we should best go in the provision of these terms.

Mr. De Monte: At the Earlscourt information centre, the department has no employees there but how much money does it cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In September of last year a grant of $12,000 was made to the Earlscourt area. The purpose is to enable a co-ordinator to be employed and other measures taken to assist and strengthen information and advice services—

Mr. De Monte: Yes; I saw that. I saw that very meeting. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —being offered to immigrants by a variety of agencies and to explore the possibility of new services. The project is being implemented by the community committee on immigrants. The neighbourhood information centres presently sharing in this undertaking are the Earlscourt information service, which operates out of the Faith United Church and the Earlscourt Public Library, the ACLI information centre at St. Alphonse Church, the York information service at St. Thomas Aquinas School, the Italian Immigrant Aid Society at St. Clair Avenue West—

Mr. De Monte: No. That is not correct. The minister knows it is not correct. The

Italian Immigrant Aid Society has been trying to get a grant from his department for years and he gave it to the wrong people. He knows it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the Earlscourt—

Mr. De Monte: And he knows—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the Earlscourt information—

Mr. De Monte: This whole affair is becoming ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order please. The minister has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Earlscourt information service Mr. Chairman, is unique and has some unique features.

Mr. De Monte: It was in September of last year—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —of all of the groups that we are experimenting with—

Mr. De Monte: It is an experiment all right. It has lost the minister $12,000 right down the drain.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —this has an individual feature. The hon. member said that this $12,000 went down the drain?

Mr. De Monte: I say it will.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It will?

Mr. De Monte: Why does the minister not give it to the right people? Why did he not give it to the Italian Immigrant Aid Society when they asked him for it? They have a lot of people up there who need help.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have outlined to the committee the work of the Earlscourt information services, Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: This is the biggest house of cards.

Mr. De Monte: Just a moment, I want to know the names of those people on that committee.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. De Monte: Right now. Mr. Chairman, I do not mind sitting here patiently and the minister asking questions, but I want answers to the little game that is going on up there and I want them fast. I want the names, addresses and to what organizations those people belong.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to supply the details.

Mr. De Monte: Now; do not send me a list. I want the names read out in this chamber.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would be very happy to supply the hon. member with all of the details of all of the membership of all of the agencies involved.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I happen to have some knowledge about this very little incident. May I inform this House that there are organizations in that area which attempt to help immigrants and they really attempt to help immigrants. There are Italian immigrant aid societies, Portuguese immigrant aid societies and Greek immigrant aid societies. They form a group of people, the Earlscourt group, up there and the minister gives them $12,000 on the snap of a finger, when these other organizations have been asking his department for assistance for the last five years and he has been handing out peanuts to them. I want to know, right now, what organizations are in this so-called Earlscourt organization. I want to know their names and I want to know them very quickly, because $12,000 for an organization that held a meeting about a month before and decided to go into community work—

There were established organizations in that area which had been there for four years doing good work and this minister refused to do anything for them. Yet this organization, which did not exist two months before the grant was given, was given a grant without so much as looking at what in heaven's name these people were attempting to do. I understand that they were going to look into the possibility of helping immigrants in Toronto. They were going to look into it—I saw the minutes, and if I find them I am going to table them in this House.

I would like to know why the established organizations were not approached in order to obtain a grant and I want to know why, when the organizations did ask for a grant, they were not given a grant. This pamphlet is an insult to this department and it is an insult to this House.

Mr. Lewis: It is a piece of claptrap.

Mr. De Monte: It is a piece of propaganda, the worst type of propaganda I have seen in a long time. It is full of platitudes, full of nothings, and it is about time these things stopped and this department stopped them now.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, one would think the minister wrote it himself.

Mr. De Monte: And how much did this pamphlet cost? May I ask the minister how much this pamphlet cost? One would think he would have less—he just has too much—nerve.

Mr. Lewis: He has no nerve; it is a lack of intelligence.

Mr. De Monte: Lack of intelligence, lack of any reason or logic—he is spending millions of dollars, throwing money down the drain.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the—the minister make a judgement—

Mr. De Monte: The minister would get mad too if he saw people in my riding who need help. Come up to my riding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The minister has made a judgement; the record will show the department's judgement was based on the making of the grant. The hon. member has placed himself on record, which is an evaluation of a judgement of the programme.

Mr. Lewis: Well, answer the member's questions.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Time will tell whose evaluation was the proper one.

Mr. De Monte: I am not afraid of that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just for the purpose of the record, in the light of the kind of language—the unrestrained, rather abusive language—

Mr. De Monte: Oh, come on; answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let the record show the following grants:

Community Welfare Council of Brantford and Brant county—I believe the members are Mr. Nixon and Mr. Makarchuk—$700.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: The point of order is that no one in this House has elicited that information from the minister. It may come during his estimates. A specific member has asked for specific answers to questions. This has absolutely nothing to do with the discussion that is now taking place, and the Chair should not allow the time of the House to be used in this way.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: This has nothing to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking to the point of order, the hon. leader of the NDP made an extravagant statement—

Mr. Lewis: About what?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —about the work of the department. A house of cards? Well let us see what the cards are.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is answering the questions from the member for Dovercourt.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am answering the interjection of the hon. leader of the NDP. If he will persist in interjecting this unrestrained language, I have the right.

Mr. Lewis: We will also name the ones the minister left out.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let us see what the cards are. Let the record show. Shelburne Community Association, Burlington; University of Guelph Health, University Volunteers for Community Programme, member Harry Worton; Hamilton Growth Centre, members Ian Deans, John Smith, Norman Davison, Reg Gisborn, Ada Pritchard; Hamilton National Conference of Jewish Women, members Ian Deans, Reg Gisborn, John Smith, Ada Pritchard, Norman Davison.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean "members"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —The Oshawa Social Planning Council, Clifford G. Pilkey.

Mr. Lewis: Well what do you mean "members"? What has "members" got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that the members supported these individual grants—that they were involved.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: How were they involved?

An hon. member: They never made any announcements.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They were told of them. Very often—

Mr. Lewis: They were told of them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —very often their opinions were solicited, in many cases.

Mr. Peacock: They supported the organizations making applications.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In London; the Ottawa; Ottawa; Ottawa; Ottawa; Peterborough, Ontario Self-help Association, member W. G. Pitman.

Mr. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): How many grant cheques did Liberals and New Democrats hand out though?

Mr. Peacock: Did you send us the cheque for the WWCO grant?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I just say this—

Mr. Peacock: To hand out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What statistics does the hon. member want?

Mr. Stokes: I want to know how many Liberals and New Democrats in this House passed out the cheques for these grants in the same fashion the Tory members did?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is a figure I do not have. But I do have this. Of the grants approved the breakdown by party representation—

Mr. Lewis: What has that got to do with it? Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The NDP—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A point of information.

Mr. Lewis: You are just corrupting your whole programme.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The NDP grants approved, 20; the Liberals grants approved, six; the PC grants approved, 15.

Mr. Lewis: So what has that got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just a piece of interesting information.

Mr. Lewis: How many of your grants did you give to northern Ontario? Maybe you would like to tell us that?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: How many did you give to northern Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for York Centre has the floor. Has the member for Dovercourt finished?

Mr. De Monte: I forgot what it was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: How many? One grant. In 1970-71, how many grants to northern Ontario?

Mr. Stokes: That is the fellow you are trying to get to run for the Tories in my riding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that we respond to requests—

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): A good candidate too.

Mr. Lewis: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and this brochure will receive some considerable distribution to make sure people are aware of the programme and that the requests will come forward.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. minister says he responds to requests, how many requests has he had from immigrant aid societies and how many grants did he make?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Italian Immigrant Aid Society received $2,500 last year and they received this year, indirectly through proxy, $1,000. I have already indicated to them that we will be considering their programme for this coming year. The hon. member should realize that this is a fairly new programme and initially a fairly small programme. We are going to be faced with a considerable number of requests as this programme becomes better known.

Mr. De Monte: May I ask the hon. minister, did he give $3,500 to the Italian Immigrant Aid in the last two years?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, last year. The hon. member should remember that last year all

that we had available was $13,000–$14,500. This year we have $148,000, so that we will be able to meet more requests in larger amounts.

Mr. De Monte: I thought we voted $50,000 for this programme last year or something in excess of $13,000.

Mr. D. M. Deacon: (York Centre): Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. De Monte: Fifty thousand dollars was voted.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not so.

Mr. De Monte: May I ask then how much was voted last year? I do not have last year's estimates here. How much was voted?

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): He told you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was $14,500.

Mr. De Monte: And of that, $12,000 went to the Earlscourt organization?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You have jumped from citizenship, which we already have passed, Mr. Chairman. We are on community development now. Earlscourt is part of our community development.

Mr. De Monte: All right then. Let us get back to community development. May I ask the hon. minister how long the Earlscourt community development, or whatever the name is, has been in existence, what are its purposes and objects, and who are the members of this organization, and when the grant was given?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, some of the information I undertook to give to the hon. member. Now, let me say this—

Mr. De Monte: No, I want the answers.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will give you the answer. There are information centres which have been operating for a good number of years—

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. De Monte: Oh, be quiet! On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the minister a specific question, and the minister goes off on some tangent and will not answer my question. Now I asked the hon. minister through you and I wish you would rule on it. I have asked him a specific question and I require a specific answer.

Mr. Chairman: As has been stated many times before, the minister has the privilege of answering in whichever way he sees fit.

Mr. De Monte: Oh!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He has to answer it, though.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just sit quietly for a moment and digest the information I am about to give him—

Mr. De Monte: Give me the answer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was an information centre, Mr. Chairman, at the Faith United Church, and at the Earlscourt Public Library. There was an information service at St. Alphonse Church. There was the York information service at St. Thomas Aquinas School, and there was the Italian Immigrant Aid Society, operating out of St. Clair Avenue West, and the St. Clair Roman Catholic Church.

Now all of these individual information centres were operating in this area separately, and what we have done is we have provided—they got together to form an umbrella organization called the Earlscourt Information Services, which is a federation, if I may use the term, of all of these agencies. We are providing funds to the federation in order to service its component parts.

Some of these have been in existence for quite a number of years. One of the personalities involved is—

Mr. De Monte: Give me all the names of the people involved. I want the names of the people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is Gene Sheck of the University of Toronto School of Social Work; Mr. Edward Gale of the Catholic Family Services; Mr. A. Mozta, who is the representative of the Associane Catolic Labotari Italiani, which is the ACLI that I referred to; Mr. Valurani, representative of York information centre; Mrs. Machelli Topa—she is a representative of the Earlscourt Public Library information centre; and Mrs. Elizabeth Luceby, representative of Faith United Church information centre; Father Polito of St. Clair church—he is secretary; Mrs. Nadia

Costa of the Italian Consulate General; Mrs. Ursola Apoloni—she is a part-time co-ordinator; Mrs. Jean Wailing, representative of the Social Planning Council; and of course, Mrs. Margaret Northway whose name should be familiar to anyone in this House and anybody, really, in the Metropolitan area. She is acclaimed as one of the outstanding authorities and workers in this field. And the hon. leader of the NDP will remember her outstanding work, "Newcomers in Transition," a blue book that formed the basis of considerable debates.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that again I know of no group of people in Toronto more capable of carrying out the kind of job they are undertaking than the list of names I have just read.

Mr. De Monte: Where is their office or their point of operation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon member seems unable to grasp the significance—

Mr. De Monte: No, I just want to know where the office is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is a federation. Their hope is to have an office to co-ordinate, but presently they are operating out of one of the offices. They are not wasting any money on setting up another office. They want mainly the personnel involved.

Mr. De Monte: Mainly the personnel? Which personnel?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The co-ordinator.

Mr. De Monte: What is his name?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mrs. Nadia Costa is, I think, on a part-time basis, now the co-ordinator.

Mr. De Monte: How much is she making?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We made the grant, Mr. Chairman, to the federation, the Earlscourt information services. It will be their responsibility to dispense with the money.

Mr. De Monte: What budget? Did the minister get a copy of the budget they intended to use?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The bulk of the work of all these agencies is on a voluntary basis.

Mr. De Monte: Yes, but they must have a budget, Mr. Chairman. Before they are given a grant, they must present a budget. Does the minister have the minutes of their first meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Most of the budget is the office space and facilities made available by the individual organizations.

Mr. De Monte: But if the minister does not know how they are going to spend their money, how could he give them a grant? I mean, I want to know what they are doing, where they are spending their money, where their office is, if there is one, or how the money is split up between the different organizations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member's information, each one of these organizations has been operating as an information centre in that general area west of Bathurst going, I would imagine, right past Dufferin Street, right over to Earlscourt Avenue. A number of agencies. There would be overlapping, there would be people moving, I would imagine, across distances, and some of them are excellent volunteers but they lack expertise. This umbrella group was formed to get together to co-ordinate the activities and to strengthen them by providing a full-time expert co-ordinator to carry this work out.

Mr. De Monte: Well, it is obvious there is no budget. Is that correct? May I ask the minister this question then: Is the minister saying that the Italian Immigrant Aid Society was part of this whole organization?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think the Iitalian Immigrant Aid Society was sort of in on the proceedings but it will be operating on its own.

Mr. De Monte: That is right. Now, am I not correct in assuming that the purpose of whatever money was given to these people was not for community development? Was it not for a project for investigation or review and that is not going to be used for community development?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know what the hon. member means by investigation.

Mr. De Monte: Well, not investigation—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Information to support information and referral services at the very local grass-roots level.

Mr. De Monte: Was it for the purposes of a study?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, an action programme.

Mr. Lewis: An action programme?

Mr. De Monte: Well, what type of action were they going to take?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say this, I explained to the hon. member that we are in an experimental stage, we have provided this group—which is the only group I believe which is a federated group—and we will evaluate their programme to see how it functions in comparison with individual centres operating on their own.

Mr. De Monte: What type of programme do they have?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are strengthening the information and advice centres which have been operating out of the individual agencies.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you not just give your microphone to your deputy and maybe we could get somewhere? He can just give us the answers direct.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, $12,000 is a lot of money. I know that a lot of the immigrant aid societies—and I have a great many immigrants in my riding, I have a great many of them—and it seems ludicrous to me that you go out and hand the money to an organization that was just formed instead of going to the organizations that are already there, who are functioning, who are doing the work, and you give the money to someone else.

There is no doubt that the Italian Immigrant Aid Society is not part of that group, and that they asked you for a grant and that you gave them practically nothing, and that the society might even close its doors for lack of funds. That is the point—that the Italian Immigrant Aid Society might have to close its doors for lack of funds. It has been in existence since 1952, it has done great work among the immigrants and it will continue to do great work among the immigrants and other people in that area, but you insist on starting other organizations with pie-in-the-sky ideas and you have the established organizations there that can be used with minimum grants to do good work, and you just refuse to do it; you go out and start up another organization, another study group, another study of a study.

This is a report of a study of a study that is being carried on. It cost $1,000, I understand, $1,000 to do a study of an on-going study. Now with the greatest of respect Mr. Chairman, we are spending the taxpayers' money here. It is not stuff that comes off the trees. The taxpayers are paying for this. It seems to me that the hon. minister could perhaps go down and look at the organizations that are already in existence and use them and give them proper grants. They can do good work; they can do terrific work without having to study studies. I do submit, Mr. Chairman, that $12,000 to have a study and to hire a co-ordinator is money that perhaps is not well spent. They could have given each individual group some money to carry on. Those groups up there might have to close up very shortly because they are going to run out of funds. They just do not have them; they just have not got the funds.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of rather simple questions I would like to put to the minister to get a few answers.

Mr. De Monte: The member will get no answers.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, member for York Centre, I will try to be kind for a change.

Mr. Chairman: I will alternate the speakers from between the two parties.

Mr. Lewis: That is judicious of you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some information from the minister about the extent of his staff to undertake this grandiose plan of community development across the Province of Ontario about which this pamphlet speaks so fulsomely. The 14 people whom he described works out to one person for each half-million residents of Ontario. The full breadth of the plan becomes apparent when one thinks of the keen person-to-person service and involvement that is inherent in one per 500,000. What do these 14 people do? How are they assigned? How are they broken down within the community development apparatus?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are, Mr. Chairman, eight officers and six supportive staff. I think the members of the opposition will have to get together. I think the inference of the member for Dovercourt was that the staff was completely unnecessary and I gather from the tone of the hon. member for Scarborough West that he thinks that they are too few.

May I say that this, the community services branch is the first phase. I think that is the term we use. We have completed the first phase. It is a young programme. Community development is the youngest of all the programmes. We are meeting the requests as they come in and the assignments. There are two who are assigned for group services, three for field services, two for consulting services, and one for the community advice centres and the director.

Now if the hon. member, if the leader, implies that it is not enough—

Mr. Lewis: I just asked a question.

Mr. Nixon: Wait till you are hurt.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —I would be in agreement with him. But I can say this that, of all of the developments in the government and in this branch, this particular one, I think, has one of the greatest potential.

Mr. Lewis: Right. I did not hear whether the minister said potential or pretension, because there is an important distinction there. And what offends—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I said potential.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well what offends us on this side of the House is the pretension to which the minister is giving this community development programme, and all that he has surrounded it with. Mr. Chairman, all of us will keep our equanimity and our cool in debating with this minister, who is without provocation in the House, but I think it is worth saying that seldom has a programme with less substance ever been submitted to the Legislature. A more inconsequential kind of design has not come from many ministers in our experience. It is particularly true in terms of the comparison with so-called community development. That is really what we want to zero in on in this party.

But before we do that I would like to elicit some of this simple information. You have two group service workers, three field workers, two consultants, one person attached to the information centre, and one director, which means that you have seven potentially active people. Where are your three field workers Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The assignment is to Ottawa, Windsor and the third one would be I assume in Toronto operating on a floating basis. Just to answer—

Mr. Stokes: None in the north?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The north?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —just to answer, "potential" is the word I used.

Look at the growth in one year. Last year's budget was $136,000 in total. This year's budget is $378,000, an increase of $242,000 in a period when anyone who listened to the budget would realize that there was some fairly great restraint put on departmental spending, and certainly one can see where the thrust of our department is.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I can see that you have gone from a negligible figure to an inconsequential figure over the period of one year in terms of community development. Which is the way in which you portentously cast your programme, community development.

Let us discuss a little of it further. You are doing research, you told us yesterday. What direction is your research in and how much have you budgeted for it, and how many people have you assigned to it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, those items were dealt with in the first vote.

Mr. Lewis: Those items were not dealt with in the first vote. I am talking about research for community development purposes, item 3. What precise research are you doing in terms of community development? Not in terms of the whole branch, involving Indian community development and so on, but this specific item.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The main research that is going on in this particular programme is the evaluation of the programme, the grants to citizens' groups and the evaluation of the community information services, of which I have tabled an interim appraisal by Dr. Helling—it is on everybody's copy—and I may say that I have always followed the basic principle that money spent for research is money well spent.

One of the important parts of the first phase was the research branch.

Mr. Lewis: So that the research in this section of the department—if it occurs at all—is confined to evaluation of the grants that are made, the extension of seed money to these various groups, primarily. What does the minister call them—his community awareness composite? That is essentially an evaluation of on-going projects.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Lewis: This department is not doing any research into subjects like experience of community development in other jurisdictions which may have an applicability to Ontario. It is not looking at the youth of field workers in community development projects in other provinces. Its research is confined largely to an evaluation of its SEED money grants.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. member will look back to vote 1701, he will see that there is an item of $112,000 for research. They are the ones who will be developing the total supportive programme for the whole of the department and they will be carrying out assignments for each of the individual branches, including a look at other jurisdictions.

Mr. Lewis: Would you say it was ethnical-cultural research at the time when you researched it or was it multilingual dialogue or perhaps it was multicultural congressional attitudes. I forget which it might have been but it was more than just the community development.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The research branch is a supportive service for the whole department, and it will be doing research for the citizenship branch, for the Indian community, for the community development—all of the department's activities.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Mr. Chairman, some of our friends from Sudbury who have been involved in the preparation up there of the conference which is to follow in a few weeks —one of these community awareness conferences—indicated to us that there came a request to the department for a permanent staff or some consistent staff support during the course of preparation of the conference and thereafter, and that request was not met. Why was that request not met?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That request will be definite at the conclusion of the conference, after it has been held.

Mr. Lewis: If I may gather directly, Mr. Chairman, not of course implying any discrimination on the part of government toward the north, but you are setting up the centres in Windsor, Ottawa and Toronto—Ottawa if I recall is established; Windsor will be established in the fall; Toronto is pending—the north—Sudbury—makes a specific request for a full-time person and received, they said, a letter in reply which was difficult to evaluate.

The letter had a certain tone of ambiguity to it. Can the minister indicate what his intentions are?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, regardless of how the hon. member or anybody interpreted that letter, the fact of the matter is that the matter will be considered at the conclusion of the conference, to see what the feedback and the feeling of the community is.

And with respect to the north, we are going to have a worker posted there in Thunder Bay, I believe it is, Mr. Roman Katreshan, who is citizenship officer and an excellent person.

Mr. Lewis: Citizenship officer?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Not one of your rarefied community development officers, a citizenship officer? Not part of this portion of the department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But he—

Mr. Lewis: Yes I know, he is a man of great and infinite capacity—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: —who will cover many phases.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. You have got it. You have got it completely.

Mr. Lewis: But he is not a community development officer?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member and I are in complete agreement.

Mr. Lewis: Right, right! But he is not a community development officer, which means that under this programme and this branch for which moneys are allocated, there is not a penny for full-time personnel or field services for northern Ontario. Not a single penny.

Now I, for one, am not sure the north is missing anything, frankly. I am not sure that it would mean anything to have someone from this branch there—expect another administrative irritant for the community—because I cannot imagine for instance what your field worker in Ottawa does. I assume that he or she, whoever it may be, accepts a great many inquiries, writes a great many letters, sends on a great many applications but it would be fasciniating to know the direct community work which is done.

The one request you have had in that department for direct community work at

the grass roots level, which some of us call community development, has not been responded to, the request from Sudbury. All that you have by way of staff are staff who process the applications, who reply to them, who spend a day now and again on community awareness conferences. That has become clear in the minister's responses to questions. Staff who are probably capable, I suspect, of doing much more and who knows, might wish to do more, but within the confines of this programme are pretty constrained. Is that fair enough Mr. Minister, or—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not quite. We have an officer in Ottawa, primarily because of the conference. The citizens' conference which was held has sparked a great deal of interest—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And when I say to the hon. member that there is a great deal of interest on the part of community groups in Ottawa, I know whereof I speak.

Mr. Lewis: Well I am sure sparks are flying everywhere.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are. We have created our own sparks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Again I say, we are having a conference—and the same for the Windsor area, and I am sure that the hon. member for Windsor would not want to see our officers sent out of there.

Mr. Lewis: He is not there yet.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He will be there.

Mr. Peacock: When?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When the Sudbury conference is out—

Mr. Lewis: Kind of hard to take the officer out when he is not there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When the Sudbury conference is held—

Mr. Peacock: He is orientating as you would say.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —we will see what emerges as a result of that conference.

Mr. Lewis: I see, a sort of form of hope for northern Ontario? Mr. Chairman, the minister does not have anything in his budget for a full-time community development officer anywhere in the Province of Ontario, in terms of working with the community. How many precise projects has your Ottawa community development officer worked in? I mean a number of weeks at a time completely involved in the life of the community? How many?

Not a one, because that is not their job, because their job is to be an information retrieval centre. That is the nature of your department, and this is not the community development branch. This is an information retrieval branch. This is a branch in bits and pieces, a branch of flotsam and jetsam of grants.

This branch has nothing to do with community development. It is a complete corruption of the term, and that is what is so offensive on this side of the House, that you should pretend that in something as sensitive and as important in modern society as community development, to hand out $200 there, $2,000 here to this group or that group, and to hold a few community awareness conferences, you are prepared to sow community development.

It just happens to have fallen into the Provincial Secretary's department because it had nowhere else to go. There was a momentary fetish, Mr. Chairman, to which the Tories latched on, called participatory democracy; citizens participation. The government became a little apprehensive—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Does the hon. member refer to that as a temporary—

Mr. Lewis: For the Tories it is a temporary fetish.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, what a slander on the citizens of the province.

Mr. Lewis: You do not have to worry. I am not worried about our credentials involved in citizen participation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What a slander.

Mr. Lewis: When you give your decision on the Spadina Expressway then we will know about the government sense of citizen participation, and then we will render our decision. Do not tell us about community involvement. Our practice is complete.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): In Saskatchewan we know what they did.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the minister about—

Mr. Yakabuski: Their record, it stinks.

Mr. Lewis: —certain of the individual grants. As I understand it, making notes on some of the things you have indicated, the Canadian Welfare Council received a grant of $570, to send delegates to their annual conference. The Canadian Welfare Council, as it was then called, received $500 to $600 to sponsor delegates to their annual conference. On what basis was that grant extended?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding was that it was a provincial conference.

Mr. Lewis: You mean you were underwriting provincial delegates who were going to a Canadian Welfare Conference held in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was an Ontario level conference.

Mr. Lewis: An Ontario level conference, but sponsored by a national body.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. Was the hon. member not aware of that?

Mr. Lewis: Why then will you not sponsor delegates to a national housing conference which happens to be held in Ontario? In fact, pay the provincial share for delegate attendance at a conference in an almost exactly analagous situation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I have already answered that question at least three times, but I might give the hon. member a further piece of information that we did, there was an Ontario Tenants Association and they held a policy convention and we granted them support.

Mr. Lewis: Right! I am not talking about the Ontario Tenants Association. We know them fairly well too. You may know that some of their senior officers are familiar with politics. We are asking about a group which finds it very difficult to find funds to support their attendance at a conference, and why you are prepared to support the Ontario section of the Canadian Welfare Council but not pay the Ontario contingent to a national housing conference involving low-income earners is an interesting discrimination in the mind of the department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let me say very clearly to the hon. member we did not support the council, we supported a number of delegates—

Mr. Lewis: That is what you are being asked to do.

Mr. De Monte: That is it exactly.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We supported a number of delegates to a provincial—underline provincial—conference that had really as its basis not only housing but a range of matters in the social welfare field. Has the hon. member not gathered the distinction between a national conference and a provincial conference?

Mr. Lewis: I gather this distinction, Mr. Chairman. I think that the government is deliberately isolating low-income housing tenants from attending a conference to discuss their social and community problems and that you are quite determined to discriminate against such tenants because you are concerned of the controversy that would arise. It is a deliberate policy on the part of the Ontario Housing Corporation, the Trade and Development ministry, and this department and you stand alone at the moment amongst the provinces of Canada in that perverse policy.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not so.

Mr. Lewis: At least five of them have already agreed—wait a moment—and the others have indicated that approval will probably be forthcoming by the end of the week. Ontario is the only province that has categorically asserted it will not pick up its share, the only one. Others have not yet given a negative.

Can I ask you about the Community Welfare Council in Brantford? You gave them $700 for a United Appeal kind of discussion. Do you normally give that to other United Appeal groups around the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This was to a community conference and there were 175 people who attended and they dealt with four topics of community concern. They are just a member of the United Appeal. We were not supporting a United Appeal as such, we were supporting an agency which happens to be a member of a United Appeal.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Do you consider that to be community development? To give a grant to a group to participate, as worthy as it may be—perfectly good cause, delighted if they got the money—do you consider that part of community development?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. Do you not?

Mr. Lewis: No, not in the terms that everyone understands the phrase. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would never ask the hon. member for his opinion on whether a grant should or should not be given.

Mr. Lewis: I would be pleased to give grants to organizations seeking to hold a conference to discuss social problems, a grant to an organization that wishes to come together to reflect on the state of the world, but you do not call it community development, because it is not community development, it has nothing to do with community development. This branch has nothing to do with community development, and it should not be pretended that it does.

What about the grant the department gave to the National Council of Jewish Women in Hamilton to sponsor a "This is your candidate" night, a panel discussion among candidates for local election? Is that community development, as it is understood commonly?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the NDP seems to have a very narrow definition of community development.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have a very broad definition.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Anything that involves members of a community—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —is probably, as we go along, part of community development.

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, I am not saying—I want to make it clear our position is not that of the NDP—we are developing programmes in this field. After a period of time we will know, based on our experience, which channels are the most productive, and we will follow those channels. But we are starting off on a very broad base and not on a narrow base.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that the minister is fulfilling the hopes, the aspirations and the objectives of our people, to quote the minister in another context earlier in these estimates. Yet he was not able to fulfil the request of the "Stop Spadina, Save our City" co-ordinating committee. Some of us, working under a misapprehension, would have thought that too was a representative community group—people in the province. How is it the minister turned them down but found money for some of these other groups, such as a local candidate night in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the "Stop Spadina" is a single-purpose undertaking. I may say—

Mr. Lewis: It is not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, if the hon. member thinks it is not, then he does not know what the "Stop Spadina" movement is all about. Any agency that has 99.9 per cent of its effort going into it, certainly it is a single purpose. Now I may say that we have supported CORA, of which I believe the "Stop Spadina" is an agency? Perhaps it is not—certainly I know there is an overlapping in membership. When one sees the names of those who are active in CORA and those who are active in "Stop Spadina"—

Mr. Stokes: The Spadina Expressway will have a very profound effect on the community.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just to get back to community development, to the brochure, Mr. Chairman—if I might just read our interpretation of community development: "It is the very thing that men have been doing for ages—only now it has a name."

Mr. Peacock: Page 2?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On page 2, right.

When pioneers had a barn raising, that was community development. When workers formed unions, that was community development. When neighbours get together to get better roads or school crossing guards or street lights, that's community development.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): They got about as much help from the government as they are getting today.

Mr. Stokes: The minister said when they got together to build a road—does it not apply to stopping a road?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It also says: "And when the poor organize to fight for a better life, that's community development" by our standard. I do not know what it is by the hon. member's.

Mr. Lewis: By the way, Mr. Chairman, who wrote this pamphlet? Was it done within the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A combination of people.

Mr. Lewis: A combination of people?

Mr. De Monte: It took more than one?

Mr. J. Renwick: It was a community effort.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was a departmental effort.

Mr. Lewis: Well, was part of it contracted out perhaps? Did Martin Goldfarb have anything to do with the writing of it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it was produced by our staff. Is the member jealous of their effort?

Mr. Lewis: No, I was just noting some of the extraordinary prose; I was really mostly startled by the insight available to the minister's department. On page 4 they say:

> History shows that people, when they join together in pursuit of a common cause, become the one irresistible human force.

Mr. Peacock: They must have been thinking of Lenin.

Mr. Deacon: They were not thinking of Spadina.

Mr. Lewis: It says:

> When all the members of a group understand what's going on, when they have shared in the process and responsibility of deciding what to do and then doing it.

and so on, then they can solve it.

Then the brochure goes on to say:

> Take reading, for example: Once we have learned what's involved in reading, we can set out to read any book, on any thing, anywhere. The essential tools—our eyes, brain and the knowledge of how to read—are ours and we can use them as we wish.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Sounds like George Kerr.

Mr. Lewis: That is pretty stunning prose. That is really one of those divine insights. For whom was this written? Who is the minister insulting on this occasion? He will have to admit that Joyce himself could not have spun a more mellifluous fabric than this verbal garbage, and he calls it a pamphlet of which he is proud. Look at the bottom of page 6: "Our consultants do not behave as experts who dictate how things should be done—"

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As you would.

Mr. Lewis: It goes on:

> They are people with particular experiences who can share these experiences with you in an attempt to find your solution to your problem. That's why there are "people-people."

Say, now; I know it brings a brave smile of pleasure to the minister's face. I have no doubt he authored it himself. Steam rises from the pages when the pamphlet is opened. Does the minister realize what kind of claptrap this is? I mean, does this pretend to him that there is any substance of awareness of what community development involves?

As a matter of fact, it is put rather well in that one paragraph which is digestible when it talks about trade unions and the poor and neighbourhood groups.

> That sort of total immersion is when a group of people get together, moved by a specific cause, and in this day and age to whom individual community development workers are directed for purposes of assistance to get that group to free itself to engage society.

But what is the minister doing with this branch? He is handing out some money to people who make application. He is setting up community awareness conferences, whose recommendations you pay no heed to whatsoever—none at all—it was demonstrated here the other night. They have recommendations and you do not pay any attention to them for your community awareness conferences.

You pretend to have information centres but you have not put a worker in one of them. You do not pay any money towards them and there is just not any sense of what is involved in community development. Do you have a single worker on staff?

Let me put it this way. Do you have a single worker on staff who is involved in a particular community project anywhere in the Province of Ontario for a number of months, called in to help a given project, because that is community development? Have you got that anywhere?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest. I would think that in spite of everything the hon. member has said about this brochure, if

my name were not on here, I would not be surprised that the next time I walked along past 299 Harbord Street, the NDP headquarters in my riding, this would be there alongside many of the other publications produced by The Department of the Provincial Secretary. Just to prove it is of value; I would hazard a guess as to the value.

Mr. Lewis: No, no!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now having had this debate—

Mr. Lewis: It is the cheapest literature we can get, so we use it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You see, Mr. Chairman, at one time the NDP thought that community development was their private preserve.

Mr. Stokes: You are trying to get into the act but you do not know how. You have not learned the art.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have a government and remember that the government, that this government—

Mr. Stokes: You think community development is sending valentines.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that this government for years has been known as the people's party and now we are just updating it. We are "people people."

Mr. Lewis: Yes? Right!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say this, that I completely differ—

Mr. Lewis: Just a second—I want to make sure that Hansard got that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member and I are—our viewpoint of community development is different. The NDP would have their people behave as experts who would move into a community and dictate how things should be done.

Mr. Lewis: That is a conspiracy theory. The minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) says he sees faces in the crowd.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not act that way. The hon. member has had an opportunity. Would he give me at least the politeness and the courtesy—

Mr. Stokes: He was doing nicely until you interrupted.

Mr. Lawlor: We should send him a valentine.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We believe that a community, a true community development wells up from the people. That is very hard for people in the NDP who would impose their will on people. The hon. leader knows that that is the basic principle of the socialist party. Is the imposition from above of what is best for the people down below. We do not subscribe to that, so that is the difference. I will say this—

Mr. Lewis: You know, it is such nonsense, it is not worth replying to.

Mr. Lawlor: It is absolutely absurd.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —we will be judged, as I have often said, not by the evaluation of the hon. member of our programme but by the people who participated in the programme.

Mr. Lewis: You have not—

Mr. Stokes: You will be judged by the size of your grants.

Mr. Lewis: Nonetheless, you have not answered my question—have you a single worker in the entire department who is involved in a community development project, fulltime for government?

An hon. member: He just answered that.

Mr. Lewis: Have you one?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are involved on a continuous basis with most of the people who receive grants from us. But we do not—we are not—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —part and parcel of the operation, neither of our community development, nor of our information services. Because, Mr. Chairman, if we were, the leader of the NDP would be the first to stand in this House and accuse us of information Ontario, of being involved in the people's—

Mr. Lewis: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We believe in the autonomy of the people. Once they have met our criteria, we give them grants, we give them supportive services, they are by and large on their own. Our people are there only to assist and support as they would want us.

Mr. Martel: Tell the city of Sudbury about the autonomy.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to extend this too far, but the answer to my question is no. Stripped of your lucidity the answer is no. You do not have a single person from government involved in a single community development project in Ontario. Not one. You have a number of people who are involved—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not have a single person dictating at the community level what they should do.

Mr. Lewis: Never mind, stop about dictating, because all over the western world there are community development projects, from the experiences of the CYC to jurisdictions all over the United States, where no dictation is involved in government or other agencies assisting community development workers to immerse themselves in the life of the community. And that is true of the Peace Corps as much as it is true of some of the urban poor wth whom the CYC work.

Mr. Lawlor: Solinsky.

Mr. Lewis: And it is in Solinsky and all the direct action people.

Mr. De Monte: CYC—

Mr. Lewis: So do not pretend for a moment that this is some kind of unorthodox proposition which the NDP is putting, It is a perfectly viable and legitimate proposition which we are really reinforcing. It is presumtuous for me to say putting, it has been around longer than the minister will ever know of. But your branch has not a single dimension of that kind of community development, nothing. You have good, able, experienced and valuable people processing grants and writing letters, and you call that community development.

It is a complete corruption of the term. Worse than that, Mr. Chairman, worse than that, it is even more perverse, because far from assisting people through this branch you are in the business of dashing the hopes of people on a systematic and deliberate basis. Because when you pull them together from one of these community awareness conferences, to use the terms of Mr. Truman in the letter you read "organized by your department," to quote from his letter—which is precisely right, whatever the sense of autonomy might pretend to be, it is organized by your department—after you have one of these community awareness conferences and the recommendations are put, what happens? Not a thing from your government.

So instead of sponsoring a sense of community development, you merely reinforce the existing sense of frustration and isolation which most communities feel, and that is in the nature of your activities.

I do not recall all the areas that my colleague from Wentworth read out.

Mr. Peacock: Landlord and tenant.

Mr. Lewis: The landlord and tenant, the help to the aged, the public housing recipients, the redistribution of social allowances—all of these programmes with which your government was not for one moment concerned, and you pretend that is community development. You have bastardized the word, that is what you have done. You have made a mockery of it. You have turned it into a handout proposition.

It might as well be attached to The Department of Health or to The Department of the Treasurer, or to The Department of Labour. It has no particular appropriateness or relevance in your department. It just happens to be given to you now. Fine. You look after it. You are the ministerial steward. You make the decisions—the grants go out.

But the purpose of the grant, in the final analysis, is to denude those organizations of whatever militancy may have been there, to deny them the wishes that they have, to thwart their expectations, even in this modest way, once having had the grant and then to pretend that you are engaged in community development.

Mr. Chairman, if I may simply say this, we understand the grant-giving proposition. Everybody in this party accepts that there are organizations entitled to grants and we would give them to them like any government gives to them—perfectly legitimate.

And we understand there has to be the occasional conference funded by government —we too would fund them from government —but this is the difference, and it is an important and fundamental difference: Instead of a masquerade for community development we would support real community development. We would have a large number of workers around the Province of Ontario fulfilling requests from individual communities who ask for them—no imposition there—who ask for them, whether it was an inner-city project or a project on a reserve or a project in a rural area.

And the worker then moves in as what is called a social animator, for lack of a better word, and works directly with the people involved on a long-term, intensive basis, leaving when they think he or she should leave. And then the project continues, primarily stimulated by the community itself.

That is called community development. That is the kind of commitment which all kinds of governments are now giving, but which this government has no intention of acceding to.

And for this minister it would be folly to accede because this minister would not know how to handle it, just as he did not know how to handle Indian community development, if I may remind him of his last exercise in community affairs—and what an international catastrophe. Why, I understand there was a paragraph in the London Times about the ministerial excellence on that occasion.

It would be the same on this occasion, if real community development was entrusted to your department. Your department does not understand it. With great respect, your department has no conception of what community development is.

That is fair enough, but then do not pretend that you are doing it. You want a few more officers, fine. You want a little more money, fine. You want to make additional grants, fine.

Even some of your grants are inexplicable. But at least that is part of the on-going process of government. It is not very important in a sense. The organizations need the money. They get the money. They would get it from whoever was in power.

What is important is the fundamental distinction between the handing out of grants, the holding of some conferences, and the emersion of a community development worker in the light of the people concerned around a particular social, cultural or economic project, and of that there is nothing from the Tories and nothing from this minister.

That is the distinction that we want to draw for you, for which you have no use, and with which your department will do nothing. You have made it clear, on the request from the citizens of Sudbury, that you will treat all such propositions with the derision and contempt they deserve in the minds of your government.

All you are confined to is $65 to the National Council of Jewish Women to have a candidates' night in Hamilton, and you call that community development. That is a grant for information purposes, which you give to a group. Do not style it by another name. We understand the difference, and for whatever value this whole discussion is, at least some of us in the Legislature can express that difference to you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, last spring there was a meeting at which this minister's predecessor made a grand announcement about a $50,000 community development programme. This is the amount I thought was being granted to encourage this work. Is this list of grants here the result of it? Is that the only thing that came out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You are holding up the Helling report I understand?

Mr. Deacon: Page nine of this blue report —the Helling report, right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, that is the quota.

Mr. Deacon: I cannot quite get the connection at all, Mr. Chairman, between this information grant and all these information services and what the member for Scarborough West has been talking about—what all of us are talking about, and what you have got in here—these matters of community grants. There does not seem to be any connection.

This is not community information you are talking about here, you are talking about community workers. Have you got a brand new programme now we are talking about for the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I just say, for the hon. member, we have held a series of conferences. Out of those conferences, and from the local community development projects, have come forth—again, have pressed forth—the need for information services so that a citizen—this is not a new cry—so that a citizen can find his way around in this maze where there are all kinds of services on one side, but the problem is to know how they get them.

So this programme is a newly developing programme, from our point of view, where we have funded 11 agencies who are already established in order to develop information service programmes. The Helling report is an appraisal of that particular phase.

There will be a final evaluation and from then on we will determine where the thrust of the information services will be and whether it stays as part of the total citizenship or whether it may be deemed to be best in some other government department or agency.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the minister is saying it is literally true. All that the member for Scarborough West said is true. All this is is a community information service that we are talking about at $130,000 for the coming year. Is this pamphlet of community workers for some other thing? Tell me what we are going to be doing with this $130,000—more community information?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say this? This is the $50,000 programme; this is the $70,000 programme and there is a $10,000 programme which I referred to as the municipal OCLG.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this $70,000 programme, has there been any money put into this type of work so far in Ontario? Have there been any community development projects—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These three grants last year totalled some $35,000.

Mr. Deacon: Of the $35,000 that was granted last year, where did that go? Would the minister read a list of those grants last year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have already read this list into the record.

Mr. Deacon: Of all those community development grants that are under this type of programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Deacon: Did the minister read last year's $35,000?

Mr. Lewis: Tell them about the grant to MAD—100 performances.

Mr. Deacon: If that has been read I shall pick that up later on. On what basis would any group be eligible? How would the department decide if there was a political bias? Would it be decided there was a political bias if one of the officers of the group seeking the funds was a member of a party or an official in one of the political parties? Would that then be a basis for deciding the group had a political bias?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Deacon: In other words, they would not worry about the makeup of the group as far as political bias goes. The definite objectives of the group would be the basis or the criteria, would it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would depend upon —if the bias of the group and its activities were politically partisan they would not meet our criteria.

Mr. Deacon: Activities would be the basis of judgement, not necessarily the members or the officers?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right.

Mr. Deacon: The second thing is that they should be without other sources of financial assistance. Now why would a criteria be that there be no other source of financial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I explained earlier, we are giving developmental money—seed money—and we have a limited budget. If we feel that there are sources whereby the particular needs of that group may be met, we steer them to that place. But we are not rigid about that, if they cannot get the money or they need supplementation. We have also been part and parcel of that kind of an activity.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, if the department is providing seed money, would it, therefore, not be important as a means of getting other financial assistance for the department, in effect, to endorse the project by making a small donation, recognizing, in fact, that the project does not have a substantial footing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we often do that. Don Vale community centre is a good example of that.

Mr. Deacon: This matter is not quite clearly worded then. What the minister is saying there is that they should not depend entirely on the department for their sources of financial assistance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is definitely so. We will provide them with the seed money, but there has to be some sort of an assurance that there will be continuation, that they will be able to grow or gather strength. If we know in the beginning that they clearly will just rely on our money and will have no other support, that will reflect that they do not have support within the general community.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, would the minister feel it would be preferable if these people have a purpose for example, of community development activity and wanted to hire a worker, would the minister prefer to have his own paid people act in such a function, or would he prefer to have them hire their own community worker if this was one of the ways they felt of achieving their end of getting the community moving?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is what I was trying to get across, the difference between the leader of the NDP and our point of view. We believe in community development by the people for the people. So I think that would answer the hon. member.

Mr. Deacon: I would concur, I think the development worker should be hired and responsible to the community groups not to the Provincial Secretary's branch. I would endorse that.

Mr. Lewis: That is quite agreed.

Mr. Deacon: The next thing is, would grants of this sort be made to, say a music group, or arts group, or something of that sort?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, any one-purpose body does not meet our criteria.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister feel it would be advisable including a criterion for these grants that any body that gets such funds must have provision for membership on its board of elected officials of each level of government and the board of education on such a board, in order that when community activity and interest is developed there is ready access between the elected representative and the community people that are a part of this group?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, we do not demand that kind of representation. What we often seek is a broad base. We try to determine—and it is a matter of judgement—whether the group that is emerging is representative of the community in which it is going to operate. And if it is just either a single-purpose body, or having a very single purpose in mind, they do not by and large meet our criteria.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister not—

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Review of government activity in Niagara Escarpment area, statement by Mr. Davis 1787

Federal-provincial rent supplement programme, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Peacock 1787

Tax rebates for students in married quarters of Student Housing Corporation, questions to Mr. White and Mr. Grossman, Mr. Good 1788

Income requirements to purchase condominium housing, question to Mr. Grossman, Mrs. M. Renwick 1788

Providing grants to conservation authorities for construction of dams, statement by Mr. Kerr 1788

Investigation of government activity in Niagara Escarpment area, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1789

Statement on government decision re Spadina Expressway, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1789

Priorities for postponed dam structures and resources projects, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon 1789

Millhaven prisoners from Kingston allegedly threatened with charges, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon 1790

Consulting local bar association before appointing to provincial bench, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 1790

Tabling Gertler report on Niagara Escarpment, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1793

Tabling Niagara fruit belt report emanating from Gertler report, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1793

Subdivision application approvals re Niagara Escarpment, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis 1793

Facts and figures as detailed by Public Works re Niagara Escarpment land, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Lewis 1793

Applying for $17 million federal money for creation of jobs, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1793

Financial assistance to delegates to national conference on low-rental housing, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis 1794

Environmental effect on major James Bay power development by Quebec, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1794

Answer to question of extending aid to separate Catholic schools, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1794

Pontiac County seceding from Quebec and joining Ontario, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Yakabuski 1794

Increase of break and entry infractions in southwestern Ontario, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Innes 1795

Furnace explosion at St. Daniel's school in Ottawa, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Burr 1795

Regulations to reduce welfare payments to young people away from home, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Peacock 1795

Bid with Supreme Court for acquisition of Pêche Island, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Lewis 1797

Land purchase approval in Windsor for E. C. Rowe Expressway, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Ruston 1797

Wages and benefits collected by employment standards branch, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Young 1797

Air pollution by Canadian Gypsum of Weston, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. MacDonald .. 1798

Dumping of coal dust at Hamilton harbour, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Deans 1798

Shore erosion by high water in Lake Erie, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Spence, Mr. Ruston 1798

Low-level radiation from New York State nuclear reactors, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Shulman 1798

Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 1799

Securities Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1800

Statute Labour Act, bill to amend, Mr. Jackson, first reading 1801

Department of Highways and Department of Transport, bill to amalgamate, reported .. 1802

Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, reported 1803

Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, reported 1806

Wages Act, bill to amend, reported 1811

Third readings 1812

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, continued 1813

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 1835

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 44

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(*continued*)

On vote 1702:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock we were still on vote 1702, item 3. Any further discussion? The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I notice in the accounts for 1969-1970 that there is an item for New Canadian Publications of $49,430.10; that is in public accounts under Provincial Secretary. I am wondering how much was spent last year, in the fiscal year 1970-1971, for the New Canadian Publications and what was it for?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): In conjunction with the figure that the hon. member is referring to, that was the basic fee for printing and distributing textbooks on teaching English as a second language, called "An Introduction to Canadian English Training" materials. That was the bulk of that particular item.

Mr. De Monte: Who are New Canadian Publications?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: New Canadian Publications is an organization that has been in existence for some 15 years. It is operated presently—I think he is the sole proprietor—by Lech Mokrzycki.

Mr. De Monte: And that includes all sorts of newspapers, does it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. New Canadian Publications is actually a commercial organization that has a number of facets; it does a great deal of work on behalf of the members of the ethnic press; that is, it participates as agents in representing about up to one-half of the members of the ethnic press. The original tenders in 1963 went to seven firms, and theirs was the lowest bid; thereafter the contract has been continued with them because they have been giving very satisfactory service, a change would involve new plates and they have established all the distribution channels. Whenever any other publishers have been approached, they have not been interested at the price quoted.

Mr. De Monte: What type of distribution? Textbook distribution?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Last year we spent about the same amount. I would be very pleased to let the hon. member have a set of these.

Mr. De Monte: I think I have seen them downstairs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, those are the multilingual brochures, which are a separate item altogether. These are the materials which are actually used in the classes of learning English as a second language.

Mr. De Monte: Do they print and publish the books or do they just distribute the books or the materials?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They arrange it from start to finish.

Mr. De Monte: In other words, they arrange for the publication, the printing and the distribution?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. De Monte: What type of book or publication is it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is called "Introduction to Canadian English-Language Training." It is all of the materials.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): On that same point, Mr. Chairman, what was the process used in the printing of the book? Was it done by photo offset or was it set in type?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not familiar with that detail.

Mr. Peacock: Did the minister give the quantity?

Mr. De Monte: No, he did not.

Mr. Peacock: Perhaps the minister can tell us the quantity first.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not hear that question.

Mr. De Monte: The quantity of books distributed.

Mr. Peacock: Perhaps the minister could tell us the quantity published under that contract with New Canadian Publications.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have that particular figure at the present time. But it is the materials that service all our classes.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, but it was one particular title, the contract value was about $50,000, and certainly there is some limit on the circulation of that type of publication.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The number distributed in the fiscal year ending in 1971 was 64,000.

Mr. De Monte: During the one year, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: During the fiscal year, yes.

Mr. De Monte: Sixty-four thousand copies of one textbook, that type of textbook?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Peacock: The company to which the hon. member is referring publishes a newspaper in the Italian language, Corriere Canadese—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I? There is not just one book; there is a series, a packet of five. As a matter of fact, the significant thing about those particular books is that they have been developed by our expert in the field, Mr. Carson Martin, and he has gained a very wide and international reputation by the production of these books. I think they are used as models in other places that have turned to us for a guide. I think it is the kind of thing I should make available to those members who are interested.

Mr. De Monte: The 64,000 books—does the minister mean 64,000 packets or sets?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Sixty-four thousand books, items.

Mr. De Monte: In other words, if we divide 64,000 by five, about 12,000 packets have been distributed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: About that, yes.

Mr. De Monte: Is there any advertising revenue in that amount to New Canadian Publications?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it is strictly a textbook. If the hon. member saw it, it is just like a textbook that is used in any class.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I just want to confirm that the minister, before we adjourned at six o'clock, was in no doubt about our question that the pamphlet or publication put before us today was completely written within the community services programme of his department. There was no contracting out of the text or writing of this to any outside agency.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is completely a staff proposition.

Mr. Peacock: I see. Then may I ask the minister if in the course of hiring personnel to staff the community services programme, or the community development branch, attention was given to someone with writing skills of this sort? Was there a person hired to write, let us say, specifically in the vein in which the minister uses language? Because it is very reflective, very close to the minister's own manner of speaking and as we know, or believe, that the minister himself has not written it, can I ask how it was that the staff followed the minister so closely in preparing the text of the publication?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That question can be answered in a number of ways. May I say that I saw this pamphlet in its first rough draft, for the first time, just a matter of a couple of weeks ago. I have been minister of the department since March 1. My contacts with the members of the staff have, in my opinion, been all too few, and it is something I expect to rectify. The only reason I can subscribe to the fact that the language comes out the same is an expression of the hon. member from Halton when he says: "You cannot help but admire the wisdom of a man who agrees with you". So if that is the kind of language that I use and it is the kind of language that they use, we are both in tune with each other.

Mr. Peacock: Right! Well you know it is rare these days, Mr. Chairman, that a minister produces material policy documents on his own initiative and one wonders if that idea still remains in government and that the flow is not completely in the other direction, entirely from the civil service to the minister who gives now only his stamp of approval. Did the minister by any chance, in reading over that draft, make editorial changes or notations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Peacock: There were no particular phrases lacking in the draft that the minister thought should be inserted? And that he then moved with his blue pencil to write them in?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: None.

Mr. Peacock: Remarkable.

Mr. Chairman: Item number three.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I did not understand the minister's reply in connection with the item under "New Canadian Publications". Do I understand that organization has printed, published and distributed the books? Or was the printing and publishing done by somebody else and the organization then distributed them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that they did the whole job from start to finish. They printed them and went right through to the preparations for distribution.

Mr. De Monte: That would mean the cost would be at least almost $4.50 a package for printing, publishing and distribution. Could I have the unit cost?

Mr. Peacock: That is $4.70.

Mr. De Monte: About $4.70 a packet. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. As I said, I would be very pleased to supply one to the hon. member. If he can imagine for himself a packet of five textbooks, and these books come in various sizes—I think the largest is scribbler size and then there are four that are sort of pocket-book size—they are supplementary but the students get them as a package. One is in support of the other.

Mr. De Monte: I would appreciate a packet.

Mr. Chairman: Item number three carried.

Item number four. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): This matter, I expect, will occupy us for some time as we get some further information from the minister on the application of the government's policy towards the Indian community and the expenditure of the money estimated for this coming year as $1.625 million—or a little more than that. I have two or three specific things to say about the government's administration of its Indian policy and also a general reference that I want to make at this time.

I might also say that I feel that the hon. member for Dovercourt made an excellent presentation in his opening remarks and I recommend it to anyone who was not present for their perusal since there were new ideas that would benefit—

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): Was the hon. member here?

Mr. Nixon: I was here, and I know that the former Minister of Energy and Resources will get the Hansards out and read that speech because it is a very good one and would do him a lot of good. We have not really had a very definitive statement from the government side on Indian policy since the former minister said: "Let them live in wigwams."

Mr. Simonett: What is wrong with a wigwam? Tell me.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, about a week ago the Premier was pictured as being present at the opening of one of the major new projects of the government, known as "Ste. Marie-among-the-Hurons", which is a restoration of forts and the facilities that are such an important part of the history of this part of the world when the white man first came in contact with the Indian community. And all of us, as we think of Ste. Marie-among-the-Hurons, think of the brave and intrepid Jesuits coming into this part of the world, bringing with them the faith and proselytizing among the savages.

I think we also immediately think of the tragedy associated with Father Brebeuf and the martyrs in the Huronia area and I think it is very suitable that we place stress and importance upon this aspect. But one thing that is missing is a recognition of the Indian role in the development of our community, because Ste. Marie, among the Hurons, certainly does not recognize the Indian role in

any significance, other than the call to the minds of hundreds of school children who will go there, about these tremendous difficulties faced by the white men, particularly the early missionaries, and the terrible suffering that they endured at the hands of the Indians, who are normally depicted as savages. This is kind of a tradition that has been established in the province.

I want to recommend to the minister, that if he has any opportunity at all in the expenditure of this more than $1.5 million, I would hope that he would give priority to those programmes which are going to emphasize other aspects of the contribution of the Indian culture, which certainly has been ignored by most of the programmes that have been supported by the government in this department, and even more important, in The Department of Education.

I think that there are those who would say that the Indian community, even as far back as the historical situation that I am referring to at Ste. Marie, in fact, saved Canada as a unified nation from falling into the great growing republic to the south in years later. The Six-Nations Indians, of which the hon. minister himself is—

An hon. member: A chief.

Mr. Nixon: —well, you do not call it chief. He has an honorary Indian name and he is a Mohawk brother of mine; I know that he has a special significance for the contribution of those Indians. And they do happen to come from my constituency—or I come from their area. I do not hesitate to say that this is the largest Indian reserve in Canada. It is, I think, outstanding, as I look through the minister's report, that they were not the beneficiaries of any of the funds that were listed in the distribution of this fund that he reported just a few days ago.

I do not blame the minister so much for this as perhaps I think the members of the Legislature ought to be aware of the great pride and individuality of the Six-Nations Indians, who have learned not to ask for anything. And particularly not to ask for anything of the provincial jurisdiction, not because they do not have any particular faith in them, but they set store by the traditions of the federal jurisdiction in Indian affairs, and I think this reflects in their attitude.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, to be fair, I have heard many of them express grave discontent with the federal attitudes as well. This does not mean that they have turned from talking to federal officials to talking to provincial officials—far from it.

They have gone ahead on their own initiative to establish a remarkable park, to develop Chiefswood historic site, to build and operate a car ferry across the Grand River, even though the Minister of Highways made a kind of half-hearted attempt to be of some assistance, which they rejected and said, "We will operate this ourselves" and they found the capital so to do and operate that car ferry during the summer.

They have taken the initiative to establish an Indian pageant of an excellence which is first-class and I recommend to any members of the Legislature who might get up to the Six Nations Reserve during the summer to see this pageant. It is based on the Indian traditions and it is held outside in a natural, wooded amphitheatre. It stresses year by year various aspects of Indian culture and history which has a lesson within it of tremendous importance for us all.

But the Six Nations community is a group of relative latecomers to this part of the world. They fought on the wrong side, as the minister knows, in the revolutionary war in the United States, and they were granted this tract of land in Canada and came over after 1776. But they, as much as any Indian group, were responsible for the preservation of our nation and their valour and loyalty in the war of 1812 and on other occasions is documented, although it is not stressed in any history text that I have ever read.

I have two specific points associated with this, and I do relate them to the Six Nations Reserve of which I have personal knowledge, but it relates to the Indian community across Canada, as well as in Ontario.

I hold in my hand an educational presentation which is called Nestum Asa—and I do not know whether my Cree pronunciation is any good but this is supposed to be the Cree language for "the way it was in the beginning." This is a series of educational pamphlets, pictures, maps, stories and descriptions, which deal with the Indians from one side of Canada to the other, and not as a particularly esoteric treatise that only those specifically committed to detailed information would make use of, but as a series in Canadian studies relating to this type of information.

Now this one dealing with the Indian community I recommend without reservation. It is published by Griffin Press Limited, 455 King Street West, Toronto, and it is well

prepared under the editorship of Mrs. Moyra Tooke, who with a number of people in the Ontario community has done the research that makes this a kind of teaching aid and source of information about the Indian community and culture which, as far as I am concerned, is unsurpassed.

If the minister has not had the opportunity to examine it, I am very glad to send this over to him at the present time, and I know he will be interested in examining it.

In my view this sort of material should be distributed through our schools and made extensive use of in many areas of the community because it is factual. The references to the Six Nations themselves, particularly the Iroquois, and the Iroquois confederacy, are excellent ones and a presentation of outstanding value.

I feel that in the expenditure of these funds if the minister would accept as one of the priorities the strengthening of the understanding, among the young people particularly, in the community of Ontario, of the value of Indian culture then he will have accepted a priority of outstanding value indeed, and one which has not been noticeable in the department or The Department of Education in the past. We have been hung up on this attitude—the savage Indian; the community that burned the noble Jesuit missionaries at the stake, and so on. This sort of an attitude has I think coloured everything we think about when we think of the Indian community in years gone by.

Of course, when we listen to stories of the problems of the Indians in many part of Canada, particularly in Ontario now, we normally think of Indians as almost an insoluble welfare problem. We hear recounted in this chamber and in many news accounts all of the terrible problems associated with the need for welfare and education, and various forms of guidance perhaps, of the Indian community. We seem never to have struck that mother lode of valuable additions to our basic culture here in Canada that the Indians have offered, and have available.

The second point that I want to make specifically is the availability for a new initiative on the part of the government. I refer to the fact that there are two institutions. One is on the Six Nations land in Brant county, known as the Mohawk Institute. This has been operated by the government of Canada for many years as a basis for the education of Indian young people who were often brought long distances from the north to undertake residential education at this centre. There is another one near Sault Ste. Marie that the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Shingwak.

Mr. Nixon: Shingwak Home, right. The government of Canada has been phasing these out because they felt it was a mistake to take the young Indian people away from their families and their homes and give them a sort of education away from their own community and I believe they are right in this.

But I am very familiar with the facilities in the Brantford area—the Mohawk Institute. It is one of the most beautiful parcels of land anywhere on the banks of the Grand River, and certainly within the boundaries of the city of Brantford. Unfortunately that city, like many others, has lost all its elm trees and it looks pretty well devastated in some areas, but out there around the Mohawk Institute and on lands owned by the Indians on the banks of the Grand River there are still many oak trees, maple trees, and wide stretches of land that were used for agriculture in the earlier days of the Mohawk Institute.

It is now empty. It is boarded up and the government of Canada is paying something like $3,500 a month simply to maintain it so that it is not going to have the windows broken and see that the heat is kept in, in times when the temperature falls below freezing, and so on. But this facility is not being used at all.

The government of Canada has left the initiative to a new use of this facility with the Indian band council of the Six Nations. This is a community of 10,000 Indians, a substantial community indeed.

I also understand that the government of Canada has made available to assist the band council a former resident of the Six Nations reserve who has been working with the Indian Affairs department for some time. He has been seconded to the general area to advise the band council on how they might make use of this very large, elaborate, modern, expensive, educational facility sitting on a piece of the most valuable land which, I understand, is owned by the Indians themselves and which is presently not in use.

I am suggesting that the minister, in cooperation with the Minister of Education, offer an initiative to the Indians to create an Indian community college with this

facility. It must surely be the kind of offer which emphasizes that the Indians themselves will have the final, and even the intermediate decisions to make upon the establishment of such a college; that it will be an Indian college and it will be operated by a board which is totally Indian. We should be prepared to make funds available from our community college resources, which are tremendous, in order to assist the Indian community and the government of Canada to accomplish this.

Mr. Chairman, I think you are aware that, even with our efforts as described by the Treasurer about a month ago to control costs and keep costs cut down for education, there is an addition to last year's budget of about $200 million for education purposes. A large share of this goes to fund the expansion of the community college system. There is money available, then, for this kind of an initiative which would be, I think, a most important show of good faith by this government, by this Legislature, and by not the white community but the community of Ontario in this regard.

This community college could have a number of functions. It could have a basic technological function in which Indians of all ages, and whoever else they want to invite there, could have technical training to allow these young people to take advantage of the growing opportunities for technological employment with the development of the new hydro facility at Nanticoke and the establishment of a new steel mill there in the next few years moving out from Hamilton. This could be designed for the special skills and abilities of the Indians themselves.

There will be another side to the use of such a community college. It could be a North American centre for the study and dissemination of Indian history, culture, language and art and crafts and anything that could go with it. I would recommend this to the minister most sincerely for his careful consideration. There is not enough money by any means in this item 4 to do, perhaps, anything more than assign a few thousand dollars to the kind of study that might be directed towards it.

I feel that the government of Canada, in withdrawing from this education, has made the right decision. The facilities have been lying idle for a considerable period of time and the minister may recall my raising this matter on two or three occasions in the last year to 18 months. The government of Canada has left the responsibility with the Indians themselves to decide what they want to do with it. They have made available technical advice which was extracted from the Indian community on the Six Nations to begin with, so there should be no problem in having this advice accepted.

I am simply saying that the government of Ontario has the role to play—by no means to go in and say, "This is what we are going to do for you—to say, "Here is a proposal." The minister knows precisely what I mean. Here is the proposal. Here is something about what it will cost. We are prepared to go to the Six Nations and sit down with the Indian council.

The minister has visited the historic council house. Sit down with the chief and the councillors and their education committee and education director, who is a man of outstanding and recognized ability, and with the federal officials. Unless we are prepared to make a commitment of dollars, then I do not suppose it is going to mean very much, but it would fit in, I think, with our whole community college concept.

It would be something that the Indians themselves would say, "This is ours," and it would not be some kind of a gift that had come from outside. It would be a gift, if you want to look at it that way, from the whole community including the Indians who are in large measure contributors to the consolidated revenue fund from which we draw for our many programmes.

There is one other consideration and that is that this facility, the Mohawk Institute, is a residential facility. There is no reason why Indian families from any district could not come down there and spend a period of three months, six months or even longer in upgrading their skills or their abilities or making contributions themselves to the teaching of certain crafts, skills and other aspects of their culture.

I hope the minister will give this careful consideration. I believe it is something that would get widespread community support. The minister knows as well as I how necessary it is to consider the Indians' own sensitivities in this regard, and I began my remarks by pointing out that the Six Nations council shies away from approaching this government, particularly for assistance in anything. They are proud of the fact that they can do these things themselves and they do not want to come here asking for money or advice or anything like that.

This is an area where I believe this minister, with his knowledge of the area concerned

and the problems involved, could be of immeasurable service in acting as a source of initiative and assistance to the Indian community and to the government of Canada in breaking some new ground here and, as I have said, making a substantial, really thoughtful, sensitive, workable show of good faith toward the Indian community.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Simonett: Good speech!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I want to express my full sympathy—and I mean that strongly as an expression of feeling—with respect to what the Leader of the Opposition has said.

Mr. Simonett: Would that be in the member's riding by any chance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In viewing the path the Indians might follow to fulfilment there is the economic development side that I think is just as equal as the development of the cultural side.

The basic true Indian cultural heritage is something of which all Canadians can be proud and, as I stated the other day, it is something we should all cherish. It is something that is uniquely our own. I subscribe to enabling everybody who holds things near and dear to him that gives him his identity of being nurtured and of being supported, so that in the consideration of all applications and proposals that have been put before us, there has been a decided emphasis on approval of the cultural side.

I am indebted to the Leader of the Opposition for having put this packet before me. In this instance, he is really one step ahead of me. I do not know whether it is hot off the press or not but certainly, as I view it, it is an outstanding production. I just skimmed through it, but it would appear to have all of the elements that we need in the development of these materials. It is somewhat comparable to what we approved of in, I think it was, December 1969, when we approved a grant to OISE to test a multimedia teaching kit, which is made up of materials that go a little beyond that. I think there are filmstrips and additional teaching aids in order to deepen the interest of an Indian young person in a knowledge of his own cultural heritage.

If I may just touch very quickly on some of the cultural operations that we have supported, the Canadian Indian Centre of Toronto has as one of its major activities the cultural aspect; Deer Lake Indian Band educational TV has both aspects; the Frontiers Foundation has to deal with Ontario Indian Communications Society. The Indian-Eskimo Association also is supported here and one of its great thrusts in the past has been in this field, and it is now the workshop that was held in Sault Ste. Marie. The Manitou Arts Foundation, an extremely important one with the Indian fine arts, which in its way is an example of what might be done. The residential school of MacIntosh was abandoned by the federal government; it is an excellent facility in first-class condition as a residential operation.

Mr. Nixon: Where is that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is near Dryden. It is more closely associated with the Wigitowin Corporation; it is immediately next to it and is a very fine structure in first-class condition that would house at least 100 people. There are a number of suggestions as to what it might be used for—home for the aged, schools of various kinds—none of which turned out to be feasible. But it will be used this summer for a fine arts project and, as a matter of fact, I believe I have here—just by coincidence it arrived on my desk this afternoon—the first brochure with respect to this. The headline says:

> Indians Seize the Initiative to Promote Identity, Self-Esteem; Arts Foundation Mounts Its Trail-blazing Course in Cultural Reinforcement."

Reinforcement, self-esteem; then it lists a number of the items which will be considered.

Mr. Peacock: What does "cultural reinforcement" mean?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Really, what I have is an application form. Then it says here:

> Wanted; 15 Indian students from across Ontario to participate in a unique experimental programme designed to reinforce the culture and self-esteem of Indian people.

Mr. Peacock: I get self-esteem. I understand self-esteem.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is an application produced by the Indians themselves. This is how they view the matter.

Mr. Peacock: All right. They have been listening to the minister too.

Mr. Nixon: Everybody has.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is signed by Thomas Pelletier, junior president. I would be very happy if I had the opportunity some day of introducing the hon. member to Mr. Pelletier—

Mr. Peacock: The minister should set a better example with the English language.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —who is an outstanding person in his field.

We have supported, for a number of years, as the hon. member knows, the Indian Hall of Fame at the CNE last year. The grant was $5,700. I was present one time when Harvey McKeough, who is doing outstanding work at Trent University, was the main speaker at the luncheon. He touched on a point that struck a responsive chord in me, by saying we should not just have an Indian Hall of Fame static at the CNE where the non-Indians in the majority would view it, but somehow, if we could lift that and take it out to the Indian people across the province, they would have the opportunity of viewing for themselves those things which they pride in.

The Mohawk Institute, I think, has a great potentiality. It so happens that in recent years, the number of universities, such as Brock University, Trent University, Laurentian University, Western Ontario, have all evidenced an interest along these channels. I myself am attracted to the kind of proposition that the Leader of the Opposition has put forth, whereby something could be initiated and developed from the Indian people themselves. They have got some wonderful knowledgeable people in the field in this direction.

I think that our position is this that we are waiting for the Six Nations to come to us. We have indicated to them a willingness to meet with them and to evolve something. I do not think that we would ever say, "This is a proposal that you should carry out." If they asked us, we would be very happy to lend them our resources to see what could be done in this field and then have them make a selective judgement.

The particular Six Nations, of course, have taken a particular position. I do not think that the position that they have taken, vis-à-vis the provincial government, is completely that of not wanting to have a part in it or to ask, because the provincial government has participated with them in a number of degrees. I am thinking of the opening of the nursing homes which is a programme participating in at the federal level and the provincial level, the staff of which is completely run to my knowledge, right from the superintendent down, by a very capable staff who are doing an excellent job. It is one of the finest nursing homes that I have ever seen. They have participated in this field, but they look at their relationship more and more directly to Ottawa.

And it is very interesting to see the position of the Leader of the Opposition, vis-à-vis his point of view as compared with the position, well expounded, but with some distinctive angles, of the hon. member for Dovercourt in what should be the basic attitude of an Indian band, and should they look to Ottawa or should they look to Queen's Park? I think, when I think of certain groups, they are not polarized but they do take a different stance from the group that the Six Nations has become.

Mr. Nixon: Just on that point, could I say one thing, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: The minister has said that he would be very glad to talk to the Indians about this and if they were to ask for certain advice or assistance that he would be glad to provide it. It occurs to me that is not going to be very fruitful in this specific instance. Maybe the Mohawk Institute will go forward with some programme that does not include the Province of Ontario at all. That might satisfy the Indians. That might satisfy the government of Canada.

But it occurs to me that you might ask one member of your staff to get together with somebody from the community college group to come up with just a broad proposal and go up there. Write them a letter and say, "We have been thinking about this and would you like to hear our views?" If they write back and say, "No", okay, forget it. If they do not write back, all right, forget it. But the minister has done a little bit of work on this and he says: "That is what we would like to do and we want to be a part of this."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that members of the staff have already spoken to the chief. When I say, "advice and assistance" I think we are thinking in terms of cash too, of material assistance and concepts. The interesting thing is that when the history of the development of the cultural activities from our branch is written, and the first one is the major grant of $200,000 that in a way

almost stems from expressions of points of view given at the Six Nations.

I happen to have had the good fortune of being at the . . . no, there was the international ploughing match which took place in my hon. friend's riding and the Six Nations had the opportunity of having a cultural display. They had all of the things to display, and the personnel, but they needed some financial support and I think that particular grant was a small one, $1,000 or so which was made with almost the initial grant. That was when I first became aware of the wonderful talents of Mrs. Smith, and from then more and more the department became involved in cultural activities. I sum up by saying we would be very delighted to work hand in hand with the Six Nations in developing and supporting their council.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak a little bit, to find some information from the minister about the community projects, particularly in the area of James Bay and Hudson Bay. I wonder if the minister could tell us what if any Indian community projects there are under this programme at Attawapiskat, at Winisk, at Port Severn, and at Moosonee. In some detail.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have the Nisku Corporation at Moosonee. I do not know whether the hon. member has this report, which was tabled on page 23, the Nisku Corporation. Employment for some 15 men is provided by the corporation at Moosonee and it was established in 1963 and it has contracting with the federal and provincial governments as planned. In 1970 they received a grant of $35,800 to purchase equipment, and then in February, 1971, they received another $8,000 to provide working capital and also to permit the corporation to engage management and financial consultants.

Then we have the Amik corporation which is referred to on page 3 of the project book. It is in the Attawapiskat area, by the band of that same name on the river on James Bay. It apparently has two projects, a co-operative general store and a snowmobile and small motors repair shop. We made a grant in March of this year of $5,500 to manage these current operations and to develop further projects, such as fur marketing and transient accommodation. The group is planning to build a motel and a workshop.

Mr. Nixon: A motel?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A motel and a workshop. Yes, as the north becomes more and more open, we are hopeful of developing the use of Indians in servicing the people who go north. I think the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), for example, has a goose camp development in order to have the Indians not only participate as employees, but to be proprietors and managers of camps. And at Moose Factory, we made a grant—

Mr. Nixon: I thought he was going to promise a road up there. If you have a motel, you should have a road.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, there are air strips.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is an airstrip under construction at Winisk camp and at Moose Factory, there was a—

An hon. member: I do not agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was a tourist canoe programme that received a grant of $6,600 currently.

Mr. J. Renwick: Where is that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is at Moose Factory.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): That is on the American side.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And we have a staff person at Moosonee.

Mr. J. Renwick: There are three projects then in the area that I referred to, is that correct? The Nisku Corporation, the other corporation and this tourist camp operation at Moose Factory? Is that the sum total?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, those are all that have come forward.

Mr. J. Renwick: What does the minister mean, "those are all that have come forward"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What we have done is that we have publicized our programme, and it is on a continuing basis, in order to let all of the Indian bands and Indian communities become aware of what our programme is and what we can render, but it is up to the Indian bands to come forward with propositions. The two books—last year's project book and this year's project book—contain 130 proposals of which two-thirds were really initiated by Indian bands for Indian bands.

Mr. J. Renwick: I want to deal then just with this one confined area, because if we get into too many generalities, I think we will begin to think that something is accomplished when really very little is accomplished. In the Nisku Corporation—that was founded in 1963 and it is now 1971—what is the total extent of the aid the government of the Province of Ontario has given to that corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The corporation was incorporated in 1969—

Mr. J. Renwick: In 1969, I am sorry. I think the minister originally said 1963, but it is 1969.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a typographical error.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the total number of dollars that have been made available to that corporation directly,—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is $43,800.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is $43,000. In other words, there were actual cheques issued by or through the minister's department to that particular corporation in the amount of some $43,000? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: They were not issued to somebody else for services to be rendered to the Nisku Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Directly.

Mr. J. Renwick: Directly? What was acquired by the Nisku Corporation? What was the project that was specifically approved in detail?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The equipment was logging equipment.

Mr. J. Renwick: What kind of logging equipment?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have that detail before me; I can get that. It would be in the proposal that would be brought forward. It could be anything. It could be loaders, tree toppers; we have provided money for a range of equipment.

Mr. J. Renwick: Would it be possible to have a detailed itemized list of the capital equipment presently owned by the Nisku Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A Ski-doo; a truck—

Mr. J. Renwick: —owned by the Nisku Corporation, and of that capital equipment how much was purchased through the agency of this minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We supplied them with $35,800 to purchase equipment and to defray part of the corporation's operating expenses that had been incurred up to that time. My recollection is they had stockpiled in the bush but it was some time before they could have got cash and they needed interim financing. The equipment was a Ski-Doo, a truck, a skidder, a loader and a power saw.

Mr. J. Renwick: What contract did the Nisku Corporation have or how many contracts? Is the minister aware of what contracts they have for the supply of timber?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually we do not supervise the corporation to that kind of detail, but when we reviewed the programme, we came to the conclusion that the long-range prospects in the Moosonee area for lumbering are excellent. They have contract guaranteed by Abitibi Pulp and Paper and Cochrane Enterprises, manufacturers of poplar and spruce veneers. I think this is a significant factor; that they are using woods which might not otherwise be used, something with which my learned friend, the Minister of Lands and Forests, would be fully cognizant.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the volume under those contracts? You must have been aware of them when you approved the project, I would assume.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, if I may say a word, I am fairly familiar with the work done by the Indians. They have district cutting licences issued by the district office. The hon. minister mentioned the pulpwood is sold to Abitibi and the veneer logs are sold to Cochrane Enterprises. Last winter there was about eight miles of road cleared in that area from Moosonee going south toward Kwataboahegan River and the Indians from Moosonee and Moose Factory were those who were doing the work in conjunction with the Nisku Corporation, using the equipment of the Nisku Corporation.

It is the intention next year, also, to do further roadwork in that area, the main pur-

poses being to provide timber access as well as to provide eventually a road leading south to Highway 11.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, thank you for the comment of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I just add a word? In addition to the lumbering operations, they are also using the equipment for allied purposes. My understanding is that they are doing trucking, they are participating in landscaping and they are supplying logs for The Department of Indian Affairs for housebuilding.

Mr. Nixon: Just a point of clarification before we proceed: Did the Minister of Lands and Forests say that the concept is to build a road down to Highway 11 from Moosonee?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, last winter it was approved by the Northern Ontario Resources Transportation Committee that 12 miles of road be built from Moosonee south going toward the Kwataboahegan River.

The purpose of this road is sort of multipurpose: One is that it provides access—it is sort of a force access road to provide access to the Indian bands of Moosonee and Moose Factory. At the same time, this will provide road access to the columbium deposits located about 30 to 35 miles southeast of Moosonee. Eventually we hope that road will extend right to Highway 11 so it will provide a link from Highway 11—

Mr. Nixon: Have we got a bridge over the Moosonee River?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the present time there is a bridge at the Moose River, crossing about 60 miles south of Moosonee, and the train only operates every second day during the winter months, so there is no reason why that bridge could not be utilized also as a highway until a separate bridge could be built some day.

Mr. Nixon: It is that bridge?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could the minister comment about the co-operative at Attawapiskat, because when we were sitting on the select committee dealing with co-operatives, on two or three occasions we understood that they were going to come and speak to us about the co-operative at Attawapiskat and on no occasion did they appear.

We were led to believe in a most indirect fashion that they were in fact told not to appear before that committee. I may be putting it too strongly, but that is the substance of the impression that I gathered.

Can the minister tell us something about that co-operative and to what extent we have financed it, what its prospects are and what we expected to accomplish in the area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the member speaking of the Amik Corporation that I referred to?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, the one that runs the co-operative store at Attawapiskat, and the snowmobile and motor repair—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a co-operative general store. The band control and operate it. They make the purchases and then do the retailing and have the turnover.

Now we have not told anybody not to make presentations to anybody. As a matter of fact, our position is completely the opposite. A presentation prepared by our Indian community branch was made to The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs that if any changes are being considered with relationship to The Corporations Act, certain new provisions might be looked at in order to accommodate the specific, particular needs of the community. It has been a basic position of the department that we assist the Indian community, the Indian bands, to set up the vehicle in order that they can carry out some of the projects—the corporation structure was one.

As a matter of fact, in several instances our department, because of the exigencies of the matter, has actually prepared the papers, phoned them in and had them signed and processed in order to be able to meet deadlines with a view to them being able to carry out their projects. It would appear, in respect of the far north and the cost of goods, that some of the answers might lie in the co-operative store aspect.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I raised a question in connection with the Indians in that particular area and I tried to get some understanding of what responsibility, if any, the government or the Province of Ontario has to the Indians in the area of Hudson Bay and James Bay, and indeed in the whole of the northern part of the province, and I find it extremely difficult to believe the good faith of the government in connection with the Indian community branch when

one looks at the historic background of what the government of Ontario considers its obligation to the Indians in that area under the historic transfer of the cession of the rights of the Indians in that era.

This minister is the minister in this government who assumes the basic responsibility for the Indian community in the province. Setting aside for the moment all the constitutional problems and hangups that we have —and it is only two or three years ago that I took the time to put on the record one conception at least of the responsibility of this government—this one specific matter that I want to put on the record in some detail about the government's position with respect to the Indian community has to do with the original treaty in the James Bay area, Treaty No. 9.

That was a treaty that was entered into between the Indian communities in that area in July of 1905, and covered some 90,000 square miles. And subsequently there was an adhesion to that treaty at a later date which ceded, pursuant to that treaty, another 128,-320 square miles, so that under that treaty between the federal government commissioners and the Indian community the province of Ontario got the rights to the lands in all that area of the northern part of the province, encompassing the large number of square miles to which I have just referred.

And this arrangement between the government of the Province of Ontario, which amounts in fact to the continued concurrence by this government in what can only be described as robbery. Now I want to put on the record the exact documents and the terms of that treaty because in my judgement, until the government takes hold of this problem with respect to the Indians in that part of this province, then it is not going to be possible to have any credibility in the government when it comes to granting for these kinds of community projects the paltry number of dollars which have been made available for the Indians in that area for these projects, with all of the nice veneer of waiting until people come forward with projects that can be approved and the grant of $5,500 here or the grant of $43,000 there.

The treaty provides very simply that His Majesty the King agrees with the Indians:

> That they shall have the right to pursue their usual vocations of hunting, trapping and fishing throughout the tract surrendered as heretofore described, subject to such regulations as made from time to time be made by the government

—and then this wonderful out-clause:

> —in saving and accepting such tracts as may be required or taken up from time to time for settlement, mining, lumbering, trading or other purposes.
>
> His Majesty the King agrees and undertakes to lay aside reserves for each band, the same not to exceed in all one square mile for each family of five or in that proportion for larger and smaller families.

Of course, a further reservation that His Majesty reserves is the right to deal with any settlers within the bounds of any lands reserved for any band as he may see fit. It goes on to deal with the reservation with respect to public works, buildings, railways, roads or whatsoever may be appropriated for that purpose by the government.

> With a view to show the satisfaction of His Majesty with the behaviour and good conduct of his Indians and in extinguishment of all their past claims he hereby, through his commissioners, agrees to make each Indian a present of $8 in cash. His Majesty also agrees the next year and annually afterwards forever, he will cause to be paid to the said Indians in cash at suitable places and dates at which the said Indians shall be duly notified, $4, the same, unless there be some exceptional reason, to be paid only to the heads of the families for those belonging thereto.
>
> His Majesty agrees that each chief, after signing the treaty shall receive a suitable flag and a copy of the treaty to be for the use of his band.

That is, in substance, what the Indians received for the cession to the government of Canada, in which the government of this province had a very real interest, in 1905.

They proceeded, in 1912, to have a further adhesion covering the much larger number of square miles to which I referred earlier and there was no variation made at all in the terms of the treaty.

There is an agreement between the government of the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada which was entered into just prior to the signing of that Treaty No. 9. This is where I consider the government of this province has a responsibility—indeed, an obligation—to reopen the negotiations with the government of Canada and to come to some proper settlement as to what the fair and proper number of dollars, or its equivalent, should be to the Indian communities in those areas, if there is to be any sense of good faith.

The agreement between the government of the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada in substance says:

> The government of the Province of Ontario hereby gives consent and upon the following conditions concurs in the terms proposed to be entered into made and agreed by the said treaty, insofar as the said government of Ontario, on and after the payment to the Indians of the abovementioned present of $8 and thereafter the payment annually of $4 to each Indian forever as above specified promises and agrees to pay the said sums to the government of Canada upon request, when and as the same are paid to the Indians upon proof when required of such payment. Such payments to be free from any expense that the cost of Ontario attended upon the distribution of the said sums of money.

I am saying to the government, Mr. Chairman, that the government of the Province of Ontario is culpable if it continues to persist in permitting its obligation to the Indian communities in that area to be satisfied by this annual payment of $4 for each Indian in that area that is entitled under the treaty.

There is, in my judgement, a very clear obligation on this minister, as the minister responsible for the welfare or the development of the Indian communities in that particular area, to make absolutely certain that there are perfectly clear understandings about the rights of the Indians in the area, so that the encroachment will not take place that was perpetrated by the government, under the Minister of Lands and Forests, when it opened up the Polar Bear Park, when the Indians did not understand what was taking place in that area.

There is a responsibility on this minister to see that that does not happen again.

There is a responsibility on this minister to establish, once and for all, what are the rights of the Indian community in the areas covered by that treaty with respect to any mineral resources which may hereafter be found in the area.

There is a permanent obligation on this government to clarify and restrict the operation of the escape hatches in that treaty, which provide for the overriding rights of settlement, lumbering, mining, public roads and other development projects to be taken at the expense of the Indian community.

I am simply saying that in 1971 we, in this party, will not tolerate the continued iniquities upon Indian communities in the northern part of this province as a result of the operation of Treaty No. 9.

We say to the government, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a matter which should be placed for private discussion or public discussion between the government of the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada in association with the Indian communities in the northern part of the province it is to renegotiate on a fair and proper basis in clear and unmistakeable language what the rights of the Indian community are in that area. It perhaps is not quite sufficient simply to speak about the areas covered by the agreement and by the later adhesion, simply in terms of the number of square miles.

Let me put on the record the actual legal description of the lands that were taken from the Indians by this kind of paltry negotiation to which this government was a party back in 1905, under the original treaty itself.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member would like to rephrase his statement in relationship to the year 1912. This government has been in power for some time, but we do not take credit to back to 1912.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly—and I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) would correct me if I am wrong—there was a Conservative government in office in the Province of Ontario in 1905 and in 1912, and that is a forerunner of this government.

Mr. S. V. Randall (Minister Without Portfolio): That was B.C.—Before Custer.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Maybe you are thinking of 2012?

Mr. J. Renwick: I am. The land covered under the treaty is:

> That portion or tract of land lying and being in the Province of Ontario, bounded on the south by the height of land and the northern boundaries of the territory ceded by the Robinson-Superior Treaty of 1850 and the Robinson-Huron Treaty of 1850 and bounded on the east and north by the boundaries of the said Province of Ontario as defined by law and on the west by a part of the eastern boundary of the territory ceded by the Northwest Angle Treaty No. 3; the said land containing an area of 90,000 square miles more or less.

In the adhesion agreement, entered into in 1912: the area which is covered comprises:

> all that tract of land, and land covered by water in the Province of Ontario comprising part of the district of Kenora (Patricia portion) containing 128,320 square miles more or less, being bounded on the south by the northerly limit of Treaty No. 9, on the west by the easterly limits of Treaties Nos. 3 and 5, and the boundary between the Province of Ontario and Manitoba, on the north by the waters of Hudson Bay, and on the east by the waters of James Bay, and including all islands, islets, rocks, waters and land covered by water within the said limits, and also all the said Indian rights, titles, and privileges whatsoever, to all other lands and lands covered by water wherever situated in Canada.

That is the extent of the robbery which was perpetrated by the government of the Province of Ontario, in conjunction with the federal government, upon the Indian communities in that part of the province. I am simply not going to elaborate any longer. I am simply saying to the government that until such time as it accepts its responsibility —and this is the minister who must take the initiative to make certain that that responsibility is accepted—to renegotiate the terms and conditions of that treaty in a way which will bring to the protection of the Indian communities, in clear and unmistakeable language, the value of what they have ceded and the potential position in its future development, which will secure them for all time. That responsibility lies on this minister. I do not want this minister to think for one single moment that we here have any sense of good faith in the position of the government with respect to the Indians within the Province of Ontario as a whole, let alone the Indian communities in the areas to which I have referred, by simply providing the kind of paltry number of dollars which the government puts forward for this kind of development. I want to know what the minister's comment is, whether he accepts any sense of responsibility about it, whether there will be some initiative taken to renegotiate those terms with the Indians in those areas with the government of Canada and with the government of the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just to review some of the points the hon. member has touched on, just back to the position that we have taken vis-à-vis co-operatives, I draw to the hon. member's attention on page 25 that we made a grant of $5,000 to the Ontario Co-operative Development Association to participate in determining the needs in this regard, and extension services to Indians. It is all set out on page 25.

Now, I just want to clarify for the hon. member the position of this department. This is not a provincial Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The minister is not the minister for Indian Affairs.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have a threefold role. We maintain a field staff of community resource officers to provide the native people and their leaders with assistance in managing their own affairs. The resource officers work with the various communities and organizations in evaluating specific projects, establishing requirements, and setting about securing the needed resources. We are not just a dollar-handing-out agency.

The basic work is our resource work, but of course we now have as backup, the means of the so-called million-dollar-plus grant to provide financial assistance, and second, we look upon ourselves as maintaining communication between the Indian people and the various departments and branches of the government of Ontario, and we are willing to assist the relevant departments with our knowledge and expertise, and sensitivity.

I may say with respect to the staff that one of the most important assets they have is an understanding and a sensitivity to the needs and aspirations of our Indian people, and in this regard we have played a very major role. Then we also look upon ourselves as being the co-ordinators of the work of the various provincial departemnts, and in co-ordinating the work of the results of the various departments through a task programme.

So that is really the general skeleton of our approach. It is within one of these elements that we are becoming increasingly aware of all of the aspects in the road to the full and complete fulfilment of the participation of Indians that The Department of the Attorney General has been asked to review, the legal aspects of all of the treaties and the relationship as between the Indian and the province, so that we may, in a knowledgeable way, view our position, vis-à-vis our point of view and not just Treaty No. 9, but the others—there are several others, Treaty No. 3,

there is the Superiors treaty and a number I do not know—there are this number and I do know this, that at the present time there is in Ottawa the National Indian Treaty Committee that has been established.

I think they themselves have been reviewing all of the treaties and I think they have taken pretty well the position that they do not welcome any major discussion at this time until they have established their point of view in this regard. And I do know this, that as far as our work we are getting more and more involved with the north country. We brought some of the Indian chiefs down to Toronto two years ago. They participated with us for the first time. I have visited Moosonee and have met with some of them. The former minister has.

I will be going up there in the month of June to a northern chiefs' meeting. It is my hope to be able to fly in to visit these places and become intimately aware of the local situation, so that the department in the discharge of its responsibilities is becoming fully involved. I think a major participant in this particular area is The Department of Lands and Forests in conjunction both by themselves and with the federal government and I think it might be appropriate if the Minister of Lands and Forests may be given the opportunity to make a comment or two here.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. member for Riverdale referred to a few matters. Firstly, as I say, as the member for that area I am quite familiar with the Indian communities on the west coast of James Bay and Hudson Bay, With reference to Polar Bear Park, we have had several meetings with the Indians, mainly at Winisk, and the last meeting was held in February at Kapuskasing. We flew the Indian chief and members of his council to Kapuskasing. Officials of my department met with them and we came to an agreement on Polar Bear Park. There were many things that were agreed upon. That they would continue their traditional habits of hunting and fishing—that this would not be interfered with. We also told them that this would be translated into Cree, so that they could submit it to their own people and, of course, we had several meetings prior to that. So as far as Polar Bear Park is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the Indians in that area are in agreement with what we are doing.

It was also mentioned by the minister that all fishing and tourist fishing camps on the coasts of James Bay and Hudson Bay are reserved entirely for the Indians and the white men are threatening that we are discriminating against them. However, this is a policy that has been adhered to by both the federal Department of Indian Affairs and our own government; we have agreements.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we visit the Indians quite often and matters that come under the provincial jurisdiction are well looked after. However, I would like to remind the hon. member that most of the Indians that are at Winisk, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany and Kashechewan are treaty Indians on reserves and in provincial matters we are looking after them. We have an airstrip at Winisk we have taken over. There is one being cleared at Attawapiskat. There is another one to be built at Fort Albany. Again, my hon. friend, the chairman of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission (Mr. W. A. Johnston) was telling me that at their last meeting—I believe it was on Tuesday of this week—they approved that telephone service be provided to the Indians at Kashechewan near Fort Albany. So these are things that we are doing and of which this government is proud. We have a good record with what we are doing for the Indians in northern Ontario.

I, for one, like a lot of other members, feel that we should be doing more for the Indians. However, in the matters that come under provincial jurisdiction we have a good record. I feel that there is more that can be done, but I feel that we can document what has been done and, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the remarks of the member for Riverdale are uncalled for and not tactful.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that one minister of the government turns over to another minister of the government the obligation to make an apologia—to give—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: —an apology for what goes on. I thought that when the Provincial Secretary called on his colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests, it was to give us some useful information.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): It was more useful than anything the member has said tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Minister of Lands and Forests knows very well that it is not an

accurate statement to say that the Indian communities in the area of Polar Bear Park are satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Renwick: All right, then we will find out.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Renwick: We will put on the record of this House the degree of their satisfaction.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Indian chief and members of his council were in Kapuskasing in February, and they agreed to what would be the regulations as far as they were concerned in Polar Bear Park and we said we would translate this into Cree. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to send the hon. member the minutes of that meeting to show that this is what was agreed. The Indians were quite satisfied; the trouble is that—

An hon. member: He does not want to—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —members of the member's party are going up to Moosonee, Moose Factory and all along the coast and stirring up the Indians. They are the ones who are causing all this unrest.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, is that not remarkable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Let me just finish. I will give you an example.

Mr. J. Renwick: If we are not stirring up trouble in the riding of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) or in the riding of the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), we are stirring up trouble in Hudson Bay!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member sure is. He is stirring up trouble all over, and the people will smarten up eventually.

An hon. member: Goodness gracious.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is the minister suggesting that we are that small band of agitators that travels around the globe at somebody's expense causing trouble?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes! Very true.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Right! Right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is the entrenched reply of a right-wing government when it says that every trouble spot in the province has something to do with an agitation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member should go to Moosonee and ask them who is causing all the trouble. He will find out that it is the members of his party.

Mr. J. Renwick: We are talking to the minister who is looking forward to the people of the province, including the Indian communities, coming forward with happy projects.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): The member's is not a happy project. He is agitating.

Mr. J. Renwick: All we are saying to him is, why does not the government take on the project of renegotiating that treaty? The minister stands up and says, "These are the little narrow confines of the responsibility that I have." Well, if he looks at the rest of the treasury benches of this government, there is no other minister in this government who has any more responsibility than he does. Therefore, we must focus upon him to accept the responsibility for the inequity that was done to the Indians in that part of the province, let alone whatever may be done elsewhere.

I was delighted to hear that the minister had asked the Attorney General for some kind of an investigation about treaty rights. Let him ask and report to this House for an opinion of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General under Treaty No. 9 as to whether the Indian community has any rights in any of the mineral resources which may be found in that area and whether they have any rights in any respect with respect to the timber in the area covered by that treaty.

With respect to whether or not the Minister of Lands and Forests should have considered that not only would he graciously translate into Cree, if I remember correctly I was the one who asked the minister to put it in the Cree language.

An hon. member: Oh, this is terrible.

Mr. J. Renwick: The record will show this.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government thought of it long before the member did.

Mr. J. Renwick: The record will show that the minister thought that was a good idea to put it into the Cree language. I am simply saying that the Minister of Lands and Forests does not understand that the basic rights of the Indian community in that whole part of the province are determined by treaty to which this government was a party in the sense that it entered into an agreement with the government of Canada a very few days prior to the treaty being entered into. And under that treaty, whatever he did at Winisk about Polar Bear Park should have been done in terms of an amendment to that treaty, not by some cosy little document exchanged with the Indian community, who had no representation and no persons to advise them as to what their legal rights were.

The minister knows full well that there was no legal counsel retained by the Indian community branch to advise the Indian community at the time of the setting up of Polar Bear Park as to what their rights were. I am saying to the minister—and I am not one to harp upon legalities except when they are important—that this is the kind of responsibility that this government is going to have to accept. I am not going to sit here and find that there is a road now being built, not for the aid and asistance of the Indian community but because the government has been under pressure for a long time to connect Highway 11 to Moosonee.

And the whole question of the airstrips is a matter that requires amendments, continuous amendments and negotiations, as part of the treaty rights of the Indians with respect to the whole of the area. The minister cannot rely upon the escape clauses in that treaty in this day and age.

If he does rely on them, then he is taking advantage at this time of the escape hatches that are written into a treaty, which was iniquitous at the time it was entered into and has been a cloud on the record of this government ever since.

All I am saying is let us get down to brass tacks, let us start with Treaty No. 9. Let us have a clear unequivocal statement as to whether the Indians have any rights that would be protected in a court of law under Treaty No. 9, to which the government of this Province of Ontario adhered when it entered into the agreement with the government of Canada a few days before the execution of the treaty.

That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about the benevolence of government. We are talking about the rights of people and the obligation of this government to move in and clarify those rights. If the rights are as weak as I think they are, then it is up to the government to re-establish clearly and distinctly the participation of the Indian community in the area covered by Treaty No. 9 and by the adhesion treaty with respect to mineral resources, with respect to timber resources and with respect to all of the other resources in that area.

The members know, the minister knows and the government knows that, in the Province of Ontario, the distribution of power follows the distribution of wealth. Until the government is prepared to guarantee to the Indians in that area a share in the wealth, a fair and equitable share in the wealth, then the Indian community in that part of the country is never ever going to have the kind of power that can withstand the encroachment of the white community, no matter how benevolent and how paternalistic it is done.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4. The member for Rainy River wanted to speak earlier.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I just want to make a few remarks on this debate and to bring to the minister's attention a problem peculiar to my riding which I wrote him about—it is not really a problem. It has to do with the appointment of an Indian development agent or an Indian development officer for the Rainy River district.

I have just got two or three words of advice and I give these words of advice to the minister. We have had similar conversations in this House before with the background that I have 12 or 13 Indian reserves in my riding. The minister has said in his opening remarks in regard to Indian consultation that he is consulting with the Indians as to the programmes that they want to undertake and that the department will not foist any programmes onto them.

A year or two ago the minister—I believe he was the minister at the time—invited a number of Indian chiefs from my riding and, I gather, from others down to Toronto, provided the funds for them to fly down here and put them up in the Lord Simcoe Hotel. They were here for, I believe, two days. They returned to their reserves some 1,200 or 1,300 miles west and north of Toronto and, on talking to them afterwards, I discovered they did not have any idea of what they had been in Toronto for. They did not know why.

They were not told apparently or it was not made clear. They did not understand, in any case why they had been brought down to Toronto—after the meeting, and they had returned home and they still were not aware of what they had been brought to Toronto for.

We will not go into the whys or whatfors of why this particular situation happened. But I would suggest to the minister that if he is serious about this community involvement and getting the information from the Indians as to what programmes should be carried out, that he—not he, particularly, and hopefully not he, but someone in his department personally—visit the reserves and discuss with the Indians on the reserves what they have to discuss with them. To bring a man or a woman 1,200 miles from their reserve in northwestern Ontario down to Toronto in this kind of society, completely foreign to many of them, is not a healthy situation nor is the minister going really to get anything beneficial either for his department or for the Indian people.

I wanted to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs might have something to add to this but it is my contention that the only way we are going to do anything for the Indian people to have them help themselves is to do it on a community basis, a reserve basis or community basis, because it is patently obvious that Indian communities vary from one another just as white communities do, and many of the Indians in northern Ontario have less in common with the Indians in southern Ontario than they do with the white people that they live with in the north.

So each reserve and each Indian community has to be taken on an individual basis and we have to build in the local areas, and I do not believe that any province-wide projects are going to be of any benefit to the Indians in northern Ontario in particular.

Now, all this is leading up, Mr. Minister, to just a brief word about the work that the Amik Corporation is doing in northwestern Ontario in the Kenora and Rainy River areas, and as the minister well knows but perhaps other members in the Legislature are not as aware, Amik is an Indian corporation which functions as an umbrella for other corporations to be set up on a reserve basis. It is pretty well exclusively a reserve basis.

These corporations—incorporated under provincial statutes I believe, and Amik I believe is incorporated under a federal statute—function as the development agency for that reserve and they have done an excellent job. I would say that Amik is one of the few experiments—and that is the only word one can use—that has showed consistent success in the last few years and perhaps the reason is because it is a voluntary organization composed of Indians and white people who donate their time and energy to helping the Indians help themselves.

The only government involvement in the Amik Corporation comes through grants to that corporation. We have had some problems with the corporation, any fledgling organization does, but I think on the whole it is doing a fantastic job. The Indians are learning how to deal with the white business community amongst other things, they are learning how to operate machinery, particularly in the forest, which is related to their background.

Overall, it has been a very good programme and I wonder if the minister can perhaps indicate his department's feelings on Amik Corporation, and if his department is encouraging other Indian reserves across northern Ontario to adopt a similar setup, if I may use that word, to Amik and if he is making the experience of Amik known to these other reserves?

Just one more word before perhaps the minister will reply. Within the last month I attended a meeting of some Indian people who were taking a band administrators' course, under the aegis of the federal department I believe. They were questioning me on various programmes of the government and they were not aware of some of the assistance that could be made available to them through your department.

Now, you touched on this a little earlier in the debate tonight. But many of them were not aware of either the background kind of help that you can give them, or the financial help. I wonder if you can outline to us what attempts were made by your department to make the various Indian bands aware of what assistance can be made available to them?

One other matter, I wonder if the minister has had time to give consideration to my letter requesting an Indian development officer for the Rainy River district?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, to deal with that very specific matter, we think we have provisions for four new complements within the branch for the coming year, and one of them will be assigned to the district that the hon. member has referred to.

In relationship to the consultation process that took place in the fall of 1969, it was really the first time that the Province of Ontario had entered into a dialogue with the Indians of Ontario. In trying to evolve a method, we came to the conclusion that the best way and the most expeditious way, would be, in the first instance, to bring everybody down. They were brought down in groups and I think we had some seven—a half a dozen or more—days set aside in which various groups came from various parts of Ontario. In some cases there were two bands and in one case there were 14 bands.

We brought in Indians from all over Ontario. I think we met with almost 99 per cent of the Indian chiefs represented at these gatherings and we used our resources in the field—that is, our offices—to facilitate as much as possible the travel arrangements to and from Toronto. This was the—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Did you find this beneficial?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, it was extremely beneficial because it was the first time there was a dialogue.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Have there been any others since?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not since that time, because there was a dialogue. We tried to convey, to the best of our ability, our programmes and what we were making available, in a broad way, for the first time.

We also heard some of the very significant things that were of concern to the Indians. Communications, the business of having a telephone—no earth-shaking thing, but the business of not being able to communicate with the outside world. Clean water, even up in the northern areas—such mundane things as that.

Now, if a particular group did not get an awareness of what was made available, it was not because of lack of intent on our part. Certainly, many other bands came back with the kind of proposals that we were able to entertain. It may be that more and more of our effort, both from the branch and of the resource people, should be to make known to the Indian communities what is available by way of services.

Now, the present series—the present contemplated consultations—is to provide the Indians across the province with the resources so that they could get together and determine for themselves how they view their relationship to the province and the delivery of services to them.

We will make available funds so that they can plan their own consultation process. We will make available to them the back-up resources. Any information they need as to services and what is available, we will make known to them. We will make known to them our readiness to provide this and then, of course, it will be up to them to decide just to what degree they want this kind of participation.

It will be held, I think, on a regional basis. I think that northwestern Ontario will form one or two such consultation areas.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is to be done in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, yes, these will be right on their home ground, and we will provide them with these kinds of resources. Our programme has developed to that degree and we have established a certain plateau relationship.

Now, I think, comes a time to clarify and gel the positions that we have. I look forward, eight months from now, to having a much clearer view, both from the Indian communities looking at the government in Toronto, and vice versa.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In eight months you might be sitting on this side, or not at all. May I ask when we can expect the community development officer in the Rainy River district? Is it within the next—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have the details of that in a letter that is on my desk to the hon. member.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I was listening with interest when you mentioned Winisk, Moose Factory and Moosonee. I too was there with some of the members and my own observations were very simple, because I did not get into the theory and detail of both provincial and federal governments. But I wondered how these people, the Indian population, could live in the cold weather that they have to contend with, and I realize that they were born there and they were acclimatized, so to speak, to those conditions.

But I noticed at Winisk, if I recall rightly, The Department of Lands and Forests had

their cabins there, where the staff of The Department of Lands and Forests did reside, and they had electrical power generated by some kind of, I suppose, gasoline or some type of generator for which you do not need water power. They seemed to be very comfortable.

But I found some homes, where the families of the Indians were living, some were a little better organized and they seemed to be a little better off, by the outward appearance of their homes they seemed to have a little more than the man next door. I inquired about why this came about, and it is like any other town or city, some people have a little bit better way of making a livelihood or a living than others, some are better hunters or trappers.

And I gathered from the conversation then, Mr. Minister, that if they had the facilities, the traps and the necessary tools to hunt with—they were good hunters in many cases—I inquired where they got their provisions and how they came by the tools to work with, the fishing poles, the hunting, the guns, the nets, the traps and I was told that the Hudson's Bay Company provided, in many cases, some of the tools that were needed on a credit basis.

They would go out and hunt and then when they came back with their pelts they would trade them in, naturally for more goods for their family and more of the necessary equipment to keep them alive. And I then wondered, because of what history I did read in my day, how badly—if they are, and I imagine a profit in a free enterprise system is not a bad thing—but I am wondering how badly the Indian was treated by some of these outfitters, if you want to call them that, or the Hudson's Bay Company, by way of first charging them something of a profit for the necessary equipment that they needed, and then when they brought their pelts back naturally the Hudson's Bay Company would take those pelts in and sell them for a profit also.

In other words, what I am trying to say to you, Mr. Chairman, is that they profit on two occasions. They profit on whatever they sell to the Indian and then they profit from the pelts that the Indian brings in. I am wondering whether it is not a little bit lopsided. I am asking you, I am not telling you. I am wondering what kind of supervision there is, or what kind of investigation there happens to be, between the government which is responsible for these people and the people who work for the minister's department by checking with these companies to find out whether they are not being treated badly by way of a profit only on one side of the ledger. That entered my mind at that time among other things. I talked to a man nurse who was provided, I believe, by the federal government in one of these Indian settlements—whatever they call them—tribes, wherever they happen to be, and he said he had a tremendous area to cover. One man nurse to take care of so many people. I understand that a lot of these people are subject to tuberculosis.

When we were in Moose Factory I talked to Brock Payne who was the administrator of the hospital there. He happened to have been working in another hospital where I got well acquainted with this man. He informed me that many of the Indian families would bring their children or members of their family and found that they were treated so well in those hospitals that they were often, or I should say on some occasions, left in those hospitals because they found they had better treatment than they could get in their own homes. These are the things that I did pick up through my travels among those people.

You talk about the Cree Indian. I found them exceptionally fine people to communicate with, if you could get through to them. Some of them spoke a little English. But I then wondered to myself how badly they are treated by way of the profiteering of these outposts, because they have a captive clientele. They cannot go to any other store and compare prices. They are at the mercy of the Hudson's Bay Company and other stores similar to this. I wondered if the minister's department ever investigated the possibilities of these Indian people being treated badly by these people who have them in a position where they cannot shop elsewhere. I want to know if the minister has any information along those lines. I would be interested in hearing his comments.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, our department does act as liaison and communications on behalf of the Indian with the government and other agencies. In this particular field the branch has been trying to liaise, if I may use that word, between the Indian trapper and the trappers' auction that takes place in North Bay for furs, using the auspices of the good office of the trappers' association so that there will be the direct link between the producer, that is the Indian fur trapper, and the marketing agency, eliminating, as it were, the middle man. If

that can be brought about then it probably will inure to the better financial position of the Indian trapper and remove any doubt with respect to whether that trapper is being taken advantage of in this regard. If we can bring this about, I think it will be a great step forward.

Mr. Bukator: There must have been some of these cases. After all, business people appear to be business people everywhere and, if they can make an extra dollar, why not? But I think they were taking the wrong people.

The minister tells me that they are talking about an auction where they get a similar price because, apparently, some of the Indian people were selling their furs for a lot less, because they were not knowledgeable in the field of negotiation. Is that true? Is that why this auction was set up, so that they would be protected from people who were taking them? Is that the purpose of it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is just that the advantages of a producer being able to deal in a market where he is marketing directly right to the purchaser eliminates whatever is necessary for the middle man, and that will inure to the benefit of the producer. I may say, in respect of the other position, that is what is done with the proceeds of the sale of the furs. This is why we are interested in the assisting and the development of co-op stores in the Indian communities, because there, again, they set up the co-op store and retail to the members of the band and also are able either to buy the goods at less cost or, if there is any profit to be made, it is made for the benefit of that immediate Indian community.

Mr. Bukator: The other question running through my mind, while some of the members were speaking with the minister, was one particular area wherein the government decided to build a store house, a freezer—a big one at that—in which they could store their foodstuffs that was caught and killed through the summer months—the fish that were caught. Kelso Roberts, as a matter of fact, was the Minister of Lands and Forests at that time. It was great an innovation. They were quite happy with this new big freezer system that they had for the community to be able to preserve their foods. How did that work out? Did it work out well enough that the minister's department has built others in other communities? Or was it just that one at the moment in an experimental stage?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not familiar with that particular instance.

Mr. Bukator: I am sure that many of the members that were with me do recall something about it. It was a big store house, a big freezer unit, where the community could store their deer.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A big truck?

Mr. Bukator: It could have been. The minister would remember that. That was an experiment at the time. I remember Kelso Roberts, then Minister of Lands and Forests, was very pleased to show us the thing. I thought that it was good because, at least, they could preserve their food. Did they go on beyond that point to build any more or just the one? How is it working? Does the present Minister of Lands and Forests know?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe too many were built, Mr. Chairman. To my knowledge that was the only one.

Mr. Bukator: Did it work all right? Does anybody know that? The minister travels about a bit.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think it is an interesting idea. It should be pursued.

Mr. Bukator: It has been there now for three or four years, and I am wondering how it is working out.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will give the hon. member a report after I have had the opportunity, possibly this summer.

Mr. Bukator: If the minister has another spot on that plane, I would like to go with him to see for myself.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: He might be taken for an agitator. Mr. Chairman, I had planned to go to Moosonee; now I have to reconsider because of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

I must say, though, that when I learned of his visit to Windsor and Pêche Island—

Mr. Bukator: Was he an agitator there too?

Mr. Peacock: —on Friday morning, the thought never occurred to me that he might be coming into my particular part of the province to stir up trouble.

Mr. J. Renwick: Agitating.

Mr. Peacock: Never mind the fact that he had all of the Tory hopefuls—candidates-to-be, according to the Windsor Star—in tow with him—

Mr. Chairman: Item 4.

Mr. Peacock: —to Pêche Island and not a word of his trip to the members of this House who represent the area.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) unfortunately had to return to his riding this evening; he wanted very much to participate fully in this debate on Indian community development, so he left with me a number of questions which he asked that I raise. I trust that if I ask the questions incorrectly or in a manner that conveys my lack of familiarity with the subject, or if I deal with the answers I will take the responsibility for that and trust that it will not reflect on the member for Thunder Bay.

I want to ask the minister what his view now is of the stage of the federal government's white paper about which a number of Indian bands of the province have expressed concern. Is that in abatement now? Is the federal government going to proceed with the provisions of the white paper in respect to the interests of the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are told that the federal white paper is just a dead issue at the present time.

Mr. Peacock: Completely dead?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the impression we get from our sources.

Mr. Peacock: This was my understanding too. So within the branch nothing really is being done at this moment in anticipation of any of the matters raised in the white paper that the federal government wishes to turn over to the province? No preparations are being made on the part of the Province of Ontario, through this branch, to prepare the government of Ontario to assume any of the obligations now held by the federal government as proposed in the white paper to be transferred to the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like to clarify that one of the objectives and one of the results of the series of consultations which will be held across the province is to enable the Indians to tell us how they view the provincial role in this aspect. There are three parties involved—the Indians, the federal people and the province. Heretofore the province has more or less maintained a static position. We are now enabling the Indians to indicate to us what they think our role should be in this regard.

Mr. Peacock: Following on the conference at which these views will be expressed by various representatives of the Indian community, how will the minister integrate the recommendations so that he can present to his cabinet colleagues or to the Attorney General, or the Treasurer who is charged with federal-provincial matters, the position of the government of Ontario to be put before Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer to that will have to await the outcome of the series of consultations which will take place.

Mr. Peacock: I see.

Now since the conferences are going to be held, does the minister not think that he should now be anticipating some of the matters that may be raised by the representatives of the Indian community, whether or not he wishes to discuss the province's own background position or not during the conference, so that once the conference has concluded, he will then be in a position to match its recommendations with the province's own position and endeavour to reconcile any differences between the two for negotiation with Ottawa.

I point to the objection cited by the National Indian Brotherhood when it met in Ottawa to consider the white paper on Indian affairs. Referring to the treaties, it said:

> These contracted agreements with the Indian people are spelled out in The BNA Act, yet the policy statement shows the minister—

the federal minister I take it—

> intends to abrogate federal responsibility and turn it over to the provinces who are not bound by any means to honour these agreements.

With the exception, I would take it, of those referred to this evening—and perhaps others —by the member for Riverdale.

Has the minister considered that particular position? Does he expect it to be discussed at the conference—the unwillingness of at least that particular representative organization of the Indian community to accept the proposals of the white paper?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is one element. I want to make clear to

the hon. members of the House that we are entering the series of consultations with completely open minds. The Indians are going to get together and enter into conversations back and forth, and what we will do is provide them with all of the information they need or ask for vis-à-vis what the Province of Ontario's role has been—what services we are providing in what areas and what there could be. We will let the Indians, having become fully aware of what is at the provincial level, then determine what the provincial role will be. We are going into this with completely open minds. I have no views at all, except that I do know that I have become fully acquainted with the Indian position vis-à-vis the white paper. I know that for a fact now.

Mr. Peacock: All right, in the event that the minister has no views on some of these issues, may I just then place some of them before him as they have been enumerated?

Would the minister consider preparing himself for this conference in case the matter is raised, on the objection of the Indian Brotherhood, that:

> The federal white paper now suggests Indian land will be taxed by authorities which have no legal claim on these lands. At all times, the Indian people have insisted that the areas referred to as reserves are in fact Indian lands and as such cannot be taxed by any other authorities.

Would the minister prepare himself to deal with that in the event the matter is raised by representatives of the Indian community at the conference?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am very much aware of these things—

Mr. Peacock: Okay, fine!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —but it is the response of the Indians of Ontario that we will be looking forward to hearing. I know, from having been in contact with a good many of them in the past few years, what their individual positions are, what the positions of groups are. What we are going to try to do is to try to see if we can garner a provincial consensus vis-à-vis these particular items, of which this particular one is just one item.

Mr. Peacock: Let me read another one then. Further on in the statement of objections by the National Indian Brotherhood it stated:

> The question of Indian lands is of prime importance to the Indian people.

Later on in the statement:

> Throughout the consultation period—

that is, with the federal government:

> —we reiterated that the government must afford constitutional recognition of existing treaties and obligations, at which time the Indian people would meet in good faith with the government to clarify the meaning and the sense of existing agreements.

This was the very matter touched upon by the member for Riverdale. Will the minister be preparing himself to answer questions raised by representatives of the Indian community on this matter of clarifying the meaning and intent of existing treaty agreements, particularly, insofar as the member for Riverdale raised it, as the Province of Ontario is a party.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman we are trying to make available as much information as possible in order to provide, during the course of consultation, a broad spectrum of information. But I do not want at this time to anticipate or to indicate any position that might in any way influence the attitude of the Indians. This is something which will have to emerge and evolve as much as possible from them.

Mr. Peacock: All right. We will concede that the minister is being careful not to take a position which may anticipate what the Indian community is going to propose to him with respect to these particular matters raised by way of objections to the federal government's position in the white paper. Would the minister prepare himself to deal with the questions that may be raised around these issues in respect to the clarification of the meaning of the treaties, at least those to which the Province of Ontario appears to be a party?

If, for instance, members of the Indian community living within the lands described in Treaty No. 9, should hear about the discussion in tonight's session of the Legislature, and want to ask the minister a question about those rights, will he have the opinion of the Attorney General ready to present to the conference to say, "Yes or no, you have certain rights respecting the mineral deposits, respecting the timber, respecting other developmental uses of the hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory ceded in that agreement"? Will he have an opinion by that

time, at least? And if he will not have an opinion, what will he be in a position to say to them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say this, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has been putting forth the views of the National Indian Brotherhood, and of course we are very interested in the position they take on a national basis. One of the things that will emerge from this series of consultations, we hope, is to see how the Province of Ontario views the position. I would hope that in the course of the consultations they also will have available to them the position of the National Brotherhood and the position of any other province where such a position has been articulated. We would deal with the matters at that time, arming ourselves as fully as we can in order to make sure that the consultations can be meaningful.

Mr. Peacock: All right! I am still at a loss, really, to pin down what the conference is going to deal with. I suspect it will be in the nature of an information forum telling the Indian community what kinds of services are provided by the Province of Ontario in health, in income maintenance, in training, and so forth, services available to all the various communities in the province, Indian or otherwise. If it is not simply going to be limited to the provision of information, then surely the minister is going to have to undertake, between now and the date of the conference, work that will engage the Attorney General, as well as all of these other departments, so that if these questions are raised they can be dealt with at the conference.

What else will it be? The minister says he will wait. He has an open mind, he will be receptive, and so on, to what the Indians propose. But how can it be to representatives of the community development position if they do not have resources, if they do not have background material, if they do not have some way of indicating to the minister what they want to discuss, of indicating that in advance, of calling upon the minister to help them identify the sources for the material to carry on the development of their positions that they want to present to the conference, or get the material directly from the minister's own community development branch?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has stated the case very well. That is exactly what we intend doing, and that is the procedure that we are going to be following. This is not going to be sort of a—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Right on, right on!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —one-day, grand conference. We are going to make the programme known. They are going to have preliminary conferences. We will make available to them the resources that they need. They will determine in their own minds what resources they will choose from. We will then put questions to them that they may want to discuss among themselves and then come back with the answers.

There are certainly at least three broad areas: There is the contractual area, where the Indians view that there is a contractual obligation and the service is to be delivered and financed by the federal government. There is what we have been calling contractual service, where the delivery may be at the provincial level so long as it is financed by the federal level. And then there are those which we call shareable, where the ordinary cost sharing of the provincial service can be considered. These are some of things that we will be eliciting their point of view on.

Mr. Peacock: Do any of these three areas of study for the conference cover in any way the reassessment of the previous relationship between the Indians and the government of Ontario and the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will get their views under item A, in what we call the contractual area?

Mr. Peacock: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Contractual is the business of the entering of the treaty, because if the treaty—

Mr. Peacock: Yes, but the minister said only in respect to services.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The treaty in one way can be viewed as a contract.

Mr. Peacock: I took the minister to say when he first enumerated item A, that it referred only to services; or does it refer to the basic concept of the treaty? He was talking about contractual services, was he not?

Well, let me go on then, Mr. Chairman. I want to turn to a slightly different aspect of the federal-provincial relationship in regard to Indians. In the Thunder Bay Daily Times-Journal of April 24, 1971, the branch direc-

tor, Mr. Peter Seego, I believe, was quoted as saying—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Szego!

Mr. Peacock: Szego! Mr. Peter Szego. The member for Rainy River corrects me.

He said:

> The extent of provincial participation is governed by agreements between the Indians and the federal government. At present the provincial Indian branch uses $1 million as a fund for money when money is not available from other sources.

I take it from that, Mr. Chairman, that none of the funds in the $1.1 million in the third item listed for community projects for Indian people that may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council calls for any matching or other sharing by the federal government. That is correct? That only in respect to such programmes as health, income maintenance, training and so on would there be sharing by the federal government and the provincial government in those costs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, with a view to Mr. Szego's remarks, I would think that he was referring to the fact that even though our fund is $1.1 million, it is still a limited fund, and when we know that there are other resources—for example, ARDA, there are the ARDA facilities. When we know that the ARDA programme is available for the specific item, then we act as a liaison between the band of the community and that paricular programme.

We direct them to that source and we participate. We participated even as they did yesterday in drawing one band's attention to a programme available under the conservation authority. We may supplement in some instances. We have done that with the cranberry produce that I referred to the other day, where the basic programme is under ARDA and we provided certain funds for equipment.

The other programme is shareable, as are certain other programmes—the social service programme—and certain items of the community development. The federal government is viewing some of our programmes perhaps in a broader way more recently than they did initially in the year 1968-1969 when they would only share in a total of $21,000—in 1969-1970 the sharing was $45,000 and in the past year the sharing was $260,000.

Mr. Peacock: There remains the fact that, as quoted in this article, the extent of provincial participation is governed by agreements between the Indians and the federal government beyond those development projects contemplated within the $1.1 million. And if the federal government will not approve the project the provincial government will not—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No; we began a couple of years ago to act quite independently. The procedures under the agreement which have been introduced proved to be completely abortive, so we started to act independently going ahead with the project. Later on, if the federal government saw fit to participate, all well and good, but if they did not participate it did not hold us back. We spent the money that we had available within our fund.

Mr. Peacock: So that if a project touches ARDA—falls within ARDA—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, this is completely wrong.

Mr. Peacock: Let me try to make the illustration, Mr. Chairman. If an Indian community presents a project to the Minister of Agriculture in respect to ARDA financing and the federal or the provincial government perhaps turns it down for some particular reason, could the funds be made available from the $1.1 million in the item now before us?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Peacock: Okay. May I?

Mr. Chairman: There are other members who wish to speak.

Mr. Peacock: I will yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Yes Mr. Chairman!

In this debate it is rather unfortunate in many respects that no members of the Indian community of this province happen to be members of this assemby.

Let us all hope that after the next provincial election, this situation will be rectified and there will be some of the provincial ridings represented by native people. The New Zealand situation where some of the Maoris are automatically guaranteed seats certainly has merit.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, in discussing the provincial stand at this forthcoming conference, one of the real travesties of Canada undoubtedly is the matter of native land rights.

One of the favourite songs during our Centennial was Gimby's "Canada" song, in which one of the refrains goes: "From the Arctic Circle to the Great Lake waters." Of course, we here in the south can sing this song with great gusto and enthusiasm. We enjoy the commercials on the television of the children singing the refrain. However, what an empty echo that particular line has, because for many of the native peoples of this country, they do not own the very land in which their forefathers have lived. They cannot even get title to the land on which their houses sit.

Mr. Chairman, during the last year's oil exploration on Banks Island we saw how the Innuit settlement on the island soon discovered that the island which for centuries they had considered part of their land was in fact owned by the government of Canada. There was no way to get it stopped and prevent the oil exploration on their island for the protection of the white fox life cycle.

This is a problem faced by not only the Innuit but many non-treaty Indians and Métis across this land, and I would like to think that I live in a province which stands four-square for freedom and human justice and dignity.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the minister, when he goes to this conference, will keep these things in mind – that he will stand up for the native rights of the people of this country, to see that within the next five or 10 years such groups as the Indian-Eskimo Association will be given the financial wherewithal and backing to work as a lobby and as a moving force to see that all provinces and the federal government recognize the native people's land rights.

Mr. Chairman, also this evening we have been discussing the matter of a natural fur harvest in our province. Last January I had the opportunity of staying a week in an Innuit settlement called Sugluk on the Hudson Bay coast. This particular house where I was staying looked out on the Sugluk Inlet, and every morning at 7, from the breakfast table we would see in the twilight hours of the early morning the Ski-Doos heading out toward the sea ice. They would go out when the wind was blowing from the north in the hopes of spotting one or two seals as they came to the Hudson Strait shore to air themselves or to sun themselves. Night after night these same Ski-Doos would return in the darkness, their little lights leading in along the inlet and I always inquired, did any of the hunters get a seal, did they make a kill?

This went on the week I was there and one hunter made that kill, yet these same men were propelling their snowmobiles with gasoline that was sold at 90 cents a gallon. This is one of the reasons people say that Innuit people or Indian people, or white people living in the north are lazy, they are not industrious. But even if we are to encourage native people and the white people of the northern region to fully utilize and harvest the natural resources of these regions, we should find some way of subsidizing or reducing the cost of their basic material, notably gasoline.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the new minister might be able to work with the Ministers of Lands and Forests, Financial and Commercial Affairs, and Trade and Development and perhaps utilize some of the provincial air power such as the Lands and Forests airplanes that fly into these northern settlements such as Attawapiskat, Fort Albany, Rupert's House, Big Trout Lake and so on—have them fly in the gasoline and sell it at southern prices to these bona fide registered native and white trappers.

Of course, the counter argument to this is that we would be subsidizing the fur industry, but I think the really important thing is that we make full utilization of the natural resources of the region, that we encourage these people to use the skills of their forefathers and to live in dignity, and not encourage them to live off welfare or other forms of public assistance and relief.

I admire many of the native bands of Ontario and other provinces who have decided to give up urban life and return to their wilderness areas where they can use these skills which their forefathers used for centuries.

The Department of Lands and Forests already has a very worthwhile programme of flying Indian people to various traplines south of Moosonee where there is a better fur harvest, and perhaps this sort of thing could be expanded. I think we should do everything possible to encourage these people in their native skills.

On the matter of co-operatives, Mr. Chairman, this is one thing that the province could get back to, as it has been a leader in the

establishment of co-operatives for Indians and Innuit, and also the Caisse Populaire Desjardins. Caisse Populaire Desjardins certainly has been a leading force in encouraging native peoples of the province to get back to or to adapt to the routine of banking and savings customs of our so-called western world.

These are the people who in turn are involved in the caisse populaire or credit union movement, who have the wherewithal and the resources to go to the credit union or caisse populaire and finance that new $900 Ski-Doo which they need to earn a living for the family. Perhaps two or three families can use the one machine. This new community development branch can do a great deal to encourage this on the various reserves or for those other non-treaty Indians in this province.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, just one thing: I hope that in the not too distant future the advisers here advising the minister might be all native Indian people, because undoubtedly one of the most successful Indian reservations in this province is that of the Six Nations Reserve which has such a high standard of education in its school system—it is proud of its grade 8 graduate record and its post-secondary achievement. Of course the basic secret of the whole problem there at the Six Nations is the fact that approximately 85 per cent of the teachers in these schools are native peoples themselves.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 4? The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister if he could tell the House, in relation to the estimates voted for 1970-1971, what proportion of it has been expended as of March 31. What is the actual figure?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is $1,418,808. That is for the year ending 1971.

Mr. Peacock: I want to get some idea, Mr. Chairman, of the extent to which the branch is now spending the appropriations voted by the Legislature. You will recall that in previous years our votes of $1 million for community development projects in 1968 went largely unexplained. There was the same figure in 1969 and the same $1 million in 1970. Could the minister tell us why this year the figure is $1,100,000, a difference of $100,000? Is there any reason for raising it by that particular amount, other than to cover the difference afforded by the Treasury Board order last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We received from the Treasury Board last year $50,000. The initial amount of money this year is $1,100,000 in order to ensure that the purchasing power remains the same.

Mr. Peacock: For roughly the same volume in grants?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Roughly the same.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I have further questions I would like to ask.

Mr. Chairman: You have further questions? We have about run out of time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the budget debate. I understand there are a number of speakers who wish to take part in that order. On Tuesday we expect to return to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, continued 1841

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 1867

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 45

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, May 21, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning as guests we have in the east gallery students from Palmer Rapids Public School, in Palmer Rapids; and a new Canadian group from the YWCA at 21 McGill Street in the west gallery, together with students from Acadamie d'Youville in Kapuskasing and from the adult education centre of the YMCA, College Street, Toronto.

Later today we will be having students from St. Anthony's Separate School in Harrow, from the John G. Althouse Public School in Etobicoke and from the Fairview Public School in Milton.

Statements by the ministry.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the annual—

Mr. Speaker: That is a report, not a statement. The Minister of Trade and Development, then.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Take him in hand, there. Tell him what the difference is between reports and statements.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, this will be an exceptionally exciting weekend for the people of this great province. Tomorrow, a place designed and built for the—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Yes, $25 million worth!

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The biggest traffic jam in the history of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Small-minded people!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not spoken more than 10 words and look how excited the opposition is.

Mr. Ruston: We cannot wait.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): See you in the red pod!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not only is it exciting them, it is killing them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a place designed and built for the people of Ontario will be officially opened by our Prime Minister (Mr. Davis):

Mr. Nixon: He is in Russia.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): He is in Russia.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I refer of course to Ontario Place, which has been described by neutral observers in such terms as a sparkling architectural jewel, a showcase of Ontario for Ontario.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): By none other than the Minister of Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a place for enjoyment.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Who was that neutral observer?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He is even making the Premier laugh.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are beginning to get the idea, Mr. Speaker. Somebody from the opposition must be writing some of those Globe and Mail editorials about Ontario Place. It will also be a place for—

Mr. Singer: Say that again, the editors of the Globe missed the last phrase.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not worry, they will not miss it. Somewhere here they have a reporter.

Mr. Singer: Say it again so there is no doubt.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will also be a place for contemplating our past and future—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): But they like it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —a place for enjoying the present. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, it will be a place to reaffirm our identity as Ontarians and Canadians.

Mr. Nixon: A place to stand!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ontario Place will provide a focal point for our province and a reflection of the vitality, imagination and industriousness of our people. It will fully acquaint our people with their Ontario, and it will particularly acquaint newcomers to our province with the history and heritage of their new home.

Ontario Place will reinforce our pride in ourselves as we look into the mirror of our progress and will demonstrate the high degree of excellence of which Canadians are capable.

The seeds of Ontario Place were planted in 1967 when Ontario's fabulous Expo 67 pavilion brought home to all of us what a great province we have. Ontario Place would be an island and pavilion complex that would be even more exciting than the one at Expo. Once this answer was found, this government moved with rapidity.

In March, 1969, the Ontario Place project was started. That, sir, was just over two years ago, with a target date for opening set for this weekend. That Ontario Place has been completed on schedule and is opening as promised is a tribute to the fantastic dedication and hard work of the more than 3,000 staff and other workers involved.

I would add, sir, that the working force have been inspired by what they were accomplishing. They have brought their families to the site for Sunday visits and last night exhibited enormous and well-earned pride when they and their families were given a special preview of what they have achieved. I was there and it was a delight to see their satisfaction. This is only an indication of the enthusiasm with which Ontario Place is greeted by all who visit the site, with the possible exception of some of those opposite. In large measure, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pilkey: Is that in the script? Was that in the minister's script?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In large measure, Mr. Speaker, Ontario Place has already lived up to its name. The more than 2.5 million cubic yards of fill which makes up the islands was hauled from construction sites around Metro Toronto. It was designed by the Ontario architectural firm of Craig, Zeidler and Strong of Toronto and Peterborough. The steel used in the pavilion was created from Ontario's mineral resources in Ontario blast furnaces. The materials and processes required to form the unusual triodetic dome of cinesphere came from eastern Ontario. Many of the trees are from The Department of Lands and Forests plantations near Barrie.

In creating motion pictures for cinesphere, our film people ranged their cameras through communities in every corner of our province.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Have you seen how healthy the former Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) looks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly one of the most exciting of films is the portrayal of northern Ontario in a film called "North of Superior."

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Great film!

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Much of the credit for Ontario Place must go to our former Prime Minister and to my predecessor as Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Singer: This is in lieu of making him commissioner.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): We forgive over here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to draw attention to the co-operation of the executive of the CNE; Metro Toronto, its chairman Ab Campbell and its officials; the city of Toronto and its mayor William Dennison; the TTC officials; Metro Police; and The Toronto Harbour Commission, who have been co-operating with us all the way and who are currently meeting with my deputy and the executive director of Ontario Place the better to facilitate the people who will be thronging to this new waterfront development.

It should be noted that Ontario Place does not in any way detract from the CNE, but rather has been designed to complement it. We are working closely with the officials for a planned development of the entire area.

Ontario Place is truly a people's park—a people's "thing", if you will—which will add to the cultural enrichment of the province and to the quality of life of our citizens.

Mr. Lewis: "A people's thing!" Very eloquent phrasing the minister has.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because Ontario Place is a large and complex operation—

Mr. Lewis: This was written by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). Has the minister been here for his estimates and read the little pamphlet, "People People"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member for Scarborough West wishes to send me a valentine he can do it by mail and let me finish my statement.

Mr. Lewis: From, me, the minister will not get a valentine in the mail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not expect it!

Mr. Pitman: It will be ticking.

Mr. Lewis: Just do not open it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will be ticking. The hon. member said it will be ticking?

Mr. Lewis: He said it will be ticking.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A Freudian slip. The hon. member for Peterborough is going to send a ticking valentine to the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Build it up; build it up!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Revolutionary!

Mr. Pitman: That is bad; that is pathetic.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So is a ticking valentine!

Mr. Lewis: Only the Minister of Trade and Development can rescue the government; let him continue!

Mr. Singer: As long as he has not got another housing plan.

Mr. Pitman: It would be sticky!

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is better. I just wanted to bail the member out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do members opposite want to hear more about this?

Mr. Speaker, because Ontario Place is a large and complex operation requiring a multitude of talents and techniques, and because the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) has been so fully involved since the beginning of the concept and with the construction of the project, I have asked him to accept a continuing responsibility.

Mr. MacDonald: A little late in the day!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has agreed to be chairman of a voluntary committee of advisors to the minister on policy, planning and operation of Ontario Place.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: That is as far as the minister can put him.

Mr. Lewis: Was the member for Don Mills bought off by that? Did he accept that? What a comedown!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: When does he get the gold watch?

Mr. Lewis: They are going to make him traffic director at the gates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: What is this voluntary stuff?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —from the comments of the opposition they obviously are surprised we do not throw a shiv into former ministers or former colleagues. We just do not do that sort of thing.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is not fooling us; they are doing just that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the agreement of the member for Don Mills to serve in this capacity and am confident that his energy and ideas will contribute to the continued success of Ontario Place. Other members of the minister's advisory committee on Ontario Place will be appointed in the near future.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister and myself, I urge every member of this House to participate in tomorrow's opening ceremonies and to visit with other citizens of Ontario as often as possible their very own Ontario Place.

And I tell the members opposite that the people of this province will laugh at them for laughing at Ontario Place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The minister should never have left city council.

Mr. Pitman: Our tolerance is being stretched.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this is too much in one morning.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was the member up late last night?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): It is my privilege to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House—

Mr. Lewis: It is not our privilege, I will tell the minister!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —that today is Citizenship Day, a day set aside to remind us of the advantages of being a citizen in this land.

Many of us perhaps tend to forget the good things that go with being a citizen of Ontario—

Mr. MacDonald: Not when the minister is around!

Mr. Peacock: How could we follow that act.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —Ontario Place being one. The streets that are safe to walk on; the police forces work for us, not against us; there is freedom for people of a multitude of cultural origins who pursue their own goals, their own livelihoods in relative peace.

Mr. Lewis: Now just a second, who is writing the minister's stuff? Tell us who is writing it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is against citizenship.

Mr. Lewis: Where does he find these people?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. minister is making a statement and I presume the members would wish to hear it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What better proof could I offer than the fact few of us look longingly at faraway countries or contemplate living somewhere else?

Mr. Singer: That certainly is not proof; it is confusing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Citizenship demands responsibility; it demands that we strive for a common goal, a goal that insists each and every person is entitled to his or her fair share of the fruits of our common labours.

For Canada is a land in which every citizen, no matter his station, no matter what may be his cultural background, is offered a better way of life. In exchange he must be prepared to observe the laws and respect the rights of others.

Citizenship Day is not a public holiday, rather a day which enables each and every one of us to reflect on the rights of the individual Canadian.

I believe I speak for all of us—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no doubt!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —when I say that citizenship is an active, dynamic exciting process.

Mr. Lewis: Yes it is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It has meaning in the actions, responses and concerns of people, and it is this particular behaviour which forms the basis and raison d'etre on which our own democracy is founded.

In this land we have stability and we have the rights and freedoms inherent in our way of life. Good citizenship demands more than flag waving and lip service, it must be felt in our hearts, understood in our minds and applied in our way of life.

Mr. MacDonald: Drip, drip, drip!

Mr. Lewis: A great thing for a little burlesque on a Friday morning. The straight man for the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On this 25th anniversary of the establishment of The Canadian Citizenship Act, Mr. Speaker, I would earnestly ask all citizens, native born of whatever generation, and those who have chosen this country as their home—

Mr. Pilkey: This government is trying to destroy Canada.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to observe this occasion and be aware of its significance.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: This government insists on underlining its own bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Lewis: Oh it is really rough over there. If they want to feel better, look at the former Premier's complexion.

FORKS OF THE CREDIT PROVINCIAL PARK STUDY

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell the House if, in fact, in his previous responsibilities before becoming a member of the Legislature, he was part of a committee that was designed and had as its goal to establish a park at the Forks of the Credit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall being a member of any such committee, or that there was such a committee.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Does the Premier not recall that in 1959 when he had just entered the House he was advocating the establishment of such a public park?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been, I think, some reference to a speech made by me—I believe it was in 1960—and I did not enter this House per se in the physical sense until that year.

Mr. Lewis: Just the metaphysical sense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right!

Mr. Lewis: Just want to be clear about this, a very profound type of guy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition is wondering whether I am in favour of a provincial park at the Forks of the Credit, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously I am.

Mr. Singer: Oh that is very good!

QUARRYING ACTIVITIES ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines. Has he taken any further steps towards the preparation of legislation which will control quarrying activities in the Niagara Escarpment? Secondly, can he assure us that no special permit nor licence will be granted any new operations in any part of the Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition some time ago, this matter is under very active consideration and study at the moment, in fact—

Mr. Lewis: Sort of voluminous.

Mr. Singer: Forks of the Credit!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —on Tuesday next—

Mr. Lewis: Tuesday next?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes on Tuesday next, I am taking an aerial inspection tour—

Mr. Nixon: Aerial inspection?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, aerial inspection tour and a ground inspection tour—

Mr. Lewis: Both? Is he parachuting?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —with members of the municipal organization; and also accompanying me will be members of the aggregate producers.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member for Scarborough West should listen and learn something.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And I am hopeful that we will have something in the not too distant future.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister answer the second part of my question and assure the House that no licence nor permission for any new activities will be granted in the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As the member knows quite well, we have not been issuing any new permits except with the express consent of the municipalities concerned. To my knowledge, at least in my term of office, we have not issued any permits for any new quarries or any new gravel pits on the escarpment.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary: Can the minister tell the House if there are applications pending for new works on the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: To my knowledge, there are not.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: To whom have rights to quarry been granted since the Act to preserve the Niagara Escarpment passed through this House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I do not have this information handy, but I certainly will check and advise the member.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, do I understand this a reversal of the government policy as it now stands to turn the temporary Act into a permanent piece of legislation to which the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) agreed?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I do not think so Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, when then will the minister announce his decision or bring legislation before the House? Has he a timetable on this aspect of the preservation of the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, as I pointed out this matter is under very active consideration by myself, I will admit, and certainly in the fullness of time and hopefully in this session—

TIME ADVERTISEMENT ON GOVERNMENT BORROWING

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Can he explain to the House why it was necessary to take a full page ad in Time magazine to advise the public of the government's intention to borrow $100 million when, as part of the ad, it was pointed out that the advertisement did not in any way indicate that the borrowing would involve the public directly and was not accessible to them?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): That is a matter of discretion of the syndicate managers. We do not take the ad. It is taken in the normal course of events. If the member would look at the Globe and Mail, he would find the same sort of ads—

Mr. Lewis: But do not knock Time magazine.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —he will also quite often find them in Time magazine.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): I think it was quite a clever story.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they did well by it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government did not pay for it.

Mr. Peacock: Oh, no!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There may well be some legal requirements that it be published.

Mr. MacDonald: Part of that American cultural influence.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Part of it!

Mr. Nixon: Can the minister inform the House, or would he be prepared to do so in the near future, as to the timetable for the acquisition of the funds necessary to support his budget that he brought down about three weeks ago now, in which he predicted a $415 million deficit with a requirement of about something under $300 million in additional borrowing this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The money will be necessary as the year goes on. No, I do not think I am going to indicate to the House—I think it would be most unwise to indicate what our borrowing schedule may be or not be. That has never been done before.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary question: Is there any possibility that the Treasurer will consult with the other provincial Treasurers and the Minister of Finance for Canada on the whole provincial and federal borrowing policy, particularly in the light of the policy of the government of Quebec to enter into such a substantial debt in order to fund their new Hydro Quebec development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have made and are making our views known to the Minister of Finance, and I assume that other Treasurers are. The Minister of Finance for Canada has indicated to the provinces by letter, which he released to the press on the same day that he mailed it, that he thought it unwise due to the pressures on the Canadian dollar for provinces to borrow offshore. What Mr. Benson also has been saying is that the government of Canada proposes to borrow, or will have to borrow, something in the neighbourhood of $2.2 billion this year, in Canada presumably.

I can only say, and this should be obvious even to the Leader of the Opposition, that to take that kind of money out of the Canadian bond market—$2.2 billion—leaves very little room if any for the provinces or the municipalities. This is the reason, I assume, that the Province of Quebec felt it necessary, in spite of the injuncture of Mr. Benson, to go to New York last week and to register there. We may very well have to take the same action ourselves.

Mr. Nixon: That is what the government has been doing for the last several years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If Mr. Benson—

Mr. Nixon: That is what the government has been doing for the last several years. Who was this government blaming last year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government did it several years ago at the urging of the federal government! At the urging of Mr. Benson, we went offshore!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Is this supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the Treasurer indicate to the House if he feels that if he, as the Treasurer of Ontario, went to the bond market of this province his request for funds would not be supported? Because certainly he has not borrowed any money here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is not quite correct. Hydro borrowed earlier this year.

Mr. Nixon: That is correct. Go ahead!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, you want the facts! Certainly, we can go into this market and borrow money—at a price.

Mr. Nixon: Then why do you not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At a price!

Mr. Nixon: Why this $100 million in New York?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At a price, we can borrow money anywhere. But we have some concern for the taxpayers of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Then as a supplementary question: Does the minister believe that it is in the taxpayers' interest to borrow in New York and thus force the value of the Canadian dollar up further when there is a local alternative?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That money, as I have explained to this House, never has left New York, nor will it leave New York. It is there to refund a Hydro issue in the amount of some $40 million and to purchase coal and equipment in excess of the $100 million which was borrowed in New York.

Mr. Nixon: One hundred million dollars additional borrowing not even offered in Canada.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, and it is commendable that there is one person in this country, namely the Leader of the Opposition over there, who still supports Ben Benson. It is great to know he has one friend.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: What are all these people doing in here? Is this pay day?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. member for York Centre has a supplementary.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Let us hear from the member for York Centre and company.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary: What proportion of the $2.2 billion being borrowed by Ottawa is refunding of issues which are maturing, and therefore what amount of Ottawa's close to $2.2 billion borrowing would be new money actually required out of the market?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I cannot answer that off the top of my head, and I do not know why—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I really do not know why the Liberals did not ask that question when Mr. Benson phoned this morning and said "try and ask an embarrassing question of this government"—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Answer the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. De Monte: Just answer the question. The Treasurer is afraid to answer the questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The Premier will have to get rid of him.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister not consider that the net amount of new borrowing by Ottawa would be an important factor for him to know before he decided to borrow outside this country?

Mr. Nixon: That is right!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would quite agree and we are doing that before we make any further loans anywhere. We will be assessing the situation on the advice of knowledgeable people, as we always have, as to where and when the best place for us or for Ontario Hydro would be to borrow—whether it is in

this market, or in a foreign market. That is done prior to making any loan and we will do so in the future.

All I can tell members is that Mr. Benson takes the view that he cannot cut taxes because he has to borrow $2.2 billion. Some of it is refunding, but nevertheless the government of Canada apparently are going into the market for something like $2.2 billion.

Mr. Nixon: He would be glad to know that the Treasurer is speaking for him.

An hon. member: Somebody needs to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Which does not leave very much room, if any, for the provinces and the municipalities; and we like to think we are partners in this confederation.

Mr. Nixon: The Treasurer does not like to borrow it here anyway. It is cheaper to borrow it in the States.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

INCO COMPLIANCE WITH MINISTERIAL ORDER

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member sure backed off that in a hurry.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes that is it. Was the minister or were his officials consulted by International Nickel before they decided to change their developmental programmes to comply with the minister's anti-pollution orders?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, we did have a meeting with representatives from International Nickel. They advised us of what they would be doing which is indicated in a press release in today's newspaper. There was no indication of course at that meeting, nor is there in the release that they will not comply with the ministerial order.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister satisfied, or as reasonably satisfied as he can be at this time, that the Inco programmes will meet the requirements of the minister's orders, which have been in effect for some time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

ONTARIO PLACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Is the appointment of the member for Don Mills to head the advisory committee a noted appointment by way of order-in-council? Is it a formal appointment of the government?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we just have not thought whether there needs to be an order-in-council or not. If it is necessary, it will be done; otherwise, it will not.

Mr. Lewis: Has it been formalized in any way other than by the minister's announcement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has been discussed with the minister, of course, at some great length.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe I should say it has been discussed with the member for Don Mills at some great length.

Mr. Lewis: Right! Oh, the minister did chat with him about it? Good.

Is it true, by way of supplementary, as strong rumour has it that the former Ministers of Public Works (Mr. Simonett), Transport (Mr. Haskett), and Highways (Mr. Gomme) will also be on that advisory committee?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never heard of that before, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may: Is the former minister to receive a salary; and if so, how much?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has insisted, Mr. Speaker, that he be given no salary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sort of disappointing to the members over there.

GERTLER REPORT

Mr. Lewis: Always hoping, always hoping, one way or another.

May I ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is it true that the unedited edition of the original

Gertler report included in it a price evaluation and range, by acre and by parcel of land of all the priority areas which Gertler recommended that the government purchase?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were some references in the basic document to possible prices. Whether it was done on the basis of individual parcels quite frankly, I do not recall.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: If, in the original report the priority acquisition areas were priced as they then stood in June, 1968, will the Premier not table that document so that those of us in the Legislature can pursue this debate with that kind of material available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday, I am reviewing the information related to this and I shall be making a further statement on it very shortly.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Can the Premier advise us whether those estimates as made in the Gertler report, insofar a price relating to particular parcels are concerned, were based on opinions given by land evaluators who are employed by The Department of Public Works, by independent land evaluators retained by Gertler, or whether the figures just came off the top of Professor Gertler's head?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that the report itself indicated the basis for certain assessments of value. I do recall, in reading the very voluminous material printed by the media, that there was some reference to assessment figures being used as one of the bases. In certain areas of the province of course, one would have to wonder just how accurate these might be, say in 1968, because they would be 1967 assessment figures, perhaps even 1966. Of course, in some municipalities it would be debatable just how accurate a reflection of a true market value these would be.

Now this is what I read in the media and not necessarily in the report.

Mr. Singer: Specifically, Mr. Speaker, that was my question. Could the Premier ascertain for us whether or not anyone who is expert or knowledgeable about land evaluation was consulted and/or retained so that a basis for these estimates was there on a professional level?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the Premier saying that after these eight days of voluminous preparation and analysis to which he has subjected the Gertler material, he is unable to tell us from personal knowledge whether or not the lands are marked by price and on what basis that price was arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that—

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is hedging and floundering.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not hedging at all, Mr. Speaker. I made it very clear in the statement I made to this House yesterday what I was doing and this I intend to do.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is floundering.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not floundering.

Mr. Lewis: The entire cabinet is floundering.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No—the member wishes we were.

Mr. Lewis: The government has never been in greater disarray.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member did choke over that, did he not? Even the member for South York is smiling at that one.

Mr. MacDonald: I am smiling at the Premier, not at that.

Mr. Lewis: I would hate to relinquish this place for a cough.

Mr. MacDonald: I only smile in the morning, particularly Friday morning.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): That is not a smile. It is gas pains.

LAND BANK PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: Yes, for the sake of some land, the province was lost.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the premier—has he, in the month that has elapsed since the tabling of the budget, decided what portion of the $20 million land bank will be used for the purpose of recreational lands on the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker. This is very much under review.

PROPOSED CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier yet another question—I do not think it has been asked in the last two or three days. Has the Premier now arrived at the names of the participants in the conference on economic nationalism, or foreign investment, in June?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the participants have been contacted and I shall have an announcement for the House Tuesday.

Mr. Lewis: Another slight delay until the Premier amasses the material.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No!

Mr. Lewis: The government moves with great decision in the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the member for Scarborough West has different ways of doing things. When people are invited to participate, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only appropriate that this be confirmed with them before it is announced here to the Legislature. I recognize the member for Scarborough East would probably do it the other way around, which is very typical—

Some hon. members: West!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Scarborough West rather! I do get the east and west mixed up and there really is not much similarity. In saying that, I hope I am not being critical of either of them.

FACULTY MEMBERS' DISMISSALS AT NIAGARA COLLEGE, WELLAND

Mr. Lewis: Could I ask the Minister of Education a question, Mr. Speaker? Is the Minister of Education satisfied in his own mind with the procedures by which a number of faculty members were dismissed from Niagara College in Welland, and has he undertaken a review of that episode?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the House the other day when I made some statement in connection with the community college programme and the Canada Manpower programme, the executive of the faculty association of Niagara College have met with me, at which time they left a very extensive brief setting out a number of matters insofar as the operation of the college was concerned and their reaction as far as the administration was concerned. I met with the chairman and members of the board of governors on Wednesday evening of this week and left with them a copy of that particular brief. The chairman and members of the board have asked for some time to review the contents of that brief. I have indicated I would be quite prepared to meet with either party as soon as both parties are as familiar with each as they want to be.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it eight of the faculty who were dismissed have no affiliation with the Canada Manpower at all, and were arbitrarily dismissed by the board. Is the minister satisfied that this is an appropriate way in which to handle faculty relations at one of the community colleges?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think I will put it this way. I think it would be in fairness to both sides in this particular matter if I do not make any further comment until such time, as I say, the board has had a chance to study the position of the faculty.

However, the hon. member for Scarborough West will recall that when the statement was made in the House it was in two parts. Although we dealt in the one part with the Canada Manpower programme and the staff implications with respect to the federal cutback there, the members of the House were also reminded that in the post-secondary programme there were some staff considerations occasioned by the change in financing, that is the move to formula financing, and that many colleges, as the result of this new procedure, were taking a very hard look at staffing for next fall and in fact had made some decisions in that connection. I have no opinion until such time as the board of governors has had a chance to review the matter with respect to the method used, but I think in fairness I should draw the members' attention to that statement which I made in the House.

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary for myself, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not concerned about the tens of thousands of dollars of waste and duplication which were revealed in the report of the faculty group and the possibility that may be mirrored throughout the community college system with the enormous public cost implied?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat once again that I think in fairness to the board of governors I should make no further comment until they have had a chance to respond to the faculty position.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Would the minister not agree that the board of governors was probably aware of most of the charges of wastage before the faculty made public parts of their report? If so, is it not rather a waste of time to leave it sit there? Would the minister not agree, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time to have a serious investigation of such charges of wastage by an independent committee, perhaps a select committee of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I really feel —and I am sure the member for Scarborough East did not intend this—but the position of the faculty has been set out in a brief. There are many sides to all these matters and I think in fairness this minister wants to hear from the board of governors itself its response to this brief. I am not prejudging the situation until the board of governors has had an opportunity to respond. I really think that is a fair approach at this time. Following this, I will have more to say about the issue.

Mr. T. Reid: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister perhaps give us some idea what he would consider to be a fair length of time to give the board of governors of the Niagara College to make its own report or rebuttal of the charges made? Is he talking about one week, 10 days, six months or five years?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker: they have asked for 10 days to two weeks.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask a further supplementary: Is the minister assured there is an effective grievance procedure for those who are members of the faculty at Niagara College in view of the fact that they seem to be in a state of limbo between a faculty association and the CSAO? As the minister is aware, the charges were that some of these dismissals were not based on academic considerations but on other considerations. I would appreciate knowing what his feeling is about the grievance procedure.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am very happy this question has been asked, because two members of the executive of the CSAO were present at the time of the meeting with the executives of the faculty association. The hon. member of course will know that the outcome of the vote with respect to the bargaining unit was announced within the last six or seven weeks—I have just forgotten the date—and they are now working out some of these details.

The staff situation there, in my opinion, is complicated in two ways: There are those members of the staff who claim to be on some type of a contract and the wording of that contract for some staff members, although it was entitled a probationary—

Mr. Pitman: It is very questionable.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes. A probationary contract carries some clause with respect to regularizing it after the expiration of a certain amount of time and I advised the CSAO people and the faculty people they should get a legal opinion with respect to this. I am satisfied that the board of governors wants to have it assessed in that way as well.

I can perhaps say this at this stage, rather than commenting in any detail on the grievance procedure, that the president of the college advised me at the meeting with the board of governors that 14 members—either 11 or 14—have already filed to take advantage of grievance procedures which the president of the college felt in fact were available to the members of the staff and he indicated that he had made this known to staff members. Either 11 or 14 in fact filed.

Mr. Pitman: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Were any of those 11 the eight who were removed from the college who were not in Manpower? Manpower tended to be tied in with the CSAO previously, I think. I was wondering if those eight, who I think, were the ones who were excluded from the Manpower section, if they have actually filed grievance procedures through the CSAO.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am afraid I do not know the particulars of those who have in fact filed the application but I would be glad to get that information for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

AID TO OPERATORS OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. Lewis: One last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Social and Family Services: Will the minister pay the additional governmental portion of the request for increased per diem for nursing home operators in Toronto who service those in receipt of welfare?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. member means by the additional amount.

Mr. Lewis: Over and above the $10.50 per day.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The government, of course, has been reviewing this particular matter and it is our intention as far as welfare recipients are concerned to pay 80 per cent of $11 for this year. Based on the studies we have available to us, we feel this is an equitable amount, particularly in light of the fact that the nursing home operators realize that on April 1, 1972, they are moving into a new programme on which they will be paid, as my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health announced last week, on a budgetary basis.

We feel that $11 is an equitable amount and that is what we will be paying—our subsidy—for those on welfare, and I would hope that none of the operators in Metropolitan Toronto would take any kind of action, such as they have suggested, because from all our studies I certainly think the rates we are paying are equitable. It is rather confusing to me, Mr. Speaker, to find them saying that they are not getting enough money for these people and yet every time a new nursing home opens up, they are crying to get these people in from the Metropolitan Toronto social service department even at the per diems that are being paid now.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of supplementary then, I am to understand that the minister has decided to pay an additional 40 cents a day from government? He is going from $10.50 to $11 a day, for which he will pay the additional 80 per cent?

By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has the minister personally attempted to intervene in this very unpleasant dispute between the nursing home operators, whom he subsidizes, and Metropolitan Toronto, and involving threats about patient care?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the minister had a long chat with commissioner Anderson this morning. I am informed the situation is that the brief was presented to the Metropolitan committee, asking for a $15 per diem rate. One of the parts of the brief suggested that the kind of action that could be taken by these operators was in effect to refuse to take welfare recipients. It was not as forcefully put as perhaps some of the newspaper stories might have suggested, but still that threat hung over their negotiations.

As I say, he and I talked about this and I have informed him of what our position is for this year. We hope that the nursing home operators will show some responsibility in this matter too, because as I say we have shown them what is going to happen in the long run. In another year they are going to be on a total budgetary position where the people of my colleague, the Minister of Health, will be going in and assessing the budgets and finding out exactly what it takes to operate.

I might tell the hon. member that part of our problem in this whole area has been the difficulty to get actual figures from the nursing homes. They have been very loath to present to us their books and their statements and therefore we have had our consultants do all our studies with figures that we have been able to assess and have had to get ourselves. In other words, we have not been able to send our people in and look at the actual books.

Those people who have consulted with us would say that the $11 rate that we have is, as an average rate, equitable. Now, it may not be for some operators, but I think it is an equitable rate for most of them.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries? If not, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs has the answer to a question.

SAFE CONDITION OF ABANDONED MINES

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to a question asked of me by the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier). I see he is not in his seat at the moment, but I will place the reply in Hansard.

The question was:

> Does the minister intend to take action this session whereby amendments will be made to The Mining Act to make sure that the areas and municipalities where mines have finished operating are left in a safe condition, as requested by the town of Timmins in its brief to the natural resources committee last fall?

The answer is the whole matter of potential danger from surface subsidence due to possible cave-in of abandoned mine workings has been under consideration by my department for some numbers of months and a committee report is expected soon. The Mining Act does require (a) the capping of shafts and raises

with reinforced concrete bulkheads; (b) the fencing of other large openings to surface; (c) the method of capping to be shown on a surface plan filed with The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs on abandoning or closing down; (d) underground level plans and sections to be filed with the department on abandoning or closing down the mine.

I expect that one recommendation of the committee will be that before the surface rights of a mining property can be transferred, that the deed filed in the Land Titles Office shall include the fact that there are underground workings beneath the surface. This would ensure that all persons interested in the surface property would be aware of the underground workings close to the surface.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

LIQUOR LICENCES FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education.

Is the minister aware that the Haldimand County School Board approves liquor licences for two schools in the municipalities of Caledonia and Hagersville? Is this a new policy of The Department of Education, to allow the secondary high schools to be used for liquor outlets in this province?

Mr. Nixon: Nice for the senior students.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I did not know about these two particular instances in Haldimand county I must admit, and I will be glad to get some more information.

But making reference to my former responsibilities, it is my understanding that it was the policy of the licence board if a group was going to have a function—that is if a community organization wanted to have a function in one of our schools, as in any other hall—the board would contact the school boards if it happened to be school property or if it happened to be property owned by the municipality, to see if they had any objection to the availability of beverage alcohol at the particular social event.

I assume that this has been the procedure followed and I would be glad to get more information if you will give me the two specific events. You know, service clubs and other groups hold functions in many of our municipalities and might have decided to have it in schools.

Mr. Singer: There is one downstairs here; what about that one?

Mr. Haggerty: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: This does concern community halls and I was wondering why the government has failed to provide community halls in these areas when funds are available in the community development branch—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I must admit I did not hear the question.

Mr. Haggerty: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why has the government failed in providing community halls in these two areas—

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Haggerty: —when funds are available—

Mr. Speaker: It is not supplementary; it is out of order. The member for High Park has the floor.

INSTRUCTIONS TO EMPLOYEES OF ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker.

Why has the Ontario Housing Corporation issued written instructions to the employees in the department of corporate planning and research that in future they are to supply no information to other branches of the Ontario Housing Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will find out from the department whether such a letter has been issued and the purposes for it. I am surprised the hon. member does not know the reason; he gets all the confidential documents and should have all the confidential answers.

Mr. Lewis: It was done in the interest of improved communications.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre. There cannot be a supplementary because the minister has said he will get the information.

SPECIAL PLANNING GRANT TO YORK REGIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In connection with the special planning grant made recently to York regional council for local planning purposes, was it contemplated that a proportionate amount of this grant would be paid over to those area municipalities that have their own planning staff to do their local planning or was the grant primarily only to assist those municipalities that would have the region carry out the local plans?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moneys were to be paid to the regions themselves; then I think we must rely on the region to work out certain arrangements with its constituent municipalities. This matter has been generally discussed with me in an informal way, and the York region, I think, is working out the matter itself.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: It is the intention of the minister to encourage the centralization of local planning in the region or not? Is that the minister's intention?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I think that in the new regions the overall planning should be within the region, and then they should work with the—

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about planning in the area municipality. Is it the minister's intention that the area planning be done by the region, or within the areas where possible?

Hon. Mr. Bales: This is a particular situation within the York region, because some of the other municipalities have staff and some do not. I think we have to look at it in a practical way. I think the overall planning should be in the region and then, when that has been established, the municipalities themselves should carry out their local planning. But it takes a little adaptation for a new region.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Was a substantial portion of the special grant made to York region for area planning or local planning?

Hon. Mr. Bales: As far as I am aware, it was not designated, it was not broken down.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ACQUISITION OF PECHE ISLAND

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Yesterday the minister made mention of the fact that the Parks Integration Board would be meeting, or that he would informed, concerning the purchase of Pêche Island. Has he any information to give to the House today?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I said that the Parks Integration Board would be meeting at 9. The meeting is on as soon as the question period is over. We are on our way there now. The meeting will be held this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was my question. Perhaps I can address a new question to the Minister of Lands and Forests, which really is by way of supplementary to that of the member for Windsor-Walkerville. Will the Parks Integration Board, at its meeting this morning, have before it the implications of the order of the Supreme Court of Ontario setting the May 26 deadline for the auctioning of the lands on Pêche Island?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I have asked our people—and I know the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) asked his people—to have all the information that we need for our discussion this morning.

EVALUATION STUDY RESULTS OF SPECIAL SCHOOL PROGRAMME

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. What are the results of the evaluation studies in two Toronto area elementary schools carried out by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education concerning the effectiveness of "the open plan and ungraded school programme" instituted by The Department of Education? My reference is to page 25 of the annual report of 1968-1969 of the Ontario institute.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get that information for the hon. member. I have not got those evaluations.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Mr. Pitman: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Could the minister indicate whether there has been a memorandum sent out by The Department of Education to principals of secondary schools across the province suggesting to them, or indicating to them, that they are expected to keep students in class until a particular date in June and that students will be deprived of their certificates if that attendance is continued?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I read that particular memorandum, except that a memorandum in the regular procedure of the department has gone out indicating the termination date of the formal programme in both the elementary and the secondary schools and the establishment of the examination period. I really cannot comment on the latter part of the hon. member's question with respect to whether or not certificates would be withheld, but I would be very glad to provide him with a copy of the memorandum.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary: I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he has given any consideration to the possibility of giving greater flexibility to this policy in view of the fact that students sometimes do secure jobs in grade 12, particularly if they are in vocational school for commercial courses and are able to secure jobs in April and May and then find themselves in a position of either having to reject the job or to stay until they can secure a certificate? In many cases, they have completed most of the class work and in fact their marks would indicate that a certificate would be most appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable request and I would be very happy to look into that matter.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

PACKAGING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Will the minister release the report of the packaging committee before he discusses this with the Litter Council?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any advantage in doing that.

Mr. Gaunt: As a supplementary: When is the minister going to discuss the report with the Litter Council? Is it this coming week?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Next Tuesday evening.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the minister consider making a report to the House on those discussions?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I think probably the best thing would be just to table the report and if the members have any questions, I would be happy to answer any of them that might develop out of the recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

TOC ALPHA PROGRAMME

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health regarding the Toc Alpha trailer project which will visit 16 Ontario towns for six days each this summer. Would the minister consider enlarging or supplementing this programme, either through Toc Alpha or through the Addiction Research Foundation?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Yes Mr. Speaker, I will consider it and report back to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION HEARINGS POLICY

Mr. Deacon: I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Why have many hearings of the Ontario Securities Commission recently been held in camera? Has the government changed its policy toward open hearings?

Shall I repeat the question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

Mr. Ruston: Will the minister wake up?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The minister is not the Attorney General!

Mr. Deacon: I thought I had caught the minister's attention the first time. Why have many hearings of the Ontario Securities Commission recently been held in camera? Is this a change in policy of the board toward having open hearings?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, many hearings of the Ontario Securities Commission are held in camera because there are interests or considerations involved that should be, so far as a hearing is concerned, not public at that time.

Now if a decision, a judgement, of the commission is arrived at there are probably good reasons why that should be public, but to bring out things which may or may not be evidential or true, allegations that are made and internal commentary, that I think is not the type of thing that should be public in a commission of this kind. It is not a change in policy at all.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister not agree that an open hearing is a good way to ensure that there is some pressure upon both the commission and all that this is a completely open case, a fair hearing? Is this not part of our basic judicial system for equity?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Generally that is a very broad principle which is to be followed, but to give an example where the type of thing I put forward in my reply is, the type of hearing that is held in The Provincial Judges Act where the council of judges there may hear allegations against that individual and that hearing is in camera and so designed and so stated in the legislation.

The hearing before a commission such as the Ontario Securities Commission where someone has made an allegation or some question of conduct which may not be so could be very damaging to a very broad spectrum of commercial life or to individuals. I think in that area there should be a private hearing. Now then if action is taken by this securities commission, as I say, if judgements are reached or directly made those, of course, come out as public statements.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the annual report of The Department of Correctional Services for the fiscal year, 1969-1970.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that when this House adjourns today it stands adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a member of the new government. I would like to commend the government and the new provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) for the bold steps it has taken in its recent budget to help alleviate the problem of unemployment, which is bringing such uncertainty to the lives of tens of thousands of families and individuals in our province.

Since the private sector of our economy is by far the largest employer in Ontario, we have moved to stimulate business investment with measures designed to promote increased tempo of business expansion and, through this, create many more jobs.

The principal step which we have initiated for this year is a five per cent tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment. This machinery will provide a real encouragement for a company which might have been contemplating expansion of its facilities but was hesitant about the cost, due to the uncertainty of the economic climate prevalent today or in a light position as far as capital is concerned. As a result of the legislation which we have now brought into being, for every $100 of investment in new plant and equipment the company makes between April 26, 1971 and puts into operation and uses before March 31, 1973, that company will be able to reduce its tax payments to the province by $5.

For an investment of $1 million, therefore, the savings will be $50,000, while a company embarking on a $20 million capital expense programme could reduce its tax by $1 million. In addition, with the coming to immediate grips with the problem of unemployment, this legislation will also play an important role in protecting long-term security for job holders.

As you know, Canadian manufacturers are under tremendous and intense competition from overseas. This is of particular concern

in my own community of Hamilton, which is one of Canada's major industrial centres. For instance, the Japanese are able to produce at wages far below those currently prevalent in Canada. Although we in Canada can be proud of our basic steel producers, their production, their skill and achievement, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should ever forget that we do face very severe and stiff foreign competition.

Likewise, many of the older, basic manufacturing firms, such as the farm machinery industry, especially with the Canadian dollar being at par with the American, are at a further disadvantage in foreign export markets. The only way in which Canadian industry can meet such a competition, and ensure and protect job security for those employed, is by investing in new plant and equipment to enable it to keep its current cost of production in line in the face of costs. This is what the government of Ontario in its budget will encourage to do.

The serious matter of unemployment for the most part has been created by the economic policies of Messrs. Benson and Trudeau. It casts its shadow across our province and our nation. It might well be that the frequent tripping about by a Prime Minister has been used as a diversion to take the public's mind away from the matter of unemployment here on the home front.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging that this government is going to embark upon a number of programmes, noticeably housing construction, to try to alleviate the present economic situation. We in Hamilton have benefitted greatly from the Ontario Housing Corporation's ambitious programmes, and now we have more than several thousand senior citizens public housing units and a dramatic increase in the number of public housing units during the past three years.

However, on the matter of unemployment I would like to say a few words about summer employment for students. I cannot help but concur with the comments expressed in the Globe and Mail editorial on Monday, April 12, "Much Ado about a Few Jobs." Fourteen thousand regular jobs to be offered to the young people of our province are but an increase of 3,000 over last year. Surely a province as resourceful, imaginative and economically stable as Ontario could provide far more job opportunities, not only in the government sector but of course also in the private sector.

I maintain it is still not too late for the province to embark on a more ambitious scheme, such as that initiated in the Province of Saskatchewan, where industry has been invited to develop a co-ordinating scheme for providing students with summer employment. The Saskatchewan government will pay a subsidy of $1.50 or 50 cents for a month's pay to companies that hire students.

Many farmers in this province who are trying to maintain small family farms likewise are in a position to hire students. Could there be a more rewarding summer job opportunity for a young person than the experience of working on a family farm? Let us do away with the airy-fairy ideas of keeping our young people amused and occupied through the building of roadside kiosks, singalong bus trips, transCanada tours, but rather let us involve those who want to work in some meaningful way.

I recall the hon. member for Ontario riding (Mr. Dymond) interjecting in this Legislature during one of our debates last year, "There is still no better therapy for a man than work". Student travel, theatrical enterprises and arts and crafts programmes as well as athletics all have their place; yet we should never lose sight of the fact that the old-fashioned adage, "Hard work is good for man, and built this country," still stands.

One of the tragedies of this century for many industrial nations—and I know it is especially true in England and Scotland—has been the fact that this very concept is being challenged by many young people and adults, some of whom no longer want to work but would rather loaf or go on welfare. Let our government also provide a $1 per capita grant to municipalities so they may be able to hire students for municipal projects. Many of our major cities are faced with public gardens and parklands that are in dire need of care and facelifting.

The fact that so few job opportunities are provided through social and family services to the homes for the aged and so on is also discouraging. Upon the young people of this province hangs our future and the destiny of our nation. Let us not stand idly by and sanction, through apathy, the present situation. The present teenage generation is indeed more mature, better educated and enlightened than possibly any generation in the past.

Coming from the industrial heartland of Ontario, I am encouraged by the announcement that, to further encourage Canadian enterprise and ownership, a venture capital fund will be established to assist in the financing of small businesses which have exceptional potential but which involve greater

risks than are acceptable to conventional lending institutions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my personal opinion that such funding is long overdue. Many people in this province are growing impatient with the Ontario Development Corporation's give-away programme to industries wishing to locate or expand in designated depressed areas. This whole matter has been brought into focus by the closure of the H. G. Wright Manufacturing Company Limited of Hamilton and the subsequent disclosure that Selkirk-Metalbestos Limited of Brockville was granted a $77,000 subsidy.

Why does every small rural area and community in Ontario dream of becoming an industrial giant? Should we not re-assess our whole concept of what makes a better life for our people? Do we want to have wall-to-wall industry all along our seaway and our lakeshores? Or should the present industrial centres be further strengthened so as to accommodate more industries and further utilize the harbours and other communication facilities which are presently in existence in such centres as Toronto, Hamilton, Cornwall, St. Catharines, the Lakehead, the Soo, and so on.

Over the past three years I have had many occasions to bring delegations of small businessmen to The Department of Trade and Development for the sole purpose of seeking financial assistance or advice on the expansion of small privately owned industries in the city of Hamilton. Although our present unemployment rates are three per cent to five per cent above average, our city is not considered a depressed region. Nevertheless, many of our small businesses through tight money policies and high interest rates are denied the means to expand their facilities for new lines or other technical advancements.

I recall on one occasion a small confectionery manufacturer, when inquiring about the possibility of financial assistance so he could expand his biscuit firm and employ an additional 15 to 20 people, was told if he relocated the plant in a depressed area, then some form of forgivable assistance would be considered. The present policy of ODC works contrary to the basic interests of industrial communities such as Hamilton.

We have old industrial areas, old and dilapidated warehouses which need refurbishing and modernization and technological upgrading. Our major cities have the educational, service and communication facilities that can maintain an increased work force and productivity. Yet so little is done to bring more industry to these large industrial centres. Were it not for the continued expansion of our major basic Canadian steel producers, I would be very concerned about the economic future of Hamilton.

The announcement by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management regarding the $500,000 grant to the Hamilton regional conservation authority to purchase the Fifty Point Park is certainly most welcome by the people of Hamilton and the Niagara region. This brings into focus the whole matter of the need for more public parkland.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in this House during the past four years, and especially this month, regarding the Gertler report. I would like to commend some of the people who not only just talk about the goals of the Gertler report, but really get down and do something about it and, in particular, the students of the Ancaster High and Vocational School, and the Parkside High School in Dundas. It was these young people who took upon themselves as a project for this year to raise funds to buy part of the Dundas Valley.

The Dundas Valley, as many members will know, is situated like a great amphitheatre between the north and south slopes of the Niagara Escarpment, carved and shaped by some huge pre-glacial river and subsequent glaciers, it remains largely an area of rolling hills, forests, scenic ravines, spectacular waterfalls. This area, immediately adjacent to the urban development of the Golden Horseshoe, is a 2,000-acre block of near wilderness, unmatched in Canada; yet here is an area that needs to be preserved and protected. It is simply a question of the community staking out this area and saying it will stay. Now that The Department of Highways has shelved its plans to build a super expressway through this last 2,000 acre wilderness area of the Dundas Valley, the young people embarked upon a programme to raise funds through walkathons, private donations, and so on, to donate the money to the Hamilton regional conservation authority, which in turn will have money tripled through provincial grants so that acreage of the Dundas Valley can be purchased.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see this grassroots involvement by young people concerned to see that this area is preserved for eternity. Within the immediate Hamilton region, there are several other very important wilderness areas that likewise must be

preserved. One of course, is that area in the Highway 403 and Mohawk Road region, comprising approximately 150 to 200 acres.

Last year, I was pleased with the co-operation of The Department of Highway officials who, when meeting with the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority, agreed to transfer to the ownership of the authority all those surplus lands adjacent to Highway 403 along the escarpment. At that time it was envisaged that the lands from the old Brantford-Hamilton radio line to the Niagara Escarpment in this area would also become part of a mountain escarpment, brow escarpment, parkway, or a park setting.

This could have been achieved in three ways: One might have been the developers of the adjoining land dedicating their five per cent of land to the township of Ancaster when they developed their adjacent properties; secondly, the township of Ancaster could have had the land frozen as agricultural and therefore preserved in its natural state; or the conservation authority could apply to the provincial government for assistance to purchase these 150-200 acres.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as the local horticultural society, the naturalists, and other interested civic groups began to probe into this, they met resistance. Where did the resistance come from? It came from certain people; and lack of enthusiasm for this escarpment land, the acquisition of it, basically comes from certain interests in the adjoining area, who would like to see this whole area developed as a satellite city by Allarco Development. It is either of Toronto or some western city.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to have these escarpment lands, these last major blocks of land, slip into private ownership. They must be preserved for eternity. It was T. B. McQueston, one of the giants in the Hepburn regime of this province, who preserved so much of the escarpment in the Hamilton-Niagara region and had the foresight—and this is what we need today, the vision of people like McQueston. Indeed this is one park area, when it is acquired for public use, should be named The McQueston Park. I would hope that the provincial Treasurer would give this particular park region a top property in the land acquisition fund.

The further erosion of our cultural heritage is certainly most evident in the current state of affairs of the book publishing industry in Canada and, in particular, the Province of Ontario. I sincerely hope that the royal commission on book publishing, which is presently sitting, will be able to bring forward positive action which will bring about a reform so as to strengthen and maintain the very existence of the industry, or fundamental changes, so as to ensure it as an economic and cultural fact of the Canadian way of life.

Around the world there is a tremendous hunger for information provided by all media but especially for the printed word which is urgently required by the Canadian public. However, this industry is faced with a multi-level dilemma. The advancement of science and technology require constant upgrading of educational standards.

Indeed, tomorrow's libraries have been referred to as the supermarkets of knowledge. The present Canadian book publishing industry and that of Ontario must show greater co-ordination among the Canadian publishing houses so that they can compete in the markets of the world and this nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the guidelines, the objectives of the provincial Treasurer, he outlined the policy of this government to maintain firm control over public spending in order to contain problems and a generation of inflationary pressures.

We in Hamilton already see the results of these government policies and guidelines. This year's newsletter of the Hamilton Board of Education has as its lead banner "Grants and Costs Control Lower Mill Rate." Very often constituents will ask: "Whoever heard of a politician who will reduce taxes?" This year we say, for the first time in the memory of any citizen, there will be a reduction in the mill rate for educational purposes.

The newsletter reads:

> Increased provincial grants and a hold-the-line policy on controllable expenditures have made it possible for the Hamilton Board of Education to reduce both the residential and commercial educational mill rate for 1971.

We, in Ontario, can do more for less and on the matter of education we are conscious of the tremendous advancements that have been made in Hamilton in the field of education.

We see looming and growing in our midst the new McMaster medical-science complex. We have the new Mohawk community college, which even the Liberal for the community acknowledges as the greatest thing that ever came to Hamilton, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, one area I would like to briefly touch upon this morning is the need

to establish further guidelines for the admission of foreign students to Canadian universities because of the increasing shortages of student places and also the costs of post-secondary education to the taxpayers of this province.

A recent report of the subcommittee on research and planning of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario shows that Ontario will be short by the equivalent of another university, as big as the University of Toronto, within five years, if present student enrolment trends continue. In my own area of Hamilton, McMaster University may have to put a firm clamp on enrolment if the present open-door trend continues. Enrolment at McMaster University has increased more than four times since 1960, standing at 7,900 this year with the expectation that it will jump to 8,664 next year. The need for guidelines is especially crucial for the graduate schools because this is where the bulk of foreign students are enrolled. I would like to see a ceiling of five to 10 per cent established on the admission of foreign students.

Mr. Speaker, numbers are not the only matter of concern. The cost to the taxpayers of this province must also be considered. According to university officials, the actual cost of educating a person is $2,000, while tuition is only $500. This means that the Ontario taxpayer, and those in the dominion, wind up paying two-thirds of the cost of a foreign student's education. In addition we are contributing to the cost of educating foreign students in other provinces through equalization payments of which Ontario contributes the most, since it is the wealthiest province.

Such enrolment guidelines would be an extension of the quota system that is being practised by universities now, although they say it does not exist. While universities do subscribe to the idea of being open to all qualified applicants, increasing shortage of space has resulted in their restricting foreign student enrolment to a certain percentage in order to take care of Ontario students.

We already have restrictions on Ontario graduate fellowships and National Research Council operating grants to landed immigrants and this is helping to curtail foreign applications to those who have their own financial means. The NRC restrictions came into force in September, 1970.

In addition, the establishment of guidelines for foreign students would be in line with those recently placed by The Department of University Affairs on foreign professors. Established in January, these guidelines call for teaching openings to be offered, wherever possible, to qualified Canadians, and for a university's overall staff balance to be markedly Canadian.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): All right, Mr. Speaker, what is going on in this House?

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that a certain international flavour is of much benefit to those in the learning situation, but a five to 10 per cent ceiling for the admission of foreign students would retain this quality and at the same time afford more opportunities to our own students for a university education.

Mr. Lewis: We want you to notice that we are bringing in the troops today.

Mr. J. R. Smith: It is good to see that the member for Scarborough West is here.

Mr. Lewis: I am always glad to hear the hon. member.

Mr. J. R. Smith: There are pearls of wisdom here.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the committee on government productivity has been asked to review the function, structure and operation, financing and the objectives of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is certainly most encouraging and overdue.

I place special emphasis on the word "objectives," for we must take great care to ensure that our energy supplies for the future are used as efficiently as possible and they will not adversely affect the environment, health or life of our people.

In 1970, Ontario had a peak demand of 11 billion kilowatts and projected peak period figures for 1980 are 22 billion kilowatts. This represents a doubling of our power consumption demand every decade. The demands for more power production are legitimate when we consider that we do not need more power to recycle waste and to operate the vastly expanded sewage treatment plants that a growing population demands and requires.

We will also need it for the developing systems of mass transportation that our metropolitan areas must have if the automobile is not to make the human lung outmoded. And, of course, a growing population places built-in demands on energy supplies.

While there is no doubt the growth of energy use in this century has a direct relation to the upward swing of the gross national product, I do challenge the claim that the quality of life and energy use are inextricably bound together and for one to improve, the other must increase.

Too often we falsely equate a standard of living with a quality of life. The powering of our country has cost us more than the obvious changes for plant construction. Development of power has necessitated the damming of rivers that cut off trout and other fish runs.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I wonder if I might interrupt the hon. member for just a moment. We are always pleased to recognize and to welcome distinguished visitors to our Legislature, and in the Speaker's gallery this morning we have two such personages. I know the members will want to welcome His Excellency, the Ambassador of Greece in Toronto. We welcome you gentlemen to the Legislature this morning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. R. Smith: We might well project what could possibly be some of the ecological problems faced when they get into the major hydro-electric developments and dams on James Bay—

Mr. Lewis: Seven cabinet ministers for one ambassador—not bad!

Mr. J. R. Smith: They are pollution in cities, raised water temperatures in streams and webs of massive and ugly transmission lines crisscrossing the land. We must not let more power for the people mean the abandonment of what is less of a deteriorating environment.

Power ecology must and should become an important part of our fight against pollution. In an age when consumption of goods has almost been made a virtue, we should, instead encourage the conservation of our resources—that is live better electrically not by a splurge of electrical gadgets, which merely make life more convenient, but we should curtail or ban unnecessary usages of power.

The advertising funds for "Live Better Electrically" campaigns which are designed to increase consumption could be switched instead to programmes to clean up the pollution of existing plants and to develop non-polluting power.

Mr. Speaker, in the riding of Hamilton Mountain is located one of the major provincial psychiatric hospitals. About a year and a half ago the sign of this ancient institution was changed from the Hamilton Ontario Hospital to that of Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital. Very often when names change, new programmes are announced. One would tend to think that really the same old routine is taking place at the same stand.

Mr. Speaker, I take it upon myself to try to become familiar with the operation of this institution, and I would like to say a few words about the tremendous progress that has been made in the matters of mental health care at the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital.

Once an institution which was basically an asylum for the aged, the mentally feeble and geared to custodial care, this institution which once had a population of up to 2,000 patients now has approximately 700 residents. This dramatic reduction of course has occurred through the transfer to nursing homes, rest homes and other boarding homes, many of whom require life-long custodial care or those who could return to normal life.

I personally know of one gentleman who was a resident of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital for over 24 years. After his retraining and reorientation into the community through a special programme last year, which even involved him going on family camping trips with his fellow patients, he was rehabilitated successfully and now is a normal member of the community, working and serving a useful life and making a contribution to society—a man who was kept in that institution for 24 years as a hopeless case. This can be repeated all along the line.

I have been disturbed by some of the remarks that have been made, especially by the mayor of Hamilton and others, that people have been bounced out of the psychiatric hospital with little care or planning or concern for their well-being.

Undoubtedly, when you have a transfer of 1,200 people from an institution into the community there are some that do not adapt and there are mistakes and some do not measure up to the mark. On the whole it has been physically a successful programme and those who remain are really receiving an active mental health programme.

One of the major forces in this institution now is the industrial therapy programme for people who, due to depression or mental breakdown, have lost their desire to live and to work. They are encouraged through various means to readjust to a society in a working capacity. Also the hospital has become an open-door sort of concept. Where formerly

recreation for the patients was entirely in the confines of that institution, they now open the door and patients are taken to bowling alleys, to cultural affairs, to events throughout the community. It is, indeed a progressive and enlightened psychiatric hospital.

Just as this institution was able to do more for less, similarly our local home for the aged, Castle Lodge, reflects the changing sociological pattern of the community. This institution, with approximately 350 bed spaces, and for many years with a long waiting list of applicants, today finds itself with an empty bed space of approximately 70 to 75 per month. It is a changing society. Older citizens, desirous of maintaining themselves in senior citizens' apartments, can now enjoy life to the fullest as long as they can. We find that those on the waiting list for this institution are those requiring bed care or some form of special care.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) and the Minister of of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) that these 72 empty beds in Castle Lodge be immediately converted into beds for special care to alleviate the serious shortage of chronic special care bed facilities for senior citizens in the Hamilton area. We can do more for less if we look at the facilities we have and are willing to adapt to changes in society and in our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we were indeed honoured to have as a visitor to our city several weeks ago the new Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province. While he was there, he was able to meet with our municipal people. He was able to tour our great harbour facilities and there see for himself the industrial giants of Canada. He saw the pollution coming from the steel mill. There was no attempt to turn off switches and shut everything down. It was there for all to see. But one thing that was evident was the marked reduction in air pollution in Hamilton. One thing I note that the people in Hamilton are beginning to take interest in is the air pollution index of the city of Hamilton as compared to the city of Toronto. Not only are we great football rivals, but we rival each other now for clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I say not only are we going to be able to clean up our harbour, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) is going to take that swim, by 1975, across the bay; we are going to have cleaner air than the city of Toronto by 1975 as well.

One thing, though, that was evident during that harbour trip was the lack of shoreline for public use. Just as Fifty Point will provide some public shoreline, there needs to be an even greater acquisition of shoreline on Lake Erie and Lake Ontario before more development takes place and it cannot be retrieved for public use.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Hamilton has made major contributions to the life of this province and nation and it is going to make greater. From our civic square, the new office complexes are beginning to rise into our city skyline. The city which has seen so much of its centre levelled for renewal is beginning to rise like the phoenix from the ashes.

Hamilton is being rebuilt and we have faith in this government. There is one thing that the Premier said on his visit—that there would be more conservative members from our city and region in the next Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I can say, from the reaction of our citizenry and people to this new government of the Premier and his programme, this is going to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Dovercourt? The hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, with the consent of the House, whether the orders might revert to statements by the ministry, with consent of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: Agreed.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): How about the rest of us?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I assumed that they were speaking for the rest of the members in that fashion.

Mr. Peacock: Unanimous consent!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I shall remember that the leader of the New Democratic Party does not speak for his members. Quite right.

Mr. Peacock: Remember the rules.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, in the House yesterday I reported that the government studies related to various allegations concerning land pur-

chases on and adjacent to the Niagara Escarpment were being pursued with the utmost vigour and were being given highest priority. I also indicated that I hoped to be in a position to make a definitive statement on this matter in due course. At a special cabinet meeting this morning, convened specifically to deal with this matter a recommendation has been made to, and approved by, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The order-in-council reads as follows:

The undersigned has the honour to recommend that pursuant to the provisions of The Public Inquiries Act, RSO, 1960, chapter 323, a commission be issued appointing His Honour Colin E. Bennett, Chief Judge of the County and District Courts of the Province of Ontario, a commissioner to inquire into and report upon:

(a) Any improper disclosure to any person, or improper use by any person, of the contents of a report prepared for the government of Ontario under the direction of Professor Leonard Gertler, dated June, 1968, entitled "Niagara Escarpment Study—Conservation and Recreation Report" and,

(b) The sale to or acquisition by the Province of Ontario, any agency thereof, or any public authority, of any of the lands or interests described in the said report or any lands or interests adjacent thereto, and the value of and consideration exchanged for the land or interest at the time of its acquisition by the Province of Ontario, its agencies or any public authority and including the value of and consideration exchanged for any such lands or interests by any prior purchases or vendor.

The undersigned has the honour further to recommend that pursuant to the said Act His Honour Colin E. Bennett shall have the power of summoning any person and requiring him to give evidence on oath and to produce such documents and things as he deems requisite to the full examination of the matters into which he is appointed to examine.

And the undersigned has the honour further to recommend that all government departments, boards, agencies and commissions shall assist His Honour Colin E. Bennett to the fullest extent in order that he may carry out his duties and functions, and that he shall have authority to engage such counsel, investigators and other staff as he deems proper at rates of remuneration and reimbursement to be approved by the Treasury Board.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are most fortunate that Chief Judge Bennett has agreed to accept this commission. I am sure that all members and the general public will welcome the decision to proceed with this highly contentious matter in this way. The House and the public communications media have been literally inundated with conflicting and confusing allegations of improper transactions, inordinate profits, advantages to individuals and so on.

The studies and reviews undertaken by the government substantiate none of these allegations of wrong-doing, but I see no way of assuring all concerned that this is indeed so except for the course of action determined by cabinet and which I am now announcing.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of clarification, subject to your ruling, sir?

Mr. Speaker: It would be permitted, briefly.

Mr. Nixon: Would the Premier indicate what land transactions, specifically, will be undertaken in this review?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the order-in-council is very broad; all transactions within the recommendations of, as we phrased it here, "the Gertler report and land adjacent thereto."

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask two points of clarification, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier? Did I hear any reference at all to applications for subdivision approval by persons concerned in these various land transactions as being subject for due investigation by the commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this would be included in it. It refers to negotiations or considerations, as I recall it—exchanged for the land or interest at the time of its acquisition by the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Lewis: You are not then including within the terms of the inquiry the question of interest in subdivision applications, except as it may relate in one specific?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Sure we are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is there. There is also a question posed, I believe, by the hon. member to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), the information for

which will be available. I think it would be quite proper to table it here in the House at the same time as it is provided to the commissioner.

Mr. Lewis: Fair enough. One last point, Mr. Speaker, does the Premier have in his mind, has he requested of Judge Bennett a date by which the commissioner will have completed his work and submitted it to the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no specific date. As far as I am concerned and the government is concerned, we are as anxious to have a report on this matter, I assure you, as the members opposite may be.

Mr. Speaker: We will revert to the previous order of business. I think we have allowed, out of courtesy, the leaders to ask the points of clarification.

The member for Dovercourt.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, about two years ago I was appointed by my leader to be the critic of The Department of Labour. Since that time, I have done quite a bit of work, both myself and through a committee that I called together, in the labour field. Today, I intend to discuss labour and labour matters and Workmen's Compensation in the light of the fifth volume of the inquiry into civil rights, which has been tabled in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, this document by the commission, headed by Mr. Justice J. C. McRuer, is of vital interest to all of us. It seems to me an appropriate time to review the labour policy of the official opposition in the light of the tabling of this document.

I would like to say right here, Mr. Speaker, that it is time we disabuse ourselves of a very great myth; and that myth is that organized labour and the NDP are close bedfellows. The rank and file of the labour movement are not fools, and they will not be led like sheep along some strange ideological pathway, at the whim and behest of some labour union leaders who think that the NDP is an answer to all their problems.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Say that again. I did not hear.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Speaker, the Robarts era is over and we now have the Davis era in front of us—a dismal, dismal prospect. I notice that the former Premier put up a smokescreen in suggesting that the real threat in the coming election was the NDP. It certainly suited his immediate purposes to do that, I suppose, but the polls since then have told a very different story.

Mr. Lawlor: Believe in the polls! Watch the polls!

Mr. De Monte: Time and again the newspaper figures and the polls have showed that the real threat is coming from this side of the House, which is why I suggest that there might be some conspiracy, Mr. Speaker, between that party and that party over there.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): They are getting into bed together.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): They are getting out of bed together.

Mr. De Monte: I think that the conspiracy is founded upon a very real worry, that we will form the next government in this great province.

Mr. Lawlor: Paranoia. It is incredible if the member feels anything like that.

An hon. member: Do not let the heat get the member.

Mr. De Monte: Since I became the critic of The Department of Labour, Mr, Speaker, I went out into the rank and file of the labour movement—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. De Monte: —and I have gathered around me people in the labour movement, on my labour committee, who tell me that the Liberal Party is as strong as it ever was in the labour movement.

Certainly the mail that I have received by all people, both in and outside the labour movement, shows that my Liberal labour committee, which I have chaired of course, has gained a great deal of acceptance throughout the field of organized labour. In fact the opposition has had nothing but praise for the leadership it has shown in the industrial relations field in the last 18 months or so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review the present labour policy of the Liberal Party in Ontario. I notice that my friends from the left here have all gone. I do not know why.

Mr. Deacon: Not all. There are two there.

Mr. De Monte: I do not think—they are not really interested in labour policy.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): The left has left.

Mr. Pilkey: The ones that count are still here.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): It is the policy that counts.

Mr. De Monte: But I do, Mr. Speaker, want to make a point-by-point survey of what the Liberal position is in this regard.

For those in this House who are not familiar with the day-to-day problems that face those who are dealing in the labour field, perhaps I might sketch in the present picture and the problem areas.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the gross problems of the industrial revolution have now been resolved. Thus, we are not overly worried in the mechanics of how certification is accomplished fairly.

We are not concerned about the fundamental right to bargain collectively, but rather about the nuts and bolts of the process, how collective bargaining can continue without government interference, and yet in the public interest. This is the real difficulty as we see it, in some instances of protracted strikes and lockouts.

Yet the right to strike itself is a fundamental right that must be preserved in our society. Only by withdrawing his labour as a last resort can the workman apply sanctions in furtherance of his just demands. For 40 years, this has been an honoured tradition in Ontario and in Canada. It is the timing and the mechanics that are the problems we now face.

This very real day-to-day kind of problem is precisely the area where this Tory government has proved weakest of all. This is because it is reactionary in every sense of the word. This will end when our Liberal government takes office.

Mr. A. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, there is not a quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

An hon. member: The member for Simcoe Centre should sit down. He may learn something.

Mr. Speaker: There may not be a quorum. We will take a count. Will the Clerk take a count, please?

Mr. De Monte: They are all out. They blew us right off.

Mr. Evans: There is nobody here to hear the member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. De Monte: That is good. Thank you very much.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The member is interrupting his own leader in front of the TV cameras, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The member for Simcoe Centre should get some of his members in the House.

Mr. Speaker: There is not a quorum.

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Kennedy: We have quality—

Mr. Speaker: Will the clerk do a count now, please? There is now a quorum. Would the hon. member for Dovercourt continue?

Mr. De Monte: I thank the hon. member for Simcoe Centre.

Mr. Gaunt: He needed a breather anyway.

Mr. De Monte: The issues then, Mr. Speaker, of the Seventies are industrial harmony, changing technology, employee rights and social justice. Under social justice, I include an end to sex discrimination in hiring and working conditions in our labour force.

The big problem that I have spoken out against many times is the question of the adversary climate which prevails today at the bargaining scene. The more we make relations and dealings between parties resemble those of a court of law, the more we set them against each other. We tend to prolong disputes and to create bitterness. The public suffers from long drawn-out strikes and often feels helpless and frustrated as a result. There is no doubt that the bargaining table has an honoured place in negotiations.

What we are looking for now is some method which will preserve all the advantages of the traditional bargaining table, yet will prove less fractious. We see quite clearly that there must be continuous consultation between labour and management throughout the life of a contract so that problems are settled on the spot before they become dug-in positions held by intractible adversaries like soldiers on a battlefield.

We saw, as we went over this ground in my committee—and let me say again what good and practical labour leaders and rank and file I have working with me; the very breadth of the shop floor comes through on these occasions. As we go over this ground, we recognize that on-the-spot settlements during the life of a contract will mean that fewer and fewer contentious issues will have to be brought to the bargaining table when the time comes for contract renewal.

It is nearly always the side issues that make for the fighting across the table. How often have we seen a TV clip where people are shown emerging from a major bargaining session. They are asked by a reporter how it went; how often have we heard the reply, "We have not come to the question of money yet"? This is the way it goes on nearly all the time. My committee and I feel that if we achieve a workable, on-the-job proposal that we can spread about, we will have made the first major step in recent years to changing the climate of industrial bargaining from the present adversary stance to a more positive and businesslike one.

The public interest can no longer withstand of lack of communication between the parties involved in labour disputes. We cannot have the general public suffering as a result of deadlocks and breakdowns in negotiations that the public is powerless to resolve. This means that withdrawal from the bargaining table is becoming the problem of the future.

Withdrawal from the bargaining table. I think about it! A strike is the right to sanction on the part of the workmen, and that we endorse wholeheartedly. It has come to be accepted and built into the very fabric of our industrial relations tradition. But withdrawal from the bargaining table has no such tradition to back it up and it has become more and more destructive as time has gone on.

It sometimes has to be avoided at all costs. I believe this tactic is not inevitable as consultation during the life of a contract comes to be the norm. We believe that the temperature of negotiations can be lowered by several degrees as a result so that people do not flare up and walk out, but continue to reason with each other and eventually resolve all their differences and come upon a settlement.

We say that one of the new techniques that must be tried is the institution of employer bargaining units on an industry-wide scale. If we can get authority for any particular industry voiced by responsible employer representatives, the union leaders will not feel so frustrated in talking for their members. It will be more a fruitful exchange if men on both sides of the bargaining table have full authority to act and negotiate. Otherwise you have the endless situation of no progress at all.

We have the explosion of the rank and file in sheer frustration; of wildcat strikes; of a reduction in the authority and power of the elected union officials. All the symptoms you will recognize; all the symptoms we want to avoid in the new industrial relations climate of the Seventies.

We are equally concerned that bargaining should begin without the usual gallery overtones that the mass media have come to expect. I wonder, do we really need this ritual any more? We think not, in this party. The general public is too sophisticated to be taken in by it any more. People are weary of the pretence that management and workers cannot even get together initially.

They know it is all a show and the sooner we can dispense with this dance, the better for all concerned. When a contract comes up for renewal let the people set a date to meet and let them come prepared to talk business.

Incidentally, in the bargaining field it is heartening to note that the labour unions have gone to the table with a pollution control proposal that management has very often been shamed into accepting. Organized labour must be given credit for acting as a catalyst and spurring the conscience of many reluctant managements to get on with the job of pollution control.

Mr. Davis, the federal minister in charge of environmental matters, has recently brought in a pollution bill with teeth, at least in respect of clean air. We can look forward to further federal measures, but does it not make you marvel, Mr. Speaker, when you see the boldness of the federal initiative and the deviousness of that of Ontario?

The lawsuit against Dow is just window-dressing for the election. Something like this exposes the Tories for what they really are.

But I digress, Mr. Speaker. I want to return to the construction industry, where many of the recent problems have arisen. It is the view of my committee that regional and provincial bargaining must apply as appropriate and specific circumstances to the various trades and crafts in construction.

We have to see a rapid tidying-up of a situation that is archaic at the moment. The whole industry is so mobile that otherwise

satisfactory settlements can easily be undercut or aborted by a few employers who carry on and make hay—and I refer the House especially to section 103 subsection 3 of the recent amendment.

Changing technology has posed problems never before encountered in labour and government or else never before encountered with such force and immediacy of impact. We are indebted to Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman for the fine report he produced after the railway run-through at Nakina in northwestern Ontario.

His observations have such generality and such meaning for the Seventies that they should be read by all thoughtful persons in our society. I predict that the Freedman report will become one of the classics of the labour and industrial relation library.

Arising from this new thinking, what should be enacted in legislation? We are conscious of the fundamental, of the property right of an employee to the sanctity of his job.

An employee must be notified well in advance when his job becomes redundant because of technological change. Issues arising from technological change will have to be negotiated as they are raised by union or management, even during the life of a contract.

We cannot have a workman thrown on the welfare rolls, Mr. Speaker, because a machine has taken away his job without notice, without retraining, without any consideration. This is the new inhumanity we must nip in the bud in this province.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a workman close to his pension should not lose his pension rights and this means that portable pensions must be brought in by law so that a man can move to another job without losing what he has built up over the years.

Not only must there be more notice of closures, there must also be more notice of relocation of plants, or parts of plants, or parts of operations. This too needs a law with teeth and we in the Liberal Party are prepared to bring in such a law.

The management of pension funds has long been a sore point with labour. Often they have not been invested to the best advantage, or have been used for curious purposes that have not benefitted the workers at all. So we are determined that employees will, in future, be represented on the management committees of all pension funds in which the workers have a substantial interest.

Some people seem to say that, because there are some pension funds where the workers do not actually put the money directly into the fund they should not have representation because it is a fringe benefit. But it is my respectful opinion that if the fringe benefit was not given it should be tacked on to the salaries or the hourly rate, so that I think that the workers have a vested interest in all pension funds.

Our position—the Liberal position—is that certification of unions should be made easier than it is today. And the advantage of such a policy, Mr. Speaker, to have the workforce speaking coherently on issues must surely be obvious to all.

Our recent policy conference endorsed that proposal, that 50 per cent, plus one person, should ensure certification of a bargaining unit without a formal vote. A new labour Act should take up the question of early mediation at the request of either party.

Our policy now endorses the idea of a tripartite commission made up of employers, workers and government whose function is to deal with automation, shutdown, layoffs, relocation, plant rationalization and industrial harmony. This independent commission would examine all issues and cases which come to its notice and would ascertain whether the course proposed was in the public interest or not.

It would, for example, determine if a proposed plant closure were really the result of the plant losing money or, as has been recently suspected in many cases such as Dunlop—but not proven—merely a device to make more profit in a global sense for an international corporation. Without such a tripartite commission it is impossible to come up with an absolute proof on these matters and everyone takes sides on incomplete information.

A tripartite commission, of course, would end all this ambiguity. It would look into all aspects of proposed plant foreclosure and would deliver a report in short order. The plant could not close in the interim. The commission's report would be written in layman's language and would have a deciding influence on the public and legislators as to whether or not the closure should be allowed in the public interest.

With radio tubes and transistors being made in Japan for world use, with Ontario Hydro's rubber manufactures coming from the east, it can be seen that the multinational corporation will be a fact of life that we all

must face. These corporations and less than 300 of the giants will hog most of the world trade very shortly. They will become so aggressive that already Fortune magazine is calling them "the real world government."

A tripartite commission is our only defence of the power that rightfully belongs to the government of Ontario and to the people of Ontario. It is our only protection against this power being eroded by boardroom decisions made 10,000 miles away. Pirelli in Italy, Dunlop in England, ICI and CIL, Mitsubishi in Japan, the giant oil and petrochemical complex that would pollute the Straits of Georgia and Puget Sound without not so much as a by-your-leave. Where will they take us without some restraining mechanism that will leave Ontarians in control of their destiny? The tripartite commission is a key tool in keeping open Ontario factories and workshops by fiat of the government. It will have to come to this. We must recognize it now, otherwise international rationalization of production will play havoc with our lives and industrial complex.

Mr. Speaker, those are just some of the issues that face us when we form the next government of Ontario, but I have said enough, I think, to show that we have a positive approach to the labour challenge and that this is what is completely lacking in the present government which, by its recent legislation, has made it more difficult for the workers of this province to obtain social justice.

Read Hansard and see how clear-cut the Liberal position is and how determined is our resolve. The Tories have made certification more difficult. They have allowed employers to opt out of the crazy bargaining units they came up with and hence they have emasculated the whole process before birth. Employer bargaining units are, of course, useless so long as even one employer can opt out and go his merry way.

Our record is clear regarding equal pay for both men and women for equal work and in regard to equal job opportunity regardless of sex. Again, we are obviously ahead of the male-dominated NDP in this. We also support the concept that the minimum-wage legislation should immediately and automatically reflect changes in the cost of living. All this is in our policy statement on labour, which will become our platform in the forthcoming election.

Mr. Lawlor: The NDP really bothers the hon. member these days.

Mr. De Monte: It does bug me. I have been taking a close look at it.

Mr. Lawlor: It is under the skin of the hon. member. He begins to break out in places.

Mr. De Monte: Perhaps if the hon. member would look at our policy, he would come over here.

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. member would find a lot more sympathy for what he says over here, than in his own ranks.

Mr. De Monte: Now I would like to go to the Workmen's Compensation Board for a few moments, Mr. Speaker. Myself, as an individual, and my party are far from satisfied with what we have seen, in spite of the very well-produced report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for the fiscal year 1969.

Underneath all this glamour, Mr. Speaker, there is, as Mr. Justice McRuer has shown in volume 5 of his report, much that is wrong with the operation of the board. The production of an attractive annual report does nothing to allay my fears, now so well confirmed by the royal commission, that things are pretty well rotten in the state of Denmark.

I note that the Workmen's Compensation Board report is signed by B. J. Legge, QC, as chairman and D. G. Decker as vice-chairman and D. F. Hamilton as commissioner.

Under section 57 of The Workmen's Compensation Act, these members of the commission should be full-time members. We have had a series of pro tem appointments and we now know from Mr. McRuer, Mr. Speaker, that many decisions of the board and many awards which have been arrived at during the time when we had pro tem people on the board are, in fact, illegal decisions, as are 95 per cent of all the decisions —that is, those arrived at below the actual board level. Certainly, I think that this should be looked into, because the legitimacy of some of these awards is very much open to question in my mind.

I give notice at this time that when we come to review the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board we shall want to know how many chairmen and commissioners have been appointed on a pro tem basis during the past six years. I shall want to know precisely the terms of appointment and I shall want a categorization of the awards that were given under those pro tem chairmanships and commissionerships and then we will look into the legalities, using volume 5 of the McRuer report as a yardstick.

What I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that there were pro tem people sitting on the board while the regular chairman or commissioners were hale and hearty and doing other kinds of business in Canada and overseas. There is absolutely no provision for this and therefore I contend that many of these decisions were, in fact, illegal. I can see nothing in The Workmen's Compensation Act that makes provisions for a pro tem appointment if all the commissioners are hale and hearty.

Turning past all the coloured pictures in the annual report for 1969, and looking at page 20—administrative expenses—we see an item here for 1969, head office administration services performed for other divisions. That is $2,586,761, quite a substantial amount for head office administration services performed for other divisions. Is this a legitimate overhead or is it just a cover-up?

There is a statement made on page 7 of the annual report that the total cost for administration of the Act is 6.9 per cent, but looking at page 23 of the same report, we see that the cost in relation to the total moneys being dealt with comes to $15,000,563.60 over $127,902,000 and so forth. According to my reckoning, Mr. Speaker, 14 per cent, more or less, of the amount handled by the Workmen's Compensation Board is actually being spent on administration.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the cost is now so high that the Workmen's Compensation Board cannot any longer increase benefits because employers would be put in a bad competitive position. We have now got to the point where the awards to the workman are made in relation to the employer's ability to pay and still stay in the marketplace.

It seems absolutely ridiculous that with only three main divisions for administrative purposes—the head office, including field staff; the hospital and rehabilitation division; and the accident prevention association lists—that the administration should run to $15.5 million. The figure on page 20, the total charge to schedule 1 employers of $8,411,011 is misleading because it is not a true figure.

It does not take into account the figures for administration which are written on page 21 and again on page 24. This points up, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that we have, as private members in Parliament.

I have looked over this report for hours and, if I could, I would like to be able, when I get down into the committee, to have an accountant or somebody who understands financial reports, help me with it. I am going to so move when I get to that committee that accountants and experts be appointed to help us look into the financial dealings of all the departments we look into.

I think that is only fair. It is very difficult for laymen like myself to try to understand a financial report, especially one so obviously doctored.

While all this money is being wasted on these beautiful annual reports, which I suggest are totally unnecessary for the purposes that we have in mind here, we find that the actual benefits are $125 per month to a widow and $60 per month to her children to exist on. Why is it in the name of equity that if a man is killed in an industrial accident, his widow has to take such a drastic drop in her standard of living and be put right on the verge of subsistence? I cannot understand it.

Why does the widow not have the right to receive the same full pension as if the workman has been totally disabled? Why should the children have to suffer because the father and the husband has been killed?

Mr. Speaker, the other gross inhumanity, of course, is the arbitrary way in which workmen are cut down from 100 per cent benefits to 75 to 50 and then to 25 per cent and then altogether, because a bureaucrat decides that the workman is capable of doing light work, or medium to light work, until they are fit to get back on the job.

In my view, until an injured workman is fully able to return to his former occupation in an unimpaired capacity, he ought to be entitled to a full pension award right through the period of his disability. This seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be just simple justice.

Mr. Speaker, if the board is just trying to save money at the expense of the injured workman, is it just so the employers can remain competitive in the marketplace? Yet, at the same time, you see this lavish expenditure on this annual report and a lavish expenditure in the number of people at 90 Harbour Street—and to some extent in the field—but certainly the head office expenditures are way out of line. There are 2,000 employees down there, Mr. Speaker, not 1,400. There are 2,000 employees down there, plus a giant computer. Up 400 since 1965—this is the terrible rate of progressive growth. And I do not want that big story, Mr. Speaker, that they handle 300,000 claims.

It is true they handle a fairly large number of claims, but they have got computers, and these claims are usually medical claims or claims upon which there is no contention and they are cleared up like that. You cannot tell

me that they need 2,000 people, plus a computer? I understand that the computers are supposed to make people's jobs redundant. It does not seem to have done that down there. They get a computer and more people. It seems ludicrous.

Well I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how much this is going to grow year by year and how many of these people are actually directly employed in the appeal system itself, because I suspect that the percentage of people actually involved is in small proportion to the peripheral people who are just hanging around down there.

One of the ways in which money is thrown away that might better go towards injured workmen is on this bi-monthly publication, the "Compensator". I just want to show it to you for a moment, Mr. Speaker. I have two copies of this in front of me and another one is in this pile at the moment, and they are just filler copy. "An Inside Look at Harbour City"—what has that got to do with compensation? Could you tell me what that has to do with compensation? Mr. Speaker, what has that got to do with compensation?

Mr. Gaunt: We will have a ruling.

Mr. De Monte: Well, you know, a ball game again, a ball game. They have a ball game in this magazine. A ball game! They have got Joe Piccininni on the front: "Take Me Out to The Ball Game Again."

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The hon. member just struck out.

Mr. Lawlor: Do not tell me Joe was playing ball?

Mr. De Monte: The whole point is, I am wondering whether they know that they are running a very serious ball game down there? This is an insult to our intelligence. What are they trying to do, kill us with propaganda when men are subsisting on 10 per cent awards from the Workmen's Compensation Board, men who cannot even lift a chair, who cannot even lift a chair, they cannot bend down, they cannot move sideways? They are completely incapable of working.

And do you know what they say to them down there? "You can perform light work." I have a case where a man lost his arm. They are fighting over what type of a pension that calls for!

Mr. Lawlor: They will not even supply him with the light work.

Mr. De Monte: No, no! They have a rehabilitation section down there and I am still trying to find out how many people they have in that section. You know how they rehabilitate them? They send them to Manpower to get a job. Or they send them to some other organization to go on a period of training and then throw them back down to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Lawlor: The whole place is one vast disgrace with its green herrings all over the place.

Mr. Peacock: What is a green herring?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Green herrings?

Mr. De Monte: That is supposed to be communication. That is supposed to be communication and it is no communication at all.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I thought the members opposite were always talking about red herrings.

Mr. De Monte: I just turn, Mr. Speaker, for the few moments available to me to the comments on workmen's compensation by Mr. Justice McRuer. I would like to ask you to turn to chapter 130 page 2141 of volume 5 of his inquiry into civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, so powerful is the impact of chapter 130 of volume 5 of the report on civil rights that every thinking member of this Legislature will realize that we have to have a complete revamping of The Workmen's Compensation Act.

It would be helpful for those members who are interested to follow me as I go through this chapter which begins at page 2141 of volume 5, as I make some comments on the most important issues.

For example, at the foot of page 2146, Mr. Justice McRuer says, and I quote:

> It is difficult to understand why a person under 21 who enters into a contract for his labour and is entitled to be paid wages should not be primarily entitled to receive compensation if he is injured. The Act should give the board authority to pay compensation to the infant unless a reasonable cause is shown why it should be paid to some other person.

Mr. McRuer has had to say this because the section to which he is referring—that is section 50 of the Act—allows the board to redirect a compensation payment to other parties. We do not direct his pay to other

parties, do we? We give it to him and he spends it. The compensation payment can either be directed to the public trustee or it can be directed to a private person.

The odd thing is that, whereas the money is directed to the public trustee, the public trustee must administer the fund, as members know, for the benefit of the workman or the dependant. Yet if it is directed to a private person, because the original recipient is incapable of managing his own affairs, any benefit to which he is entitled which is then paid to his parents, his spouse, or to a committee of interested persons, is made without the provision that those people have any responsibility towards that person who is incapable of receiving the money. This is something out of the Middle Ages and has to be rectified right away.

Mr. Justice McRuer points out:

> . . . generally the compensation is something that belongs to the injured workman or dependant and it should be paid to him unless it is demonstrated that for his protection or for the protection of his dependants it should be paid to some other person. The final decision as to what is to the benefit of the injured workman in this regard ought not to rest with the board. There should be a right of appeal.

On page 2151, discussing the amount of payment of compensation and the commutation of periodical payments in favour of lump sums, Mr. Justice McRuer states:

> There are no procedural provisions which require that a workman be given a hearing before an order of commutation is made. This is a matter that vitally affects the interest of a workman. There should be a statutory provision requiring the consent of the workman or, in the alternative, that such an order be made after written notice has been given to the workman and he has been given an opportunity to be heard.

Further, says McRuer:

> If an order of commutation is made by any body or person legally authorized to exercise the power of the board by delegation there should be an express right of appeal to the board.

Mr. McRuer then looks at RSO 1960, chapter 437, section 27, subsection 3. He says:

> This gives the board the power to override the workman's direction and to do what the board deems best for him by applying the lump sum in several ways which are set out in that section. Here again, no procedural safeguards are provided which would give the workman the right to be heard before the board makes a direction to pay the lump sum in some other way than according to the workman's direction.

At present, there is no right of appeal, so McRuer says:

> There should be a statutory provision that an order directing the lump sum to be applied in any way other than that directed by the workman only be made after reasonable notice in writing to the workman. If such an order is made by any body or person legally authorized to exercise. . . .

And so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made it clear that the workman should have a right of appeal and a right to refuse a commutation and to decide what is best for him in the circumstances.

The next section in McRuer is a section in connection with the levies and assessment of employers which I think I will let the employers handle. They are more capable of doing it than I am.

But I am really concerned today with the urgent civil rights aspect of the Workmen's Compensation Board procedure, and I will confine my remarks to that side of the question. Powers of investigation then are dealt with on pages 2157 and 2158.

Mr. McRuer observes that the inquiry should be limited to the purposes of the Act. I want you to listen to this because it is important. Later he remarks:

> Merely to state that an officer of the board or any other person appointed to conduct an inquiry should have the power over the liberty of the subject and the power to commit for contempt is sufficient to condemn the provision.

That is what Mr. McRuer says. He is commenting on the power given to the board under section 65 of the Act.

Mr. McRuer says that the recommendation made in his first report, on page 446, with respect to powers of committal for contempt applies with emphasis in the case of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

He says that sections 75 and 65 of the Act should be repealed and replaced by sections conferring proper powers in the board to do just what the Act requires.

Here is a very important comment:

> All the decisions not made by the board itself, but made at the lower level in the

> hierarchy of the decision-making process, are of doubtful legal validity since there is no express power conferred on those making the decisions to make them. In claims matters, this would comprise approximately 95 per cent of the claims considered.

Do you know what that means? It means that there is no legal validity to the appeal system set up by the bureaucrats down on Lakeshore Boulevard, that there is no provision in law, and he casts doubt on the validity of 95 per cent of the decisions made by the boys down there.

Just think of it. Those people down there have had carte blanche to do what they want, when they want, how they want—and the legality be damned. That is what Mr. McRuer is saying in these four or five lines in his report. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton) is not here, but I suggest he look into that very quickly.

Mr. McRuer has other things to say. Thank God for Mr. Justice McRuer. Thank God for that man in our province. Thank God for him.

Getting back to my text, Mr. Speaker, according to the 1969 Workmen's Compensation Board annual report—and, of course, it depends on how you define what I am saying now—there were 387,004 incidences recorded during the year. This would seem to imply that 95 per cent of those decisions—well over 300,000—would be of doubtful legal validity.

It is said there is no appeal to the courts—and I am sort of paraphrasing McRuer now. The Act says that there is no appeal to the courts but, as Justice McRuer points out, there is one way of appeal to the courts and that is on the basis of an ultra vires decision that the board had no power to make the decision—not the board, because 95 per cent of the incidences down there are not heard by the board. They are heard by some people appointed. And we know there are no powers of delegation in The Workmen's Compensation Act, so the board—and when I refer to the board, I refer to the commissioner, the vice-commissioner and the commission—they are the only ones empowered under the Act to make any decisions.

As we follow Mr. Justice McRuer we find that only five per cent of the decisions are made at the top. Then, if we look into it further, does a pro tem appointee have the power to sit on the board if all the members on the board are hale and hearty and healthy? Can a pro tem commissioner sit on the board while Mr. Legge is marching down the street as a colonel of the army or whatever he is?

What I am trying to point out is that McRuer says that 95 per cent of the decisions of the board are illegal and the other five per cent are of questionable legal validity, because not all the boards are sitting; the board does not sit completely to decide some of these cases. Some of the pro tem commissioners are sitting on the board, so we have a real mishmash down there that somebody should look into very seriously. So Mr. Justice McRuer goes on and says—so it is possible that 300,000 people—I am sorry, those are my terms—I am saying so. It is possible for 300,000 people who so choose to block the entire judicial processes in this province with appeals against lower level decisions of The Workmen's Compensation Board's junior officials in the year 1969 alone.

I am exaggerating the case. I do not think when the Board says it has 300,000-387,000 decisions—that that is true. In a lot of the decisions, there is no decision to make. They are made by a medical officer who decides that two days off work were sufficient for a cut finger. I appreciate that, but there are many decisions that go up through the appeal structure that are basically illegal. They are illegal, and God help The Workmen's Compensation Board if something it not done about it very quickly. It is a frightening thought, but it is not beyond the limits of possibility that say, 10,000 of those decisions are appealed on the basis of being ultra vires. I am certain, too, that some of the claimants will try it. I hope they do and perhaps it will speed the overdue revision of this Act.

Now Mr. McRuer's solution is found on page 2170. He says:

> In our opinion, where judicial power is to be exercised by a hierarchy of tribunals, the statute should establish them directly.

What he is telling the government is that if it agrees with the appeal system, if it agrees with the adversary system, then it should enshrine it in law. Put it down in the Act but, you know, I do not even think that the Labour department knows what is going on down there. I am convinced of it, because if it did, it would be down there so fast trying to rectify that situation, it would make our heads swim.

That is what bothers me. That board is responsible to this assembly and it has been before us only for two hours since I have been a member of Parliament. Two hours!

It has been before one of the committees. It gets there for a while and we never see it again. We have lost control of the boards and commissions of this province. We, as legislators, not the government, have lost them by default and we have got to do something fast.

That is what McRuer is telling us now. He says grab control of it, take over men, because it is your responsibility, not some chairman on the board, to decide what policy is going to be applied to that board. It is government policy that should be applied. If you agree with something, make it legal.

He has pointed out to us that most of the decisions down there are illegal. As I said, his solution is—and I will read it again:

> In our opinion, where judicial power is to be exercised by a hierarchy of tribunals the statute should establish them directly.

What has happened is that a four-tier system has been set up by the compensation board itself, without any legal validity. People without the power of board members have been making decisions which are now thought to be illegal because they have never come to the attention of the board members for review and ratification.

And, of course, these powers cannot be delegated, as I said. There is no power of delegation in The Workmen's Compensation Act. There is no power to establish an appeal tribunal. The only power is that the board gives decisions from the initial decision—a two-tier system—and that was what was intended by the framers of this law. They intended to keep the legalisms at a minimum because they know that a workman who has no arm cannot pay for a lawyer to appear through the system, and he should not have to bring in a lawyer. We, as members of Parliament know that they should not be at our door day after day. You feel frustrated and sick about some of these things. They just sit down there in their little domain down there, their little fief, and actually they laugh at us. I am convinced of it.

I understand that they sit there and drink tea from great big tea services. I understand that they also salute when "his nobs" goes by too. I cannot prove that but I would like to be able to go down and take a look at it.

And McRuer goes on. He says:

> We are concerned with whether sufficient safeguards are provided for the benefit of those affected by the decisions made.

Later on in the same page he says:

> We are particularly concerned, however, with two matters:
>
> (1) that the processes of the board continue to be investigatory in nature and
>
> (2) that in the decision-making process all workmen, whether literate or illiterate, union members or non-union members, have equal opportunity to have all relevant matters considered and to have available to them all information necessary to make a full presentation of their cases before a final decision is made.

He shares the fear of the union leaders and representatives of labour that there is a development of an adversary system and he says:

> We think there is a foundation for this apprehension and that adequate safeguards must be provided.

All he is saying is that if they are going to have an appeal system, make sure that the workman has the same safeguards as the fellow sitting at the other side of the table.

There are many lawyers in this room and we know that when you get to a courtroom, any tribunal, you have got to try to get the balance of the evidence in your favour. It is a question of presentation of evidence and if someone is hiding that evidence in his back pocket you know that your case is far from won. It is only fair that all evidence be presented fairly and concisely before any tribunal, whether it is a court of law or the appeal tribunal down at the Workmen's Compensation Board.

And he goes on. He says:

> Mr. Justice McGillivray expressed a similar view in his report.
>
> The whole purpose of the Act is to provide a means by which loss through accident caused to workmen while they are engaged in the process of production or rendering services should be borne as a cost of production . . . The loss occasioned by injury to the workman should be just as much a cost of production as the repair of a machine.

And how true that is. In some cases we worry more about the machine than the poor workman who has lost an arm, or completely disabled his back, or suffered a fractured skull or got killed and his wife is put on the welfare rolls because of such a low award to a widow.

Now he goes on and he gets on the subject of medical reports, and it is interesting to

note when you ask for a report from down there they just give, in my opinion, what they want to give you. They give you a summary. I imagine you have read full medical reports, and I have read them, but some of those summaries! You get to the point, where some of the medical reports are five pages long and you might get one paragraph in the summary. Is that fair to the workman?

Mr. Peacock: Then they throw another one at you you have never seen?

Mr. De Monte: That is right. In simple justice if we are going to have an adversary system, that is all right, have an adversary system, but make it equal.

Mr. Lawlor: It is not funny when you get to the board and they read it out to you in full.

Mr. De Monte: That is right. I have even seen where a commissioner flips the pages over and looks at you, and he looks at the pages and takes another look at you. You wonder, "well, I wonder what he has got there, that I cannot see and I cannot present."

On the subject of medical reports, Mr. McRuer makes an overwhelming case for these reports to be made available to the claimant. He says:

> The satisfaction of the requirement with respect to minimal procedural rules would dictate that these be made available to the claimant.

And on pages 2173 he does not agree with the Ontario Medical Association that these reports are confidential communications.

On page 2174 he says:

> The difficulty appears to arise largely out of an apprehension on the part of the members of the medical profession that they may be exposed to vexatious actions for malpractice—

Now the hon. member for Lakeshore is a solicitor and I am a solicitor, and we have probably read as many medical reports as anybody else in this province. Has there ever been a suit against a doctor—no matter what is in the report—in the province?

You think that your client might be upset with the report, but if it is true, what has the doctor got to worry about? Even if his opinion is wrong, he is entitled to be wrong in opinion. He is not entitled to be negligent, but his opinion can be wrong. He is not infallible.

They use this excuse to prevent the workmen from being able to present a proper case before the board. That is exactly what they are doing, and that is what Mr. McRuer says.

He says this. He makes a powerful argument that failure to see the report not only could mitigate against proper treatment of the workman and his rehabilitation, but also against proper assignment of work. And you know, that proper assignment of work is being used today, in my respectful opinion, to cut some of the pensions down to a minimum degree when a man cannot possibly work.

You say, if a man has a bad back "he might be goldbricking." I think you have to have had a bad back to understand what the pain can be. There may be some goldbrickers, I am not denying that, but not that many.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The doctors are goldbrickers too.

Mr. Lawlor: The whole world is goldbricking.

Mr. De Monte: That is right, if we want to really.

Mr. T. Reid: So are the lawyers!

Mr. De Monte: And this is vitally important when it is left to those low down in the hierarchy to determine whether or not a man's compensation should be cut because he is fit for light work.

Can you get the concept? It is simple. McRuer says, if you are going to cut a man off compensation because he can do light work, if you have not got the full medical evidence before you, who is to decide? Some bureaucrat low down on the level of the board over there, who says: "You are fit for light work but I will not tell you why." That is what he is saying. He says: "You are fit for light work, but I am not going to tell you why."

Well, what does the doctor say? And what the claimant has to do is to go out and get his own report and some of them cannot afford it. They simply cannot afford $100 for a doctor's report, or $150. I do not know what they are charging now—$150?

In any event, that is the situation we are in now, and that is what Mr. Justice McRuer has attacked so vehemently in his report. How can that be challenged without seeing the medical report? That is what Mr. Justice McRuer says. How can the workman challenge the fact that they say he is fit for light work if he cannot see the doctor's report?

As for the doctors, he says if it is necessary to give them protection, it should be done by

legislation in clear language and not by way of creating a statutory privilege to the board. If you want to protect the doctors, he says, protect them in the Act.

The workman should be entitled on what material a decision involving his rights is based, and that is the crux of the whole argument. And he says this: on matters of pure law, there should be a recourse to the courts for final determination. On matters of pure law, now—not on matters of whether a man is disabled or not—but in matters of pure law, there should be a right to a higher tribunal than the board for final determination.

And on page 2179, Mr. McRuer recommends that the Act should provide that, where compensation is refused on grounds other than questions of disability, then there should be a right to appeal.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, on page 2181 is a comment on ultra vires which would open the doors to the courts to about 300 dock workers if what they say is true down there. The way out is the right of appeal by way of stated case on matters of law and all clauses restricting judicial review ought to be repealed.

Now, he comes to the final determination and opinion in his report, Mr. Speaker. He says, finally, there should be an independent workmen's advisor paid for out of the consolidated revenue fund, along with his staff, and he should have full access to all the files in every case, and people should be told that this office exists and exists for their benefit with the right to appear before the board for the claimant.

Now all Mr. Justice McRuer is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that you set up an appeal system and the rules must be changed and that workmen have the same right to the information in the file as the board. And he says: In simple justice, and if we are going to have an appeal system, let the government agree to an appeal system. That is their duty, and if they want to do it that is their problem. They will face the people. Let them enshrine it in law. But he says that if we do have an appeal system, give the workman a break and let him see the file.

I think I have spoken at length, Mr. Speaker, in connection with what my party considers as some very vital issues. I trust that the government opposite will listen to my issues and perhaps do something about them.

Mr. Lawlor: I think his daughter should be proud of him.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we should have a motion of adjournment of the debate by the member for Wentworth.

Mr. De Monte: Oh, sorry!

Mr. Deans moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, today's Telegram, on page 2, says: "There was in fact not a solitary PC backbencher in the Legislature." I was here at that time, sir.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): There is no doubt he is a backbencher.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But I was here too.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion, I wonder if the minister can tell us what the order of business would be on Tuesday.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Yes, we will reconvene on Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue the estimates of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Followed by?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I do not have that information. I am sorry.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): University Affairs!

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:50 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 21, 1971

Opening of Ontario Place, statement by Mr. Grossman 1871

Citizenship Day, statement by Mr. Yaremko 1874

Committee to establish park at Forks of Credit, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1875

Legislation to control quarrying in Niagara Escarpment, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 1875

Full-page ad in Time to advise of government borrowing, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deacon 1876

Inco changing developmental programmes to comply with anti-pollution orders, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon 1878

Appointment of member for Don Mills to head advisory committee, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis 1878

Unedited edition of Gertler report including recommendations, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 1878

Portion of land bank fund for purchase of escarpment recreational lands, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1879

Names of participants in conference on foreign investment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 1880

Dismissal of some faculty members from Niagara College in Welland, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman 1880

Government portion of request for increased per diem for Toronto nursing home operators, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Lewis 1881

Making sure abandoned mines are left in safe condition, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Ferrier 1882

Secondary schools used as liquor outlets, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Haggerty 1883

OHC employees in corporate planning and research to supply no information to other OHC branches, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 1883

Special planning grant to York regional council, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Deacon 1884

Purchase of Pêche Island, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Peacock 1884

Evaluation studies by OISE in two Toronto area elementary schools, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. T. Reid 1884

Memo to secondary school principals re keeping students in class, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Pitman 1885

Report of packaging committee, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Gaunt 1885

Toc Alpha trailer project, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Burr 1885

Securities Commission held in camera, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Deacon 1885

Tabling report, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Apps 1886

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. J. R. Smith 1886

Appointment of commission re land purchases on and adjacent to Niagara Escarpment, Statement by Mr. Davis 1892

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. De Monte 1894

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to 1905

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Bernier, agreed to 1905

No. 46

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from the David Maxwell School of Windsor, the Main Street School of Toronto, and Air Cadets from 608 Squadron of Belleville. In the west gallery are students from the Aberarder Central School of Camlachi, the St. Paul the Apostle School of Coniston and the Westview Centennial Secondary School of Downsview.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

RIDEAU REGIONAL HOSPITAL POLICIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A question of the Minister of Health: Is he prepared to make a statement to the House regarding the policies of the Rideau Regional Hospital dealing with those patients who, under the auspices of the hospital, have been placed in employment in the eastern part of the province—often farm employment—particularly in the light of the second piece of information indicating that these policies are not properly administered?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Not today, Mr. Speaker.

In relation to the second instance—the one referred to by the Leader of the Opposition—I might underline that this man is not a patient at the institution and has not been for some three years. But certainly, I will be reviewing the background of this particular incident as I undertook to do with regard to the person who was a patient and died a couple of months ago.

Mr. Nixon: Two supplementaries: Can the minister indicate why he has not reported to the House the information in his investigation into the first instance?

And second, can the minister tell the House whether or not the patient who was discharged three years ago in fact got his employment with the assistance of the Rideau Regional Hospital?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: On the last question: I believe he did in the beginning, but he has worked on a number of farms since.

With regard to the first question, that investigation will take me a bit of time. The department is working on it and I hope with extra help this summer to have it finished off in the next month to six weeks.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, am I right in recalling that the first instance involves Elijah Frederick Sanderson, and the inquest that occurred? Did not the minister intend to make a statement in the Legislature about it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, and I hope to do so when my investigation is complete, but at the moment the investigation is not complete. One of the things we do not have available at the moment is the full transcript of the inquest itself. Depending on how long the House sits, I think we should be able to do it.

SPADINA EXPRESSWAY DECISION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, question of the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport: Can he tell the House if the government's position with regard to the Spadina Expressway appeal from a Municipal Board ruling has been arrived at and when we might be made aware of it?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways and Transport): I think, Mr. Speaker, my only answer to that can be that when a resolution of the matter is decided upon the House will be informed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

SITE OF OLD FORT AT THUNDER BAY

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Tourism, Mr. Speaker: Has the government yet arrived at a decision regarding the location of the old fort in Thunder Bay?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, as you know we had a problem in finding a site for the old fort. We approached CP Rail two weeks ago. The original site is not available. We are planning to go back to Thunder Bay to meet the council and the people up there and to tell them what our plans are for the future.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, then, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the CPR has finally rejected the government's request for the original site and you are not back to the site of which the minister personally spoke when he was in Thunder Bay some time ago and that that will not be government policy?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, we did receive a letter from Mr. Allison, the vice-president of CP Rail, telling us that it was not available for any consideration, so we are planning to go ahead with the plans of the department and we are looking at the Pointe de Meuron.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, two quick supplementaries: Could the minister table for the Legislature the correspondence with the CPR on the location of the site; and could he indicate who owns the land across from Pointe de Meuron now? Who has options on the land where roads may have to be built, in order to reach the site?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I will be glad to table the correspondence with CP Rail and find the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Can the minister explain why the government could not use its powers of expropriation to use the property presently owned by CPR, which has not been used for substantial transportation but only for storage, in order to make the original site available for the rebuilding of the fort?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, Mr. Speaker, the department has been in touch with the CPR company for quite some time and I wanted to find out for myself two weeks ago when I met the two vice-presidents of CPR in Montreal and the answer was negative. We were hoping to get some assistance from the federal government—as you know, the railroads come under the federal government—but this has not been forthcoming so far.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Has the minister looked into—to repeat my question—the possibility of expropriating the property?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As far as I know and as far as I have ascertained myself, the price of the location that we are looking at—we have an option on the land; it is recommended by Public Works—is in keeping with properties around there and I do not see why we should go to expropriation measures.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: With regard to the recommendations for the new site, has it been recommended by any group in the Thunder Bay area?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: That is the kind of recommendation that the minister might act upon, not one from Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, as I say, we have an option on it and we are still looking at it. Our option is good until the end of June and I am looking at it very closely.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North has a supplementary?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the minister's reply, is it true that the minister himself or his department does not look favourably on restoration of sites on their original locations as evidenced by his remarks about the foolishness of restoring Fort York?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the question. Would the hon. member mind repeating the question?

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I am asking whether the hon. minister or his government opposes the restoration of these sites on their original location as evidenced by his remarks about Fort York?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Oh, no, we are not opposing. I told the people in Thunder Bay several weeks ago—I met with them for two days; the news media as well—we were not opposing. But when the original site is not available, well then we have no other option but to find another site.

Mr. Lewis: How are they going to save the seat of the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman)?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

ACQUISITION OF PECHE ISLAND

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, first I have a question of the Speaker. Who today, sir, is acting as House leader? To whom may I direct a question in the absence of the House leader?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the hon. Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) is not in his seat. Perhaps I can appropriately put it to the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, giving him an ascendance which he invites. May I ask of him, has the Ontario government made a decision on the Pêche Island acquisition for which the deadline is 3 p.m. tomorrow?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): No.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, has the Ontario Parks Integration Board made such a decision?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, that would be communicated to the House in due course.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, will the provincial Treasurer undertake to make a statement—well, I guess he cannot make a statement tomorrow; the House does not sit. Will the provincial Treasurer be willing to have the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) or the Premier (Mr. Davis) interrupt the proceedings of this House at some point today, something which is not unknown, to give government policy on this rather important issue?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government policy will be announced in due course.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Not before the expiry date of the application?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the government is making offers from time to time on properties in various parts of the province and I do not know that it is necessary that when such an offer is made, it should be announced here in the House.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the Treasurer aware that as of 3 p.m. tomorrow, without a successful bid having been received from the board, the rights of the lienholders expire?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, right.

Mr. Lewis: Good. The minister is aware of that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question?

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have another question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Has the application for subdivision approval from Blue Mountain Air Park on the escarpment yet been decided by government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is a question that should be more appropriately put to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales).

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will such applications which lie outside the finalized land transactions under scrutiny by Chief Judge Bennett now proceed in the normal course of events before cabinet?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They will be looked at, I assume the minister would say, with the same scrutiny with which they are being looked at presently.

Mr. Lewis: I take it, by way of supplementary, that the inquiry into the 21 individual transactions does not necessarily preclude further development on other parts of the escarpment or the applications coming before government for approval?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is correct.

Mr. Lewis: That would be correct?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ALLEGATION OF PLANT CLOSURE

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Did the minister receive a telegram from Mr. Stephen Harris of local 200 UAW stating that Ford is closing out a portion of the engine plant in the city of Windsor and moving it to Cleveland, and this would affect 400 jobs?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I have not received a telegram. The hon. member was kind enough to send over a newspaper announcement to this effect and I shall check into it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Did the Ford local in Windsor not inform the Minister of Labour that 400 men would be laid off by the end of this month in the process of the engine development in Cleveland?

Hon. Mr. Carton: My answer, Mr. Speaker, was that to my knowledge I have not been informed. I might say the reason for this may be, as you know, it is either 15 per cent or 10 per cent—I am not certain—of the number of employees involved in the plant, but it is about 10 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

PURCHASE OF UNITS FOR OHC

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker. In view of the figures prepared by his department last week, which show that Ontario Housing units which were purchased have run at approximately half the cost of those which OHC has built itself, why has he stopped the purchase of all such units beginning January 1? From January 1 to the end of April there were absolutely no units purchased.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): If the hon. member will send me that clipping, I will give him the answer.

Mr. Shulman: This is not a clipping, and the minister has asked me not to send him any more confidential information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know. The hon. member has access to confidential information which apparently I do not have, so if he would be kind enough to advise me.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister inquire within his department for the reason why he is doing these things?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I make too many inquiries, the hon. member may accuse me of taking retaliatory action on people who are giving out alleged confidential information to the hon. member.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the minister not deal with the issue?

Mr. Lewis: He is going to have problems.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for High Park a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister find out why these units are no longer being purchased?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course I can.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways has a reply to a question asked the other day.

E. C. ROWE EXPRESSWAY

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question asked me the other day by the hon. member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) was: Would the minister inform the House if The Department of Highways has approved the purchase of land from Marentette Brothers for the E. C. Rowe Expressway, and, if so, what price was paid?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Marentette property was purchased by the city of Windsor. The Department of Highways approved the payment of a 75 per cent subsidy. The purchase consisted of 14.19 acres at $12,500 an acre for a total of $177,375.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

LOANS TO LAKE ERIE COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Is it true that the Lake Erie commercial fishermen, who filed application for a loan at the end of March, have received only 30 per cent of their loan? If so, when will they receive the other 70 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I had presumed that all those who were receiving loans had already received them, if they had made applications up until this time.

Mr. Spence: That is not what I hear, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the question period perhaps I might be permitted a very brief interruption. The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has some introductions to make to the House.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought the hon. members of the House would be interested in meeting members of the Argentine field hockey team from Buenos Aires who played a couple of exhibition games in Toronto over the weekend. They are on a world tour. What might be of interest to the hon. members of this Legislature is that they financed this on their own. So it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to the members of the Ontario Legislature the member of the Argentine field hockey team from Buenos Aires.

POSSIBILITY OF AMENDING CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. members and I will extend the question period two minutes. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services: Has the minister sought, or will he be seeking, an amendment to the Canada Assistance Plan in order to allow the municipalities more discretion?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

REDUCTION IN WELFARE PAYMENTS TO YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services: Can the minister tell us how many persons are involved and how much money is at stake in the minister's proposed changes in welfare regulations, which will allow municipalities in Ontario discretion to cut off welfare assistance to 16- and 17-year-olds, and also to those who have been referred to as "US draft dodgers"?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a definitive answer that applies across the province. I can tell the member that it involves—somewhat over—2,000 people who are in the category of those eligible in Metropolitan Toronto, or rather those who are now receiving payments. The amount involved is somewhere over $200,000. Naturally, all of these would not be ineligible under the discretionary powers that are being sought, but I cannot tell him at this point a more definitive answer, not really with regard to teenagers on welfare.

His last comment about draft dodgers, Mr. Speaker, I guess refers to the statements that I made about some restrictions on those who are immigrating into this province. I might tell him that I am considering these regulations and as I said we hoped we may bring forward something in this regard, mainly in answer to a proposition put forward by his leader, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) who asked me a few weeks ago if I did not think there should be some residence requirements for immigrants coming into province, and this is why we are looking at this particular problem now.

Mr. Nixon: The minister thought up the draft dodger part all on his own.

Mr. Lewis: Just handle your own witch hunts.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that there has been professional denial of the fact that any draft dodgers are getting unfair assistance or assistance of any sort of this nature, where did the minister get his figures? For what reason did he make the statement in the first place?

Mr. Lewis: Because he is a Tory. He cannot stand it.

Mr. Nixon: A clueless reactionary, according to the Globe.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I answered this, and I would be very happy to review for the hon. member the sequence of events. About three weeks ago a judge in British Columbia made some comments about young people who were up before him on certain charges. He asked how they were financing themselves. They informed the judge they were on welfare. And he found out to his amazement, as he said, that these people were on welfare and he wondered how they could come into this country and in such a short time be living on welfare.

As a result of those questions the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me a couple of weeks ago in this House if we were considering anything in this regard, any regulations or anything that would result in a time limit applying before people coming into this province could receive welfare if they came

from outside this country. I indicated at that time I would look at it. I think that a case can perhaps be made in certain instances for having some time limit restrictions.

I might point out to my hon. friends that the State of New York—as they will notice over the weekend—has imposed a one-year residency for welfare recipients.

Mr. Shulman: They have reasons.

Mr. Lewis: They have larger problems.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I do not condone that necessarily, but I say that it is certainly an area where there can be legitimate investigation.

Mr. Lewis: What about the draft dodgers?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As a result of that statement, and as a result of my statements in the House at that time, we are looking at the whole matter. Draft dodgers are an—

Mr. Lewis: Tell us about the draft dodgers.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —example of some of the people who come into this province and who might be living on welfare. There are no great numbers of them at this present time, but we just want to let people know that this is no easy welfare haven for people from outside this country.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Pretty solid citizens.

Mr. MacDonald: So the minister is fighting what might be. Why do you not fight the real problems instead of the—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Throw them a fish.

Mr. Shulman: Another supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister saying that his statement about bringing in these restrictions was made on the basis of no evidence whatsoever within Ontario?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): He is looking at the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, sometimes people criticize us for having interminably long studies. There are times when you can see that an abuse may come about and you take action before it actually happens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Are there supplementaries?

Mr. Lewis: Just one quick supplementary to the minister: Has the minister one documented example anywhere in Ontario of a draft dodger, so-called, being paid by way of welfare assistance?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, that of course is a very irrelevant question because firstly, I merely used the draft dodger—

Mr. Lewis: Just as an illustration.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —as one illustration of a total problem—

Mr. Lewis: I have here a list of 493 draft dodgers, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and I am just saying, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. Lewis: The minister did not have the basis on which to say it. It is his old witch-hunting techniques.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —it is a typical question from the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Social and Family Services intend to rise in this House on a point of personal privilege because of the remarks that Ron Haggart made about his attitude toward young people in Saturday's edition of the Telegram?

Mr. Lewis: And today's Star editorial, and the Globe editorial?

Mr. Randall: Who is Ron Haggart?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, actually I do not, because I noticed that in the Toronto Telegram of yesterday the editorial writers of the Telegram repudiated Mr. Ron Haggart, as did the editorial writers of all three Toronto papers, in saying that there should be some discretionary power given to welfare administrators in handling the teenage welfare problems. All three Toronto papers are in favour of what we are doing.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister intend, in his proposed regulations, to make it clear to the municipal authorities that one criterion

for granting public assistance to 16- and 17-year-olds will be the family background of their parents and whether or not—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is going beyond what—

Mr. T. Reid: —they are from a single-parent family?

Mr. Speaker: —might constitute a supplementary question.

Mr. T. Reid: I am asking the minister if he is making regulations based on analysis—

Mr. Speaker: This is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. T. Reid: He is still a Neanderthal.

Mr. Speaker: It is not supplementary. The hon. provincial Treasurer has an answer to a question.

MAKEUP OF $2.2 BILLION BORROWED BY OTTAWA

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) asked what proportion of the $2.2 billion being borrowed by Ottawa is refunding of issues which are maturing and therefore what amount of the close to $2.2 billion borrowed by Ottawa would be new money actually required out of the market.

Actually, the $2.2 billion cash requirement to Canada is all new financing. The additional amount which is to be refinanced is $2.6 billion, for a total of $4.8 billion. The $2.2 billion which I referred to is all new money.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HEALTH HAZARDS OF FIREWORKS

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A question of the Minister of Health: Will the Minister of Health make representation to his cabinet colleagues with regard to the health hazard to small children of abuses which are brought about by the continued sale of fireworks and firecrackers in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Yakabuski: They are one of the most enjoyable things.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I hardly think it is a question of health in the context of the department's work.

Mr. Yakabuski: The hon. member wants to deprive the young again.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Certainly, the request has been heard by my colleagues. Perhaps the Attorney General would be the best person to address himself to it in the beginning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): They do not want children to be children.

PROGRAMME TO REDUCE VENEREAL DISEASE

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My question is of the Minister of Health. To what extent has the minister discussed his programme to reduce the occasion of venereal disease in the province with the local medical officers of health across the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I know that at the staff level the discussions have taken place. I have met a couple of times with the executive of the medical officers of health and will be meeting with their president next week, I hope. I had not known that there is a gap. Is there some allegation that there is a gap in information here or a gap in communication?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, my question was leading to the point that Dr. Cunningham, the medical officer for Hamilton and Wentworth, has claimed that the minister's multimedia programme will not be effective and that the way to reduce the occasion of venereal disease is to supply the bodies to track down the carriers. I wonder why one of the most effective medical officers of health declares that the multimedia programme does not work.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is anything inconsistent between the two. No one can quarrel with the fact that the most practical role, although the most difficult, of course, is to track down carriers. But that does not seem to me to be in conflict with an informational campaign, a multimedia campaign, alerting the public and particularly the younger section of the public to the dangers of the health hazards involved.

Mr. Deans: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the minister feel that the programme now under way is consistent with

the government's decision to cut back the funds available to the Hamilton-Wentworth Health Unit and thereby eliminate a great number of persons from the field who might have been useful in combating the problem my hon. colleague refers to?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, as I suggested earlier, I think we are dealing with two parts of the same programme. Certainly the more people we have involved in the diagnostic and tracing exercise the better. But I also believe we need a public information programme. That programme has not been established, by the way. It is not in operation yet, nor has its tone or content been settled, nor has its proposed budget been established. So we are talking about a programme that will not be in effect for some months to come, insofar as the informational side is concerned.

Mr. Gisborn: As a supplementary to this question, Mr. Speaker, will the minister then contact the various local officers of health as to their recommendations as to what they need to combat the increase of venereal disease?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be most useful.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: Will the minister then consider, in conjunction with the question from my friend from Hamilton East, to reconsider the decision to cut back on the funds, and to put back to full staff, in terms of public health nurses, the Hamilton-Wentworth health unit in order that it properly combat these problems?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think the question is more complicated than that, in that these clinics themselves are run by the hospitals, as I understand it. Any cutback—and I do not know if there has been, in particular, a cutback in Hamilton—

Mr. Deans: Six nurses.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I cannot suggest, and I do not think the member is suggesting that those six nurses were deleted from work in the field of venereal disease prevention.

Mr. Deans: No, general work.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It was a general cut.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

USE OF TEMPORARY HELP

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Yes, I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Labour. It is in two parts.

Firstly, is the Minister of Labour familiar with the comment reportedly made by one William J. Coke today, who styles himself as president of the Canadian Institute of Temporary Help and Business Services, to the effect that he sees the possibility of a great growth in the temporary help industry by the utilization of temporary help by management in the province to avoid the normal and equitable welfare benefits accruing to employers under usual collective bargaining agreements? Would the minister agree with me that he might express some concern to that industry that that type of involvement by management could lead to the ultimate erosion of proper collective bargaining in this province?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not quite hear the first part. Would the member mind repeating it?

Mr. Bullbrook: The first part was, is the minister familiar with a quote attributed to one William J. Coke, who styles himself as president of the Canadian Institute of Temporary Help and Business Services, wherein he says he looks for a great growth in such industry by reason that management are able to avoid some of their equitable and collateral obligations under collective bargaining agreements in the welfare field? Would the minister express any concern as to the possible erosion of happy labour relations in the province as a result of this?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I believe that was in this morning's Globe and Mail. There was some article on this particular point—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): That is where they get all their information.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and I would agree with the member that this could cause some erosion.

Mr. MacDonald: They have been doing it for years through contracting out.

Mr. Bullbrook: As a supplementary: I wonder if the minister might, perhaps, direct some liaison between his department and the temporary help industry to make sure that collective agreements are not avoided by this type of contracting out as they have been in the past?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

GRANT TO SUDBURY BOYS' HOME

Mr. Martel: I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Can the minister indicate if the grant has been made yet to the Sudbury Boys' Home?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge I do not think that a grant has been made at this time to the Sudbury Boys' Home, but I would have to check it to be absolutely sure.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary: Could the minister have this matter expedited so that this group could get on with the construction this year of such a facility?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member, I think, knows, the group was down to see me only a few weeks ago and they left a brief at that time and the project has to be considered within the money constraints that we have for all these projects. We will let them know as soon as we can.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

CHEQUES SENT IN ERROR

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. How many persons received $50 cheques in error under the elderly persons' tax assistance programme, and have they all now received letters asking that the money be returned to the department?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information with me. I will look into it and obtain it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, now that he is here, the status of the application, I assume for subdivision development, on the part of Blue Mountain Air Park to build condominiums and chalets in the Blue Mountain area of the escarpment which Gertler has marked out as an entire area to be placed under land-use controls?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that development by name. I will obtain it for the hon. member and provide the information. There is a question on the order paper from the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) and that information will be provided very quickly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How is it that Blue Mountain can write those wishing to purchase, including the following: "We are presently awaiting approval of our chalet condominium development by The Department of Municipal Affairs, from whom we have received tacit approval." On what basis is tacit approval of subdivision development in Gertler area land on the escarpment given by the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is not. We do not give tacit approval at all. In most of the cases, they are simply told that there is an application for draft approval and until such time as draft approval is given, Mr. Speaker, they would act privately at their own peril in reference to that matter.

Mr. Lewis: A last supplementary: Would the minister indicate to us, when he gives his reply, what position The Department of Lands and Forests took on the matter of approval of this development?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the member referred to the name of Blue Mountain but would he give me the name of the municipality since he obviously has some information there? Could he give it to me now?

Mr. Lewis: All right. I will give the minister the correspondence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

TOURIST RECEPTION CENTRE

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information. Is it the minister's intent to operate the tourist reception centre at the Ambassador Bridge or on Huron Line, a bit away from the Ambassador Bridge, on a year-round basis?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at it now.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary of the minister: Can we expect a decision on the part of the government within the next two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

ONTARIO MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Gisborn: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister of Labour under consideration for the near future an increase of the minimum wage in Ontario at least to match that of the federal government's $1.75 an hour?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker. Presently we are doing a great deal of research into the whole question of minimum wages.

Mr. Gisborn: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is it correct to say that the Minister of Labour for Ontario joined with other ministers of various provinces in Canada at the recent federal-provincial Labour Ministers' conference, and prevailed upon the federal Minister of Labour to cut back, or to contain, their minimum wage rate because of the economic impact it was having on the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker. There was a ministers' conference but there was no attempt in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

OHC RENTAL ARREARS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker: At the present time, how high are the rental arrears in the Ontario Housing Corporation and how much were the rents that he wrote off last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as I advised the House the other day, I will have a statement shortly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the light of the conference discussing these matters and others the last weekend, is the minister now prepared to appoint three or more members of the Ontario Housing Corporation from among the public housing tenants?

Mr. Speaker: I think this is hardly a supplementary question to the original. The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: To the minister of housing, following the question, will the minister appoint three or the nine directors of Ontario Housing Corporation from among tenants in Ontario Housing projects, as I suggested at the conference yesterday in Ottawa?

Mr. Yakabuski: The member does not hear too well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not the minister of housing. However, I read a lot of statements the hon. member made and, even having regard for his usual academic aberrations, the one that I read here is a perfect example as to why we have to be careful about some suggestions that are made which come from some politicians, particularly in the Liberal Party and the NDP.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the minister going to answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will quote:

> Mr. Reid said he thought a rent supplement and enough houses on the market would be preferable to high-rise public housing. But he said rather grumpily: "This would be the end of tenant associations because there would be no public housing and some people may say this is a middle-class plot to break up the tenant associations."

Now, that one is a honey. The hon. member is, in fact, saying we should not give them individual houses, because they would be happier then and there would not be any need for tenant associations and he would hate to see that happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that was a supplementary answer. The answer is no, absolutely not, and for very good reasons, Mr. Speaker. We believe in this government that public housing tenants should not be second-class citizens, that they should be first-class citizens. As far as we are concerned—

Mr. Breithaupt: All Liberals are going to get involved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member need not hold his head. He knows he will not get an academic answer here. It will be quite clear.

Mr. Speaker, we see no reason why public housing tenants, while we do not want them to be second-class citizens, should be considered super-citizens either, because a private person, a private taxpayer, in a private apartment house does not get to be on the board of directors of the landlord's company. I see no reason why we should pick public housing tenants out of the regular population and point them out as being public housing tenants and give them special consideration so that people will say that because they are public housing tenants, they should be treated differently. It is a ridiculous suggestion, an absolutely ridiculous one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask a supplementary question? Will the minister responsible for public housing in the Province of Ontario consider enabling tenants to participate effectively at the local project level in the management of the project, or does he simply believe that this is a philosophical abberation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, long before the hon. member got into politics, I was a public exponent of making sure that, if you are engaged in some operation involving citizens, it is wise to get the citizens' views because you are going to learn something in many instances. The Housing Corporation does, in fact, encourage tenants' groups, tenants' organizations, in its housing developments and engage with them in discussions in respect of those matters which concern the tenants, but that does not mean that they are going to become landlords. You cannot be a landlord and a tenant at the same time and only someone with his head in the clouds could consider that would be possible.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The entire debate, and I think that is what it is developing into, was hardly supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West, and I cut him off previously.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. member for Scarborough East asked a supplementary to the previous question.

Mr. T. Reid: No. This is a supplementary. In view of the minister's remarks that Ontario Housing Corporation tenants are consulted, could the minister explain why, at the town housing project on Danzig Street in Scarborough, the minister has refused to alter a 50-foot by 50-foot asphalt playground with logs five feet high at the request of tenants, who believe their children might fall off and split their heads on the pavement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is a typical kind of question that you could ask of any minister and he would not know the answer to it. It is like asking what the hon. member for High Park is doing every day in the question period.

Mr. MacDonald: So the minister does not know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have, I think, hundreds of housing projects with some 37,000 tenants. You can go to any of those buildings and pull something off the bulletin board and say, "Does the minister know that in this housing development that tenant B is complaining about not getting the laundry on time." That is a ridiculous thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: The former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) would have known.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Housing Corporation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Ontario Housing Corporation has good relationships with those tenants who are prepared to do a job for the other tenants. There are a few crackpots amongst them, and I am rather surprised that Mr. Andras had anything to do with some of those. And let me be quite clear.

One of those people involved, as the hon. member knows—and he was careful not to mention—was a gentleman by the name of Gordon Potts, Liberal candidate in Riverdale. Now, if you want to applaud, let me give you something further to applaud. He was also one of those who engaged on that attack and the smashing of Ontario Housing Corporation headquarters a couple of weeks ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —with some children. Now there is a wonderful thing for a Liberal candidate to engage in. And does the hon. member want me to read to him some of the comments made by the other delegates about the Liberal Party and Gordon Potts?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, we would like that.

Mr. Speaker: Is this all part of the answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: You see what they do, following the example of the present MPP.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NDP has chickened out a bit, and left it all to the Liberals.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Could I put a relevant supplementary, Mr. Speaker, while the minister is gathering his wits?

Mr. Speaker: There is only one minute left in the question period.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will quote:

> Brian Knight of the Park Extension Community Corporation, Montreal, had just finished telling the delegates to "squeeze the middle class for money" when Mr. Potts shouted, "How much will you donate?" "How much will you give?" he asked, stressing the "you." "I have already given my service," said Mr. Knight, "but I will give nothing to a candidate for the Liberal Party." Mr. Knight—

This is the gentleman who asked the question and who answered that he would not give anything to a Liberal.

> —was sitting beside Tim Reid, Liberal member of the Ontario Legislature for Scarborough East. Earlier Mr. Potts had said he had not wanted to mention the name of the party, but he is a Liberal candidate in the next election.

But I want to tell the hon. member. Just let him get all of his members down and engage in the kind of riot that was engaged in a couple of weeks ago down at the Housing Corporation on Bloor Street and we will be glad to go to an election on that issue if you like. Would you like to do that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And while on this subject—will I give him a supplementary answer, Mr. Speaker?

Incidentally, I am sure that the hon. member was glad to engage in a conference in which one of the main speakers was the leader of an American militant rent strike group, and I am sure that Mr. Andras is very happy to have him there. I will deal with Mr. Andras tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order. I would like to put it to you, sir, if you consider it parliamentary that the hon. minister would make the charges that he has just made about a citizen of Ontario, whether or not he is a Liberal candidate. I consider that as an asset. The minister feels that it is not, and perhaps he would make it clear if in his responsibility he has instructed his bureaucrats to lay charges against Mr. Potts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, in my view, my officials should have laid charges against everyone who was involved, and particularly, in my view, they should have—

Mr. Nixon: Is the minister going to instruct them to do so, because otherwise he should retract—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Leader of the Opposition asked me a question, I am giving him the answer. In my view they should have been charged with contributing to juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Nixon: A further point of order, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister make it clear whether he is issuing those instructions to the people in his department or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, at the time I raised that with my officials, they did not have a sufficient number of names—

Mr. Nixon: The minister is not so sure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will take that under advisement and maybe we will do that.

Mr. Lewis: Did anything happen this weekend that upset the minister?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Petitions.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I think we should go back to the former minister.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that Mr. J. Renwick be substituted for Mr. Gisborn on the standing procedural affairs committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(concluded)

On vote 1702:

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. We are on vote 1702, item 4. Just give the minister a moment, please, and then the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, some further comments on this branch of the minister's department. The minister may recall that on October 29 last year the then minister (Mr. Welch), now the Minister of Education, made a statement in Hansard, at page 5737, indicating that the department was engaged in a series of experimental housing projects to be undertaken jointly by the department and the Ontario Housing Corporation; that the department was concerned about the quality and availability of housing for the Indian community; and that therefore the department was making a grant of $200,000 to the Ontario Housing Corporation for the construction of housing at Armstrong, Macdiarmid, Minaki and Dinorwic.

He further stated that the land was going to be acquired for the housing sites in conjunction with advice and assistance from The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Lands and Forests, and that these houses would be constructed by local community corporations who would own the houses and who would, after their construction, be responsible for their upkeep and management and the decisions as to who should occupy the homes and under what terms and conditions.

When questioned by the leader of this party (Mr. Lewis) at that time we thought that there was an extensive housing programme, but we were advised by the then minister that it amounted to some 20 houses, which I assume are five houses in each of the four locations.

Would the minister please advise us now in detail the exact status and position and the progress which has been made in carrying out that experimental housing programme what the department has learned from it, and what plans they have for an immediate acceleration and development of housing accommodation for the Indian communities?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, the matter respecting the housing is set out very succinctly on page 26 of the Indian Community Project book, and I would direct the hon. member's attention to it, not only for the description of the programme as it has developed to date but also for a photograph, a picture of what is being developed by way of housing specifically tailored to meet the needs of the Indians and in particular in northern Ontario.

These housing projects are a partnership undertaking between the local community, the Housing Corporation and this department, and of course, we have the other departments—Lands and Forests, Municipal Affairs, Social and Family Services, whenever they have to be involved. The first section of the project was at Armstrong—very well known, I think, to the member for Thunder Bay. Armstrong, for a small community, is becoming very well known in Ontario.

There were four prefabricated three-bedroom homes which have been completed; ownership has been transferred to the Armstrong Development Corporation. This house, of which there is a photograph, is one of the homes in Armstrong. As owners of the homes, the Armstrong Development Corporation is entirely responsible for the allocation and management. We have plans under way for a section of the project in conjunction with the Dinorwic-Metis Corporation, which is near Dryden. At Macdiarmid discussions are underway with members of the community there and we hope that there will be a housing project set up there. That is also in the Thunder Bay riding, south Macdiarmid.

The fourth location at Minaki is receiving the review of the Ontario Housing Corporation. We are really stimulating the interest of the residents of these communities in what is developing. We are not really yet at the stage where we can be hopeful of meeting all of the housing needs, but the programme is experimental in two regards; that is, experimental in the developing techniques of involving local community interest

and in developing the actual structure best suitable for the location and for the need.

The housing on reserve lands is primarily a federal responsibility and there is still some reluctance on the part of Indian people on the reserves, whether they want to become involved with the provincial governments and so perhaps dilute their relationship with the federal government. Our thrust so far has been in providing housing for non-status and Metis people living in unorganized territory, and this is one of the reasons we are able to participate.

In the last year the community branch financed housing construction repair at Auden where 26 homes were renovated. Of course, the Ontario Housing Corporation has been very actively involved in Moosonee. They built 15 homes during the previous year and 15 more will be added. The commitment of Ontario Housing was $200,000. The hon. member will see that in the grant structure that $50,000 has been actually transferred to the Ontario Housing Corporation but we will be in a position to make good that commitment whenever they are able to tie in their development programme in this regard.

Mr. J. Renwick: I take it then, from what the minister says, that in fact of the proposed 20 houses in some seven months, the co-operative activities in the minister's department, in Ontario Housing Corporation and with whatever assistance was required from Municipal Affairs or Lands and Forests, has achieved a total of four houses which have been completed and that construction of none of the others at the other three sites has been commenced yet.

Let me be as charitable as I can that this was the first of a series of experimental housing projects. What has the minister and his department learned from the experiment at Armstrong? What are they going to do? What are the lessons that have been derived from it? What are they going to do in this year's estimates to expand that programme? Or are we going to have another seven months go by and find that four more houses have been built? Then another seven months, and another four houses? And another seven months and another four houses which will then accommodate, I assume, some 20 houses, or 16 to 20 houses with three bedrooms each; about 48 bedrooms. Is that what the minister's experimental project is about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not catch that last figure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Renwick: I said 16 to 20 houses with three bedrooms in each is somewhere between 48 and 60 bedrooms or living accommodation. Is that what the minister announced here in October of last year, and is that what this department is now carrying out? Or have they any solid framework within which they are going to have an on-going programme to provide adequate housing for the members of the Indian community in Ontario, who live on unorganized territories, if that is what the minister wants to limit it to?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly clear to the hon. member that housing in the Province of Ontario, the provision of housing, comes under the partnership of the Ontario Housing Corporation and CMHC, who are developing a total housing programme.

We have become involved in highlighting the fact that for northern Ontario, and for Indian communities, we have to develop two things.

1. We develop the specialized type of housing; and

2. Our experiences lead us to believe that, in order to have a completely successful housing programme, we will have to get the community involved.

That is why the first one is the Armstrong Housing Corporation which is a community corporation which did not exist before this project came in. It was set up as a local housing authority involving the non-status Indians and the Metis who will have the full management of it. I may say that our experience has proved that it has taken longer, really, for the corporations to take over the full management, to place the people than it did to actually build the homes, to choose and assign the homes.

I may say to the hon. member that volume is not presently our particular concern. Nobody has to be told that housing is necessary in any one of these four places. I have visited those four places and I have seen the conditions and I know that housing is a requirement, as I am sure the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) are acutely aware, in these areas. But what we have to do is see that we are participating and developing a special programme.

This is where we are fulfilling a role as we see it. Here are the residents on the one hand who need the housing, and here we have on the other hand, an authority which has been set up to provide housing. Despite what may

be the evaluation of the members of the opposition as to Ontario's housing programme, it is a fact of life that home ownership made easy is just all over southern Ontario. What we have attempted to do—and we have succeeded—is to turn the eyes of Ontario Housing Corporation northward, at the same time pointing out to them the fact that the idea of transferring a 21-story condominium or a ranch-type bungalow to that area is completely out of the question.

So, really, I say to the hon. member, we do not evaluate our programme on the number of beds constructed during 1970. We will evaluate our programme when we see how much success the future development brings about.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the double-talk of the minister makes it absolutely incomprehensible to question him about it. I doubt very much whether in any unorganized territory in the Province of Ontario, Ontario Housing was determined to provide condominium or ranch-style housing for the Indian community.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was engaged in the technique of the NDP exaggeration.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, let us get down to the details. What did the minister's department learn from the experiment—under which he advanced $50,000—about this special type of housing required for Indians, as distinct from housing required for anybody who is not an Indian? What did the minister learn from the experiment?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are learning the techniques of setting up a housing corporation at the local level. We are learning by having built, and as I said, having seen the photograph of this home in the book, this is a completely new development. I do not know whether the hon. member for Thunder Bay can verify how many homes of that particular size and structure are available.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): There are four of them and they have been waiting six months for water so that they can move into them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The reason that they have not been filled is not because they have been waiting for water, but the corporation is also learning the techniques of dealing with people because the corporation is a limited number of people and they have to come to conclusions as to who is going to occupy and under what terms of occupation they are going to be, who is going to maintain them, that type of thing.

Insofar as water is concerned, from our point of view, from my point of view, that should be no problem at all because we have been working—

Mr. J. Renwick: I think there is water in northern Ontario, too.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, it was the winter period. I understand that the weather conditions were a contributing factor, but I see no reason why water should be any problem. That is not holding—

Mr. Stokes: That is what the Indians cannot understand—why the minister would design a home without making provisions for some water. They are entitled to water. They use water the same as anybody else and they just cannot understand why you would spend $12,500 on four homes in Armstrong without making some provisions for water.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member makes a flat statement and I of course have to say—I say this in all honesty—that I do not take his statements as necessarily being the viewpoint of anybody up north. He is right part of the time, he is right about part of what he is talking about part of the time, sometimes he is completely wrong about the whole subject.

Mr. Stokes: I am totally right in this instance. The hon. minister has not even seen the housing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not had the opportunity that you people—

Mr. Stokes: I know the conditions.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not been up there, but as I say to the hon. member, the fact that the hon. member makes a statement is not to be taken as the gospel truth in this House.

Mr. Stokes: The hon. minister has been standing there for the last 10 minutes asking me to endorse his statements and yet he will not accept mine. I have seen them and the hon. minister has not.

I am telling the minister categorically that the houses have been sitting there for six months and they have not been occupied for the lack of water. Let us go back to my colleague's question: What has the minister

learned from this study—that Indians need water too?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that our staff was up there last week and the matter of water is not the reason for the delay in occupation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what is the reason for the delay in occupation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have explained to the hon. member three times.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, will the minister answer two or three questions?

Can he give me one specific instance in the construction of those houses that makes them specially equipped to house members of the Indian community as distinct from any other kind of house construction? Secondly, how many rooms are there in the houses and is there anything different about those rooms than there is about rooms in any other house? Thirdly, did the minister have anything to do with the Armstrong Development Corporation and its structure and if so, who composed it at the present time? Why are they in it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will do me the courtesy of looking in the book, he will read about the programme. He will see it is one of the first homes built by Ontario Housing Corporation in unorganized territory. My understanding is that this kind of accommodation has to be developed—and this may not be the total answer—to meet the special needs of the Indians and of the special areas.

What was the last part of the question?

Mr. J. Renwick: What are the special needs of the Indians that require special type of accommodation and what is special about that—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It depends upon the location.

Mr. J. Renwick: —other than that this department happened to get it built?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know that I have been in a home—although it was not built by Ontario Housing. The president of the corporation was showing it to me and told me how he had developed his own home. I think it was a home in McIntosh. His home has been developed because he is aware of the kind of equipment that he uses—his snowshoes, his hunting equipment and these things. This hallway is quite different from the kind of a hallway that you would see in southern Ontario, the small narrow hallway which is purely a passage.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Is there a basement in the House?

Mr. Stokes: No.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am informed that this particular one has not been tailored along those lines; it was developed to be able to provide—

Mr. Stokes: It is a prefab.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —a construction very quickly in order to be able to give an opportunity to the corporation to develop techniques of assignment. Remember this is not only an experiment in housing; it is also an experiment in bringing them into being and in having people find out and learn the management of such an operation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, was there an architect who was responsible for the design of that particular home, or was it purchased as a prefab from one of the companies in this field?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was purchased as a prefab—I was describing to the hon. member our experimental programme.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, is it a prefab house or not?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: And it is a standard prefab house that the Ontario Housing Corporation bought for $12,500 and erected on the site. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I understand that is correct.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then it is not a series of experimental housing projects. Will the minister please admit that this particular programme is again just a façade of this government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the corporation that was formed, the Armstrong Housing Corporation, is the first one of its kind to have been formed specifically to deal with housing in unorganized territory. That is not a façade, that is a reality.

Mr. J. Renwick: Did the minister's people have anything to do with the structure of

that corporation, and if so, who are the members of it? How were they selected? How were they appointed? What do they do?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would think we would probably have assisted them in the legal structure of it, but we have no control over the membership or who participates in it. We could get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Who would we get the information from?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be available in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. It is a corporation, as—

Mr. J. Renwick: The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a corporation like any other corporation. A structure to the same form.

Mr. J. Renwick: Who was instrumental in initiating the formation of that body? Was your department simply making an outright grant to the Ontario Housing Corporation? And have you washed your hands of this project, or do you still have a continuing interest in the way in which that development corporation functions?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the department has now had some experience in dealing with corporations. It was decided some considerable time ago that we need to have a vehicle through which we can deal with people. Our department went up to Armstrong. We encouraged the idea of the setting up of the corporation as a vehicle in order to bring housing into that community. Mr. Hector King was one of those who was involved and I understand that Mr. Laird is the vice-president who is actually managing the affairs of the Armstrong Development Corporation. But the community itself, the people in Armstrong, decided who would make up the membership and the directorship of the corporation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Do I take it that in the vote we are discussing at the present time that $150,000 of the $200,000 is included in this year's estimates?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, it would be.

Mr. J. Renwick: And I take it that none of the other houses are under construction at either Macdiarmid, Minaki or Dinorwic?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not under construction. We are trying to stimulate the formation of the community organization.

Mr. J. Renwick: And in your department there is nobody who is engaged in making any assessment whatsoever of the four houses which are completed at Armstrong and are standing vacant at the present time without a water supply. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I guess the hon. member did not hear me say a moment or two ago that a member of our staff was in Armstrong last week with respect to the housing development.

Mr. J. Renwick: And has the minister received any report from the member of his staff about the four houses in that area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we have several reports. They would report not directly to me, they would report to the senior personnel of the department.

Mr. J. Renwick: In other words, is this an experimental project or not?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, the whole thing is an experimental project.

Mr. J. Renwick: What is, "the whole thing is an experimental project"?

Hon. Mr Yaremko: The creation of homes in unorganized territory, tailored to meet the needs of the people, involving the local community in the organizational structure which will manage the housing development.

Mr. J. Renwick: I take it then, as my last final comment about this fiasco, the minister has categorically stated he is not interested in people from the Indian community in inadequate housing occupying homes. Therefore he contradicts the statement of his predecessor, that the object of this experimental housing project was to deal not only with the quality, but with the availability, of housing for the Indian community in unorganized territory in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we are working out the programme and I would say that 98 per cent of the hon. member's statement is pure balderdash.

Mr. Farquhar: I would just like to suggest that people like Halliday Homes, Alcan Homes and 100 others, have been experimenting with the building of homes for specific family needs for many, many years.

I would like to ask the minister which one of these companies—and I am sure it is one of the established companies in the field—actually built this home for the corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear to the hon. members of the House that the important part of this experimental project is not the structure itself. This is important and we can gain expertise in that matter. The important part is the involvement of the local community in bringing into being the organization for the management of the operation. And it is the hope of our department, and the Ontario Housing Corporation as a partner in this, that when we have this experience we will be able to move ahead in providing that range of housing for the Indians in northern Ontario which is available in all other parts of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Farquhar: Yes, again, Mr. Chairman. I would like very much to see a house that will work for a family in an unorganized township, but move it over the line and it will not work—that is the part of it that is so ridiculous, building a home that is adaptable to unorganized territory. What could be so silly? People just have needs, that is all. Would the minister mind answering my original question; what company built the home?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Unitized Construction Limited of Thunder Bay.

Mr. Farquhar: Good.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I would like to go a little bit further, Mr. Chairman, on the questioning the hon. member for Riverdale was engaging the minister in.

I want to refer, Mr. Chairman, to an article that appeared in the Thunder Bay Times-Journal on April 24, 1971, headlined, "$1.1 Million Budget Set for Indian Projects," and I want to quote a part of that news report. It says:

> On Mr. Szego's priority list are housing, care of the elderly Indians and diet supplements for children. He said the extent of provincial participation is governed by agreement between the Indians and the federal government. At present the provincial Indian branch uses the $1 million as a fund for money when money is not available from other sources. More than $50,000 was made available last year through the fund for a housing project in four northern Ontario areas. Four homes were built in Armstrong, Dinorwic, Minaki and Macdiarmid, said Mr. Szego.

Obviously he was misquoted on that, I take it. By the minister's own admission there were four homes built at only one location and that was at Armstrong.

The minister, I think, has cleared that up and I was wondering if the minister or Mr. Szego might want to inform that newspaper that Mr. Szego was misquoted.

He said that:

> By the combined work of the Indian community branch and the Ontario Housing Corporation, the Indians formed development corporations on the reserves to design and build the homes.

Now, we know they did not design them. That was by Unitized Construction of Thunder Bay. We know that they did not even build them. They were—

Mr. J. Renwick: Prefabs.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, they were prefabs. I am just wondering how these press releases get out. Does nobody ever follow them up?

The minister has community development officers in Thunder Bay who know what is going on in the area, so I am wondering why the minister allows these fallacious news reports to come out. He knows that they are misleading and that they are false and yet nobody bothers to correct them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the business of correcting news reports can sometimes be quite a futile occupation, as anybody in this House will discover over a major period of time. The significant part of this programme is that the Ontario Housing Corporation, having constructed tens of thousands of units—

Mr. J. Renwick: Bought a prefab house for the Indians from Unitized Construction at Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —throughout the Province of Ontario, is moving into providing housing in unorganized territories where no vehicles for doing so have ever existed. The municipalities are the vehicles through which the housing corporation operates.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is not so.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is a completely new development.

Mr. Peacock: They build anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are different aspects which I have outlined to the House. They have not all been looked at in the one operation. The Dinorwic corporation, for example—the people there are participating in designing the homes themselves. The Macdiarmid people sent in pencil sketches, but I think they are in the process of reconsidering the sketches that they sent in, so that is an aspect of the operation in which people are involved.

I am advised that in Armstrong, although the homes were built by Unitized, the residents themselves approved the particular type —they did give approval to the kind of construction that was proceeded with.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I have one question. With one breath the minister is talking about unorganized territory—which is a territory without municipal organization—and in the same sentence he talks about the municipalities becoming involved. How can we have the municipality involved if there is no municipality?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I say the community of Armstrong, it looks like a municipality—you know, you drive past their homes and everybody is around—but it is not a municipality, it is a community.

What I was talking about was involving the community, not the municipality. The municipality is a legal—

Mr. Jackson: Right, and if the minister is going to involve the community when there is no municipal organization he must be involving individuals in that community. If so, then how do they represent the people in the area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the technique that we are developing in Armstrong. I would assume that all of the members of that community were invited to a meeting. The Indians and Metis were invited to a meeting and discussions were held. That is how we get them involved. The same would apply in Dinorwic and the other places.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, the minister said that he assumes that all of the people in that area were invited to a meeting and from that meeting arose something. Is it a fact that there was such a meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Jackson: And did the minister attend such a meeting? And what did come out of it if such a meeting was held? What in fact did come out of it? I am sure this is the crux of the whole matter. What did we find out after we had that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, such a meeting was held—it is beyond even my capacity to attend every meeting in the Province of Ontario, as much as I would like to. I have been in Armstrong and the result of that meeting was the planning and the coming into being of Armstrong Housing Corporation, the first of its kind, which is involved in the management of these four homes.

Mr. Jackson: Well, then, just one further question, Mr. Chairman, and I will let someone else up. If there is such a housing authority which arose out of this meeting, who were the responsible citizens? And how did you arrive at the responsibility in that community, in order to choose those persons who ultimately took over the operation and the responsibility for such a housing authority, if, as you say, it is still in the formation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is completely formed. As a result of the meeting, on our initiative the Armstrong Housing Corporation was formed and is in active operation. There were the usual types of radio announcements about a meeting and public announcements, and those who showed up at the meeting indicated by their attendance that they were interested and wanted to participate in the corporation and the corporation has come into being.

The interesting thing, from the point of view of Armstrong, is that up until that time the community had not been interested in any organization of any kind. Now, they want to use Armstrong Housing Corporation as their community organization to go into other areas.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, what bothers me is that we are talking about community and community activity and community participation and yet what arises out of this so-called meeting is the fact that the government appointed someone to set up a housing authority—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we—

Mr. Jackson: Did the people in the community actually set up the authority?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Jackson: If so, in what way were they involved in the setting up of the authority? On a democratic vote, by picking people—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Jackson: —by selecting persons?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer to everything the hon. member says is yes. That is the way we discharge our role in community development.

Mr. Jackson: Then the person who at this moment is head of the authority in Armstrong is a community resident? And he was chosen by a democratic vote of the people of Armstrong?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A community resident; yes, he is a community resident and those who participate even paid $20 for the incorporation.

Mr. Jackson: Well, Mr. Chairman, would the minister, in view of what he said, consider tabling the minutes of such meetings, or meeting, that took place, so that all of the members of this House can see what actually took place at the meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the corporation is not our corporation. It is a local community corporation and we do not dictate to it. All we do as part of our community development programme is to encourage them to take an active role and bring into being this kind of an organization which can then go on to do other things, which can be the vehicle for the provision of homes for the community and go on with many other needs. For example, if in Armstrong there is a need for a community water supply, or recreation, there is no reason why this corporation, if the members of it see fit, should not undertake an interest in those areas too.

Mr. Jackson: Well, the minister's answers have not clarified the point in my mind, as to how the housing authority came into being. Surely what he has said earlier indicates to me that the housing authority was set up by appointment. The persons who presently constitute the membership of that authority were appointed by this government through the minister's department. If this is true, then the community participation does not exist. As a matter of fact it is a housing authority under the direct supervision of this government and therefore—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The members of the housing corporation are not our appointees, and it is a total community project. All we did was to provide the initial idea and then the corporation came into being. Then of course we acted in conjunction to communicate with the Ontario Housing Corporation to bring them face to face with the Armstrong Housing Corporation. That is our role. It is not government operated at all. In fact it is a very fine example of community development.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, is the minister saying that it grew like Topsy, that the people of the area decided that they wanted something and all of a sudden it came into being without any democratic system of setting up the corporation? It just did not come into being. Someone set up the directors, someone set up the corporation, funded it. Surely the government did that?

If there was such a meeting and at that meeting the people of the area decided that they wanted the corporation and voted on certain persons to be the directors, then there must be minutes of that meeting, and if there are minutes for that meeting, then will the minister table them in this House?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member has completely failed to grasp what a corporate structure of this kind can be.

Meetings were held—three meetings I believe there were, at least three meetings were held—after public announcement, and the people came together and they discussed it and they themselves came to the conclusion that there should be a corporation, and they themselves decided who should be the members of that corporation, and they themselves decided who should be the directors of that corporation. We did not play a role in that aspect at all.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I will accept that statement, but if I accept it then there must be minutes of those meetings, and if there are minutes will the minister table them in this House?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There may or may not be minutes of the meetings, we did not dictate any course of procedure, and if there are minutes we would be very happy to get in touch with Armstrong Corporation and say the hon. member has requested copies of the minutes and then it will be up to them to decide whether they will release their minutes. Those minutes are not within

our control, it is a completely independent, autonomous corporation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I just want to develop this a little further. Why was it that the minister called it an experimental housing project? Is there something different between the houses that we would put here and perhaps the houses developed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for northern conditions? Is that the kind of housing he was trying to develop?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have explained this matter several times. The record will indicate all the details that I have given.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Well, actually the same questions have been asked.

Mr. De Monte: Respectfully then, can the hon. minister tell me to what extent Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is involved in this? Have they put any money into it? Have they supplied any staff?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, they have not been involved at all—neither with money nor staff. We hope that they will become involved and provide the kind of funding that will be necessary if there is to be the same availability of housing on a broad scale as is elsewhere in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. De Monte: May I then ask the hon. minister to what extent Ontario Housing Corporation is involved?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have supplied them them with $50,000 and they have supplied the staff and they are building the houses. They are the contractors who are building the houses.

Mr. De Monte: They are not building the houses. I take it that the houses were prefabs. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not in Armstrong. The houses were put up under the supervision of OHC.

Mr. De Monte: In other words, they did not build the houses?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, but the hon. member knows that Ontario Housing Corporation does not have carpenters and bricklayers. They use all kinds of resources; they are managers, as I look on housing, and—

Mr. De Monte: I have a question to ask then. In what respect can this project be considered experimental? I ask that question again because certainly a prefab house, Mr. Chairman, is not an experimental house. Perhaps the plans that were submitted by the company might have been experimental but I want to find out what type of an experiment it was. Was it a northern condition experiment like Central Mortgage carries on to build houses?

Mr. Stokes: It has nothing to do with the design of the house. It was self-help, so they could manage their own affairs. The minister obviously does not know that.

Mr. De Monte: The folder says—and may I read it: "For the first time Indians in unorganized territories now have access to public housing through an experimental project set up last fall in four northern centres." I would like to know if it is an experiment with a new type of house. Is it an experiment with a new type of organization? What type of experiment is it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have explained it, but I will attempt once more for the hon. member's benefit. We must look at this experiment as being a total experimental project, the most significant factor being the coming into being of a vehicle through which housing can be developed in northern Ontario in unorganized territory.

The significant thing about Armstrong is the very fact that a community organization came into being for any reason, but there is that organization now. Secondly, there is the fact that this organization was brought into contact with an established governmental organization whose job it is to provide housing —namely, the Ontario Housing Corporation.

The third aspect is the provision of homes that will be tailored to meet the needs of the people who will occupy them, of the kind of community in which they are, of the kind of conditions which exist in those communities. In the overall picture the members of the corporation and the residents themselves will be involved in developing what I call "tailored-to-meet-the-specific-needs" type of housing.

The fourth aspect, I would think, is the ultimate involvement of CMHC in order to provide the kind of funding that is necessary.

It certainly stands to reason that neither $50,000 nor $200,000 would come anywhere near providing the number of homes that are necessary in these four communities alone, let alone the other communities scattered across the breadth of northern Ontario.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, do I take it that none of the $50,000 in fact went to the Armstrong Development Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right. The $50,000 worth of homes went to the corporation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Do I take it now that the Armstrong Corporation in fact owns outright the four houses?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, and the proceeds from them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They own the land on a 99-year lease and the houses they own outright.

Mr. J. Renwick: They own the land—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They have a leasehold —a 99-year lease on the land.

Mr. J. Renwick: From whom?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The corporation has a 99-year lease on the land and they own the structures.

Mr. J. Renwick: From whom was the lease?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ontario Housing Corporation assembled the land first.

Mr. J. Renwick: So the Ontario Housing Corporation has leased the land to the Armstrong Development Corporation on a 99-year lease which cannot be cancelled by the Ontario Housing Corporation and that the development corporation owns outright the buildings that stand on that leased land?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is correct.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why did the Ontario Housing Corporation lease the land instead of granting it outright to the Armstrong Development Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think that is a part of the general policy with this type of development of housing across the province. I know of no special reason. It is just part of their—

Mr. J. Renwick: Was the minister's department engaged in the negotiation or assisting in the negotiation of the lease for the land?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We were consulted.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is there any rent paid for the lease of the land?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One dollar.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, one other question in connection with the Armstrong Development Corporation: I just wanted to confirm that the minister does not know the names of any of the persons who participated in Armstrong Development Corporation. The minister is also confirming to me that his department did not provide any dollars for the purpose of seed money or for organizational purposes for the Armstrong Development Corporation. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think I gave the House, the committee, the name of one person—Mr. Laird, who is a member of the corporation—

Mr. Stokes: Hector King.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Hector King, I would imagine, knowing his activities, would be a member of that corporation.

As the hon. member would know in the Province of Ontario there are tens of thousands of corporations which are structured and act as corporations. They are completely independent. I would not be expected to know at any one time the membership of the board of directors. If the hon. member wants to know the names, we can contact Armstrong or even refer to the latest returns in the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs to find out who the officers are. We would not know who the members were because that would be a matter for the corporation's personal knowledge.

Mr. J. Renwick: You confirm the last part of my question, that no part of the $50,000 went to the Armstrong Development Corporation by way of seed money or assistance in its internal structure, organization and eventual incorporation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes. They did not ask for any seed money. Apart from the contribution of $20, my understanding is that participation in the affairs of Armstrong housing corporation is purely on a voluntary basis. It was voluntary work provided by the local people.

Mr. J. Renwick: So the $50,000 went directly from your department to Ontario Housing Corporation to Unitized Construction Ltd. of Thunder Bay? That is the extent to which the $50,000 was made available to

the Indian community and the Indian community had no say whatsoever in the use or dispersal of those funds?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, they were involved in the design of the homes. As I indicated, they gave their approval to the particular kind of home that was involved. I may say that now the houses have been turned over to the housing corporation they will manage them. They are the landlords; they are the housing authority. To use an ordinary expression, they are the landlords of those homes. They will collect the rents and make whatever arrangements they make for the upkeep and maintenance. They manage those homes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the degree of involvement of the Armstrong Development Corporation, and the persons in it in connection with the design of those houses, was the selection from the Unitized Construction Limited book of which house they would take, if they had that participation in its design.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what point the hon. member is driving at.

Mr. J. Renwick: My point is simple, that they did not have anything to do with the design.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have explained to the hon. member the total experimental project in this particular situation. The approach was to provide houses as quickly as possible. The part of the experiment which was highlighted and paid attention to was the formation and the working out of the local community in the actual management of the corporation. My understanding is that they not only looked at the Unitized designs but they also saw other designs, including CMHC designs which are available.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4?

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to pursue the other two priorities that Mr. Szego is purported to have enumerated in this story. One is the diet supplements for children and the other is accommodation for aged people. How much money has been allocated in this fiscal year for those two priorities and how and where will it be spent?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The diet supplement programme was the setting up of a pilot service project in the light of the fact that we have received representations about the lack of an adequate supply of nutrients in some of the more remote areas. Attention was directed primarily toward the serving of milk and vitamin biscuits in the morning immediately after school commences, and the serving of hot meals at lunchtime, and the developing of parental involvement by getting this to be a community project. So a task force was set up by The Department of Education, Health and our own department to deal with the problem. The Department of Education is in contact with the local educational authorities to see how this programme can be carried out.

With respect to the homes for the aged, that, of course, has been a matter of particular interest to myself. I know that we were trying, through the aegis of The Department of Social and Family Services, to see whether we could not also develop a special type of home, not only special in the kind of physical surroundings but to see if we could take the concept of a home that is being used now through The Homes for the Aged Act, and see whether some machinery could not be developed for the special needs of the Indians. As the hon. member knows, I think every home in the north is available for Indians the same as it is for accommodation for other citizens.

Mr. Stokes: The minister knows they will not go to them though.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is exactly the problem—not a problem but a fact of life. The life style of the Indians and the values that they believe in do not lead them to be attracted to the ordinary homes for the aged. Although there are, and I have met with residents, Indian residents, in the homes for the aged. I think the one in Thunder Bay, Rest Haven—is it Lynn Haven?

Mr. Stokes: Pinewood.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have been in Pinewood and met some of the residents there. The idea is to try to develop some sort of accommodation, and again it will have to be specially developed. I would like to see this as a programme with something like a motel type of accommodation where there is access to and from the outdoors into the accommodation. It may be the kind of home that is just developed for the hard season and then, at other times, the residents may be able to

go back to the reserves, which are the communities where their families are. Still within the Indians, the family tie for generations is a very strong thing. You will find a great-grandmother and a grandmother living with the mother and the children in one kind of accommodation. It is a question of working out the physical needs and the life styles to meet with our programme.

This is a problem which has not yet been solved. We were looking at a home in McIntosh. There was a residential school in McIntosh which was a very fine school which was closed up. I had thought of it in terms of being used for this specialized type of home for the aged but for some reason it was not found feasible. That is where it is going to be used; the Indians themselves came to the conclusion they did not want it, and it is being used now, as the hon. member knows, for the Manitou Arts Foundation.

Mr. Stokes: The minister failed to answer the two basic questions I put to him. How much of the $1,250,000 is going to be allocated to diet supplements for native people in places of need, and how much is going to be devoted to accommodation for our elderly first citizens in this fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the hon. member would be one of those who would appreciate the jurisdiction of this department. The dollars that are spelled out, as I indicated in my opening remarks where I spelled out the jurisdiction of our department, are in Indian community development.

Now, as part of our role, we see to it that we have communication and co-ordination and that is why we are not in the business of really providing homes. Our $250,000 or $200,000 is not an Indian housing programme. It is an experimental programme as we are playing our role in communicating and co-ordinating.

Because we are on the spot, we see the diet supplement and we are the government agency that becomes aware first that the old age programme does not meet the need. So we initiate the setting up of task forces which will use all of the government resources, we hope, in coping with these particular areas. But our priorities are as I set out in my opening remarks.

Mr. Stokes: In other words, what the minister is saying is that there are no direct funds for a specific programme? All you are attempting to do is co-ordinate that programme and to establish dialogue with other governmental departments and agencies, and try to entice them to provide the necessary funds for these worthwhile programmes, in kind the same way you did with Ontario Hydro in bringing power into Aroland. Is that the kind of thing you are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Aroland project was a little different. What we do is we get into an area; we set up a task force to delineate the problems, delineate the needs, to come to conclusions of the cost and then the answer will have to be met—who is to pick up the tab? We invariably try to find those resources in other departments in order to maintain our programme completely for our own uses.

Now the Hydro one is an example where our resources were supportive because we developed two things. First of all, we entered into an agreement with the Hydro to guarantee the payment and last year, as a result of that, we met some $4,700 of the guarantee, and we actually paid for it. Now if Hydro or if somebody else, had been able to pay the $4,700, we would have been just as pleased because then we can use our funds for somewhere else.

In this diet supplement programme we are hopeful—for example, I would be hopeful that in the homes for the aged programme, between a combination of the resources of the homes for the aged branch, together with the resources supplied through the social services branch which supplies the pensions under family benefits or the old age security pensions, somehow we can work out a situation where a programme is developed and another department uses the total government resources.

But it is true, if you will look through the blue book, that we have funded the initial stages. They fund some sort of a project to prove that the need is there and that it can be met, and then we try to find some other source for on-going programmes. Eventually, in the housing programme the CMHC funds with their millions of dollars will be available.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, on this same point.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: I have been following the minister's answers to the member for Thunder Bay. He says "refer to my opening remarks" and I do so on page 7. After various

sentences about enriching the whole approach by contributing to it the Indian point of view, the minister said:

> The function of the branch has grown out of the recognition that quite often Indian people are not fully aware of what services are available—

Now in respect to the—I should go on and complete that sentence.

> —or cannot take full advantage of what is offered or in some way these services are not particularly suited to them in the light of their needs and wishes.

I presume that from what the minister has said, it is within his jurisdiction not to supply the actual service in respect to the special homes or the diet supplement programme, but to point out to the Indian communities which department will provide the service. How much did the minister, last fiscal year, recommend to The Department of Education for expenditure on the diet supplement programme for children in Indian communities? And how much does he recommend to The Department of Education to so spend this year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have not reached that point. The task force has been set up and we will be considering the matter and then we will be making a report.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, last winter when the Toronto press, at least, gave such prominence to malnutrition among certain Indian communities in the remote parts of northern Ontario, what was the response of the Indian community branch of the minister's department under the diet supplement programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is confusing the two things. One is the diet supplement programme for children that we were discussing and the other one is the programme of the department, of the government, in meeting the high cost of food in remote northern Ontario areas. I think the Prime Minister himself made mention of the fact that in the newly formed Department of Transportation and Communications, part of its goal will be to meet these costs for everyone in northern Ontario. There is a particular awareness of the high cost of foods in the very far-flung regions of northern Ontario where adequate supplies are not readily available.

Mr. Stokes: Like 75 cents for a loaf of bread and $23 for a bag of potatoes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The airstrip service that has been developed will be playing a significant role in this. We are attempting to play an active role in this by assisting Indian communities and establishing community stores. The hon. member for Riverdale and I had quite a discussion the other day about co-operatives, and it is mainly in this field that our thrust has been; I think of the Amik Corporation at Attawapiskat, where we gave them a grant of $5,500 and they are financing the operation of the store and thereby are enabled to reduce the cost of food somewhat. Wherever any particular need is brought to our attention—

Mr. Stokes: What about Sachigo in the Kenora riding? The minister got a request from there. How did he respond to that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we had a request. A notice was given to our office about the Indians in Kassabanika and we have been in communication with Indian Affairs and were told that the conditions as were described to us were not a fact. We directed the inquiry to the federal department because this was on a reserve. We contacted Indian Affairs ourselves and were told that the head counsellor Simeon McKay, had himself written a letter, saying there was no such dire need and suggesting that no food shipments be made. However, we contacted The Department of Lands and Forests and they said that they, as a department, are prepared to move with their planes in the event that food supplies have to be flown in.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the minister said that perhaps I was confusing the cause of difficulties of the supply of food with the question of malnutrition. Surely, even in this minister's mind there is some link between the need for a diet supplement for children and the difficulties of supplying food by reason of cost or transportation?

What assessment did the minister or his branch make of the special diet needs of children in Kassabanika or other remote communities which were alleged to be suffering the difficulties of food supply?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This department does not have the expertise to evaluate this. We initiated the bringing into being of a task force on which the two main partners were to be the Departments of Education and Health and Social and Family Services in order to assess the situation and come up with the answers to the problem, in conjunction with the local school board, because we are

doing it primarily at the local level because of necessity they must approve of the programme if the schools are going to be the part of the delivery system.

Mr. Peacock: I see. Can the minister tell us, since this is a priority item, if the diet supplement programme likely will be in effect, if there will be the actual delivery of foods or money for the purchase of food to supplement the diets of children who need it, whether within schools or in some other community where a school is not accessible before the onset of the next winter season?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It will depend on what the report will bring out. They are assessing the problem now and I guess they will come to a conclusion as to the delivery system, whether it will be the school board and the involvement of the local community in the preparation.

For the hon. member it may be true that the transportation costs might be a very significant factor, but there are other factors involved in malnutrition. There are a lot of children from good homes who suffer from malnutrition for other reasons. This task force has been brought into being to deal with representations that have been made with us and we can see what programme will evolve from it.

Mr. Peacock: Just to conclude, Mr. Chairman; therefore, in the previous fiscal year and in the current fiscal year to date, no fund has been committed or expended in respect to the priority programme of diet supplement?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member keeps referring to it as a priority programme. I have outlined for the committee—to the House and to the committee—

Mr. Peacock: It was so referred to in the press release from the minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the total programme of our department. There is much to be done and we are meeting with it. The funds are being expended—our funds as voted here and the funds in other departments as the need arises.

Mr. Chairman: On item 4? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Does the minister really think —for all of the things that he has been talking about over the last week—does he really think that it is realistic to assume that he can accomplish these things in a meaningful way on a budget of roughly $1.5 million?

Anything that the member for Windsor West spoke of, surely, is something that would arise in an emergency. It is something that the director of the Indian community branch said was top priority.

Obviously, if the minister is going to do anything meaningful by way of either diet supplements or accommodation for the elderly, the minister is going to have to come up with more money in order to co-ordinate the kind of study or task force that is going to co-ordinate things on an interdepartmental or an intergovernmental basis in order to provide for the needs in those two vital areas that, by the admission of this very department, should be given top priority.

Does the minister really think that a relatively insignificant amount of $1.5 million for experimental housing, for dietary supplement, for homes for the aged, for community development, co-op housing, a number of things that this minister seems to take credit for—does he really think that $1.5 million is anything more than a drop in the bucket when one considers the amount of work that has to be done among the native people in order to bring them into the mainstream of things, whether it be economic, social or cultural?

The minister is so persuasive and he has been in cabinet for about 10 years. He knows his way around in government circles and he has the audacity to come to this Legislature and ask for a paltry $1.6 million for Indian community development work. If you ask the minister to make a guest appearance any place in the province and ask him to give a long dissertation on what his department is doing, I bet you he would have enough material to keep him going for three hours about all the things he is doing; all of the things his department has in store for our native people, whether they be treaty, whether they be non-treaty or whether they be Metis.

I think anybody in his department who is trying to do a good job would agree with me that it is just a drop in the bucket. He is not even on the periphery of the problem. If he is going to get involved in assisting Indian people—you know, in this very article it said:

> Mr. Yaremko said in the last few weeks he has sent out more than 200 letters to Indian chiefs and key contacts on the reserves announcing what he terms his open-door policy."

Well, if the minister got a 10 per cent feedback from those 200 letters and if he paid attention to the requests that he has, most of them I suggest would be worthy of consideration. And I suggest that $1.6 million could be expended in two weeks.

Does not the minister really think he should be sitting down with the Treasury Board and saying: "Give me $25 million and then we will get the show on the road"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is just making a big smoke-screen; he is trying to misinterpret the whole of what this government is doing for Indians. I have repeated, and he knows better than anyone else, that the $1.5 million does not constitute the money which is expended on services for Indians by this government.

Mr. Stokes: I am not talking about this government, I am talking about this department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member insists on making this department a Department of Indian Affairs and I say to him that is not what the Indians want and he should find that out for himself. I am surprised that he wants to create a Department of Indian Affairs, because the funding of the kind of department he is talking about is exactly the kind of an operation that has been going on in Ottawa and has been a complete failure. We are developing a whole different approach. The million and some-odd thousand is outlined in the kind of work which is shown in this blue book and I only wish that the time of this House permitted me to read into the record—or perhaps, Mr. Chairman, with your consent, I could file this, which is such an integral part of the work of our department on this particular item, as an appendix to the proceedings of this committee. But we have an Indian community development programme.

Mr. Chairman, we do provide seed money when it relates to other programmes. We are not in the housing business, and never intend to be in the housing business, but we did provide this $50,000 with the committal of $200,000 for housing. We are involved in other items where we provide the seed money. I could tell the hon. member that we are attempting to use this million-dollar fund in a very unique way to meet demands that other people cannot meet, to have experimental projects. But the bulk of the work, the bulk of meeting the answers in the whole range of needs of any of this, is going to be met by the other departments, and they are meeting them.

The Department of Agriculture and Food estimates that $200,000 in its budget will be spent. The Department of Education estimates some $3.5 million of its programme; The Department of Energy and Resources, some $12,000; The Department of Health, almost $1 million; The Department of Highways, almost $1.5 million; The Department of Labour, over $500,000; The Department of Lands and Forests, well over $750,000; The Department of Municipal Affairs, $100,000; The Department of Social and Family Services, over $3 million; The Department of Tourism and Information, $14,000; The Department of Trade and Development through the Moosonee Transport, some $226,000. Millions of dollars.

Our programme is but one facet of the money that is being spent, except that in addition to spending money we are discharging a special reserve. And the wonderful part about our continuing programme is the fact that we are able to harness the expertise and the resources—man resources and dollar resources—of other departments in this work. I really will not take three hours to give a complete report, but I would like to read just a sentence.

Mr. Stokes: Tell us about the 70 projects that you got involved in for a non-Indian department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I quote from the Lake Nipigon Metis Association over the signature of the president of the Lake Nipigon Metis Association.

Mr. Stokes: P. J. Maguire.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: "In the short period that you were minister of the branch under Social and Family Services, you did more for the Metis people in my area than was done for them in the last 100 years."

Mr. Stokes: Because nothing was done in the last hundred years, so if you did anything at all, it was certainly better than nothing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I prefer Mr. Maguire's interpretation to the hon. member's.

Mr. Stokes: You prefer his interpretation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of what was done.

Mr. Stokes: All right. You are saying this is not an Indian department, that you just provide seed money. You provide the ideas

and then you tell other departments what they should be doing by way of dietary supplements, by way of housing, by way of homes for the aged, by way of all of these things on which you say the various government departments spend millions. And by your own admission last year you got involved in 70 different projects. All on a budget of $1 million.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We got our money value, too, I think.

Mr. Stokes: I am sure you did. But what I am saying is that you should be doing about 10 times that much. Because obviously there is nothing at the federal level that fulfils the need for the things that you are doing, whether it be establishing a commercial fishing operation, getting a sawmill going, or any of the number of things that you get involved in. I am not criticizing those. I think they are great. All I am saying is I think you should be doing more, because it is filling a great need. But the thing is, as I say, you are just working on the periphery of the whole problem.

I want to get to another matter, Mr. Chairman, and that is a grant was made of $200,000 last year to establish a handicraft organization to sell Indian crafts, and later this month the department will announce plans to open a craft centre at the new Ontario Place pavilion. The craft centre will be operated by Indians. Now I would like specifically, if I can, to get some information from the minister. How many directors are there on this Indian Crafts of Ontario? How many of them are natives and how many of them are not natives?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the board of directors at the present time includes the following: the chairman, who is Dr. Gilbert Monture—he is an Indian; Mrs. J. Beaucage, who is an Indian; Chief F. Commandant, an Indian; Mrs. Oliver Smith, Indian; Mr. Andrew Rickard, Indian; Mr. Gene Rheaume, an Indian; Mr. Seluyn Dewdney, not an Indian; Mrs. Alma Houston, not an Indian; Dr. Edward Rogers, not; Mr. Roger Ball, not; Mr. Bob Liss, not. So that six out of the 11—that is the majority—are Indians.

The executive director at the present time is Mr. Lightbown, who is a west-coast Indian, and on staff there two other Indians and one non-Indian. Their own objective, as I understand it, is ultimately to have a full board of directors made up completely of Indians, but the structure is such as is the wish of the board at the present time.

Mr. Stokes: All right. Now, how many of those directors—you said there were six out of the 11 who were Indian—are actually involved in the supplying of raw material or marketing or actually physically involved in making the handicrafts?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, our involvement with the foundation was the provision of the $200,000. We have a member of the staff who sits with the board although he is not a voting member of the board. All of the decisions, all of the actions of the board are theirs and theirs alone. So the kind of details that the hon. member is asking for are not within the purview of our department but I would be pleased to get the answers. We know from our contacts that the two persons involved as the hon. member says are Mrs. J. Beaucage and Mrs. Oliver Smith, They are the two. My craftsmen.

Mr. Stokes: Since these are government funds that were passed over, has the minister any idea of how much of the $200,000 has been spent to date?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there is an implication to the hon. member's question which I want to disabuse right at the very beginning. We funded the foundation, they assumed the responsibility. They put a proposal to us, the proposal had a great deal of appeal to us, we funded it. From there on, it is by and large the operation of the foundation. We only are a part of the scene, when we are sort of invited to participate in order to give whatever information or expertise we have. But we do not supervise. We are not in the business of supervising the operations of the foundation.

Mr. Stokes: Well, who is—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, it would be presumptuous—I read the names—it would be presumptuous of our department to try to dictate to these people how they should operate. They are far more knowledgeable than anybody else in the province is.

Mr. Stokes: Well, who is responsible for appointing the board of directors? Was it the department, or did you vest that authority in some other person?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They came together themselves and formed it. A group of people outside formed the foundation. Then they came to us for funding.

Mr. Stokes: As a recall, and I have some information to support it, you physically handed a $200,000 cheque to a person. Do you recall who that person was?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That, Mr. Chairman, was at a ceremony in the Macdonald Block, when the board of directors and I joined in a press conference in order to let the public know about the formation of this foundation. I then handed the cheque to Dr. Gilbert Monture, who, as president of the foundation, was acting on behalf of the board. I think most of the members of the board were present and were actually introduced to the media, the newspapers, the radio and television. My recollection was that it was a joint press conference with Dr. Monture and myself and our respective associates with us.

Mr. Stokes: Did you not have some correspondence or some talks with the Union of Ontario Indians, asking them whom they would like to see head up this, and vest in him the authority for bringing together a board of directors?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We did not ask and I cannot conceive of us asking someone to pass judgement on it. My understanding is the union approved four nominees, including Mr. Andrew Rickard. There were four people that either had the approval or the blessing of the union, two of whom were Indians and two of whom were not Indians.

Mr. Stokes: Did you never have any dealings with a Mr. Arthur Solomon? Was he not in on the original formation, or did he not go around and seek out these people who might act as directors?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that he is an Indian craftsman and he played a role in the bringing into being of the foundation and ended up by being a—as a matter of fact, the picture that the foundation I think used as part of the release, was a picture of me with Mr. Solomon, who was then, or turned out to be, the first buyer of the corporation.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, all right. Now I want to refer the minister to a letter that Mr. Solomon got on November 25, 1970, and I quote:

> Dear Art:
>
> At a directors' meeting of Indian Crafts of Ontario held on March 6, 1970, at which you were present, you were hired by this company to act as a purchasing agent for an initial period of six months.
>
> At a directors' meeting held on September 25, 1970, at which you were present, your period of employment with the company was extended until December 31, 1970.
>
> At a regular directors' meeting held on November 20, 1970, it was decided by the board that your period of employment would not be extended past December 31, 1970. And you may accept this letter as sufficient notice of that decision.
>
> We do not consider that you are entitled to any further remuneration after December 31, 1970. However, we wish to provide you with some financial assistance to enable you to seek further employment. Therefore as a matter of courtesy we will pay to you, after fulfilling your employment obligations, the sum of $1,800 less deductions for income tax thereon.

And it is signed by Roger E. Ball, Secretary Treasurer, Indian Crafts of Ontario.

Now, does the minister know why he was let go, since he was in on the initial arrangements? As a matter of fact I think I have a recollection of the minister handing the cheque over to Mr. Solomon.

My reason for asking the question is, I am just trying to find out what was behind it all, whether it was a conflict in personalities, because I have letter after letter here, written in syllabics and everything else, from Indian craftsmen all the way from southern Ontario here, right up to Fort Severn. I am wondering just why Mr. Solomon—here is one in syllabics—why Mr. Solomon would have fallen in such disfavour with the board of directors, when obviously he has a good percentage of the Indian craftsmen behind him? The minister can look through these letters if he wishes. But I am just wondering why the board of directors, who were operating on funds made available by this department, saw fit to let Mr. Solomon go.

Does the minister or any of his staff know anything at all about this? Because, as I say, I have dozens and dozens of letters from people on reserves all over Ontario asking me to find out why he was let go when they had such confidence in him and he seemed to be doing, obviously, a good job for them. I am wondering why he was let go without any real explanation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. member that he direct

that question to Mr. Ball and that he be good enough to send, if he feels so inclined, the correspondence to Mr. Ball.

This is an autonomous corporation. We fund it. And the line of questioning that the hon. member is pursuing is the kind of line of questioning that the hon. member for Windsor West and the hon. member for Timiskaming were trying to let the members of this committee believe—

Mr. Stokes: That is the furthest thing from my mind. The minister has a guilty conscience. I am not going to look for any argument.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am just bringing to the attention of the hon. member for Timiskaming that he and the member for Windsor West were on the wrong track, because I know that this hon. member could never be on that track.

Mr. Stokes: All I am saying is that the minister provided $200,000 for this worthwhile programme and now he does not know a thing about it.

I think the minister has some responsibility to report to this Legislature and this committee, telling us what is going on, whether the $200,000 was well spent and to what useful purpose the money is being put.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that is not the question that the hon. member asked. He did not ask me whether I thought the $200,000 was well invested, well spent; whether they were doing a good job, whether they were producing results. He did not ask me of the operations of the outlet on Adelaide Street, which speaks for itself. No. He asked me whether I knew why somebody had been let out of a job. That is not my responsibility. That is the responsibility of this autonomous board, initiated by Indians for Indians and operated by a majority in those interests. They make the decisions. It would be very presumptuous of me indeed to even inquire, because the board could very easily say "We are autonomous; thank you very much, Mr. Minister."

Mr. Chairman: Item 4.

Mr. Stokes: I want to find out. In the same press release the minister says that as a result of this $200,000 that he spent, he is going to have some craftwork to see at the pavilion at Ontario Place.

Could the minister give us any more information on that? This was supposed to have taken place in April, I think. Since Ontario Place was opened, have there been any arrangements made to have that Indian craftwork on display? Who is going to operate it? Is it going to be Indian Crafts of Ontario? Does he know anything at all about this $200,000 investment—whether it is making money, whether it is holding its own, whether it is losing money?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That boutique is called the First Nation Boutique. It was part of the operation which was opened over the weekend. It is a separate corporate entity entirely.

Mr. Stokes: It has nothing to do with the Indian Crafts of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. The boutique is operated by a charitable corporation called Craft Foundation of Ontario Indians. The members, the directors are Omar Peters, Chief Wilfred Owl, Bernard Johnston, Joanne Brook and Peter Szego, three out of the five—that is, the majority—being Indian. We gave this organization a grant of $65,000 to cover the first inventory salaries and incidental construction site. The government made the boutique available rent free for the first year, and we hope that the boutique will have the kind of sales volume which will—$500 a day is the kind of volume I expect; it has been done. And I may say that I was there just in the two previous evenings and unfortunately I did not have the opportunity—they were closed—but I looked in the window and what I saw was a first-rate display of excellent handicraft. The sales proved that. This boutique is a retail organization, whereas the Ontario Crafts Foundation is a wholesaler. But it is more than just a wholesaler because it supplies materials and takes items on a consignment basis and it encourages design. It is operated like its name, a boutique.

And I may say that one of the very significant factors of the boutique is that the people of Ontario—and there are tens of thousands—will be able to see in one spot some of the finest examples of Indian crafts in Ontario. We hope this will not only encourage the purchase but an awareness of the standard of crafts that will be made available. I am looking forward to actually being in the boutique—my fingerprints are on the window—and viewing some of the—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The minister's fingerprints are on the—what was that? What was that gem about his fingerprints?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Just like footprints in the sand.

Mr. Bullbrook: Sounds like Graumann's Chinese Theatre.

Mr. Stokes: Is the boutique that the minister speaks of buying any handicrafts from the Indian Crafts of Ontario? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that the larger proportion of items on sale would be bought from the Indian Crafts of Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Fine. All right. I want to get into something else, Mr. Chairman, and that is a communication that the minister got. It is a letter sent out of Thunder Bay on May 21. I do not think it is privileged. It is addressed to the minister. It says:

> Enclosed herewith please find a proposal, along with complete budget, for the purpose of reviving in northwestern Ontario the fast-dying native art of dancing, singing and drumming. Since this is an aspect of native culture that is fast dying and since work has begun immediately, I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience.
>
> I appreciate your personal and professional concern with the retention of native arts and crafts as has been shown by your response to the Wikwedoong native cultural centre's audio tape library and your response to the craft workers of Ontario. I am sure that your past concern will be reflected in your response.
>
> Thanking you in advance, I leave. Yours for more native awareness.

And it is signed by William E. Sault of the native cultural centre.

I would like the minister to outline to what extent he is willing to get involved in this —phase one, two or three of this project? Maybe he has not got it yet; if he has not got it yet, I know he has already made an initial grant to this, I think, in the amount of—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What is the date of that letter, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Stokes: The twenty-first.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The 21st of what month?

Mr. Stokes: May.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Pardon?

Mr. Stokes: May 21.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Last Thursday?

Mr. Stokes: Yes. Obviously I am a little more attentive to my mail than the minister is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the member must be getting more direct service because this is the department that provides mail service; so the needs of the hon. member have priority over the minister.

Mr. Stokes: All right. Obviously I am being unfair then in asking the minister to comment on something that he is not even aware of yet. Let me get into another one then and let us talk about the Thunder Bay Friendship Centre.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is this the one that we have already given some—we gave to them in the last year—

Mr. Stokes: Right. This is one of the 70 programmes that we spoke of earlier.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Our attitude is very positive on that.

Mr. Stokes: Well, I hope it continues to be that way, because I am wondering what the minister is going to do with the Indian Friendship Centre at Thunder Bay under the directorship of Xavier Michon, who made application for something like $60,000 for the construction of the Indian Friendship Centre. He made a representation in the company of about 20 young Indian students about two months ago, I would think, and at that time he sort of led these people to believe that very active consideration would be given to a request for funds to match dollar for dollar the amount of money that they had already been able to accumulate by their own efforts. It seems to me it was in the neighbourhood of about $60,000 and they had asked the minister if he would match it.

Is the minister in a position now to state whether or not he is going to become involved in the construction of that friendship centre to a much greater extent than he indicated, say, a few short weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, Mr. Chairman, at no time did I or any member of my staff ever lead anybody in the Thunder Bay Friendship Centre to believe that we as a department could participate in capital funding of a friendship centre. Just the opposite.

As a matter of fact, when they visited with me I had the regrettable situation and discharge of my responsibility to say no in such a way that one of my favourite friends in that friendship centre—a tear came into her eye because of the very frank way in which I had to speak to them at that time because I do not believe in leading people along paths.

We had a very thorough discussion. We pointed out different avenues to them; we pointed out that The Department of Agriculture would have funds available through The Community Centres Act. And, at our suggestion, they have gone to the local municipality to see how they could involve the municipality in getting the funding from The Department of Agriculture.

They have also taken our advice and not set a goal as high as they wanted—that is, for the structure in its fullness, which is a very laudable but a very ambitious project. I think they have now come to the conclusion that they might start out with something half that size. I think they will probably feel that they do not have to pay for it all in cash, which was their initial goal, a tremendous undertaking, that they will build half the building and probably borrow some of the money to fund even that half. I am surprised that they have not taken up my suggestion of having a lottery up there, because they participated in Miles for Millions to raise funds.

But the group of young people—and there were some 20, I think, who visited me—those 20 young ladies could be the most dynamic vendors of lottery tickets that one could ever find, because what they have is enthusiasm and the will to work. We were going to put them in touch with The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, or I made that suggestion to them that they hold a lottery to supplement their funds. I would like to see that friendship centre built, that is, I have encouraged it in that way from the very beginning as a laudable undertaking. The idea is a fundamental one.

The significant thing is the reputation that the friendship centre has gained for itself in operating out of a building that ordinarily would have been condemned. They have revitalized the building and have done an excellent job of it. Of course, we have funded them operating support. I think we have given $14,000 and the federal government gave them $6,000 and the municipality gave them $2,500 last year, which is really not much of a three-way partnership when we supplied almost twice as much as the other two parties.

We have committed $14,500 to them for operating for this coming year. We will support them in every way and fashion within our jurisdiction, and we will give them advice and counsel and direct them to other sources of money, but we have not yet been able—that would be a very fundamental question—to fund a friendship centre, because there are now in Ontario seven friendship centres, all of them having the same hope, and some of them having even greater needs than the others.

Mr. Stokes: With regard to $14,000 that has been made available to them, did the minister present that to them personally, or was it the member for Fort William who presented that cheque?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I presented the cheque to Mr. Michon in the presence of the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman).

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware that the friendship centre is in the riding of Port Arthur?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I never really directed my attention to that. I also considered it as being the Thunder Bay Friendship Centre.

Mr. Stokes: Oh, I see. Did the minister invite the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) to participate in it? Did he think that he might have liked to go along with him while he was presenting the cheque?

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): Where would the minister find him?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will be very interested in this. The cheque was just about to go in the mail in my office and I came out of my office and ran into Mr. Michon who was in the building with the member for Fort William at the time. I think he was either—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Wonderful coincidence!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —with him or near him and I said, "Is this not a happy coincidence. I am about to—"

Mr. Gaunt: And he said, "It certainly is."

Mr. Stokes: Is that when the minister asked him?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now just a moment. Let me finish. I said, "You will save me the bother of putting this in the mail. Let me see if it has not gone out." We gave him the letter—no, the cheque was presented. We had the cheque. My recollection is that I remember having a picture taken with Mr. Michon and my recollection was that it was presenting the cheque for $14,500. Why? Did the picture appear in the local papers?

Mr. Gaunt: You just happened to have a cameraman.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not seen that paper.

Mr. Stokes: I am wondering, when did the minister ask Xavier Michon to accept the nomination for the Conservative Party in the riding of Thunder Bay? Was it before or after he gave him the cheque?

Mr. Gaunt: You do not mean to tell me he is using it for his campaign fund?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the minister made no such request at any time.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon me? I did not get the answer to that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The minister made no such request at any time.

Mr. Stokes: In other words, the minister is suggesting that if the present director of that Indian friendship centre is getting involved in politics it is of his own volition, nobody down here has tried to exert any pressure on him, it is his own decision, it that it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for myself, and the hon. member knows that. I heard the announcement. It was reported in the local press, and my understanding is that Mr. Michon, like all other candidates, made the announcement in a very personal way that he intended to seek the nomination.

Mr. Gaunt: I bet you sent him a valentine.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Xavier is a man.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 carried?

Item 4 agreed to.

Vote 1702 agreed to.

On vote 1703:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1703, item 1, Registrar General. Shall the item carry?

Mr. Bullbrook: I do not want to let the item carry yet.

Mr. Chairman: All right, the hon. member for Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I should have sent the hon. member a copy of this book so that he would be a little more familiar with it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am going to say something nice to you so you had better be quiet for a while. It is different.

An hon. member: How much did you pay for it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman just one moment so that I can get the relative material from my desk.

Mr. Bullbrook: You do not need any material. Listen to what I have to say first.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Fine.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wanted to record that since I was elected I have had nothing but the utmost co-operation from the department of the Registrar General. I do not, by that, want to give any peripheral aggrandizement necessarily to the minister. This goes to the Deputy Registrar General and his staff. From the thumping of the desks apparently we all—I thought frankly I got this as a particular treatment for myself, but apparently everybody gets the same. Oh well, I thought I was being well treated individually.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you seriously, I want to record there is no situation that has come over my desk, and on many occasions as you know we do have involvement with this department in matters that require complete expedition, and that is exactly what we get, co-operation and expedition.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1703 carry?

Vote 1703 agreed to.

On vote 1704:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1704, legislative services programme. The first item—the item of Speaker's classification. Any discussion on item 1? The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some remarks on the entire vote and I wonder if you would permit me to make them now, rather than to go item by item. It is not that long.

Mr. Chairman: The division seems fairly clear. I think it might be a little more orderly to take each item and clear it as we go along.

Anything on the Speaker? Shall item 1 carry? Carried.

Anything on item 2, Hansard? The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, that was one of the topics I wanted to touch on, and since we are doing it item by item, perhaps I can first ask the minister—which I had not intended to—why the amount devoted is reduced from that voted last year?

Mr. Chairman: I apologize to the hon. member. I did not get what he said, the last few remarks.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The figures, the hon. member will realize, are tentative. We really try to estimate the expenditures but the expenditures are dependent upon a whole host of factors—the length of the session, things of that kind—which are really unpredictable. The services are now more stabilized. The salaries and the staff classifications have been finalized because they have become members of the civil service, and last year there were expenditures for equipment and furnishings that were not repeated this year.

Incidentally, with respect to the salaries, although the individual salaries have not changed—indeed, they will have perhaps gone up—the aggregate of salaries which would be necessary by virtue of this now becoming part of the civil service has been reduced. I have some of the figures here and the net decrease is some $22,700.

Mr. Peacock: Now that the Hansard staff are part of the civil service, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister when the next pay cycle or review comes up for them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will get that for you in a moment. I think it will be in October; yes, in October of this year.

Mr. Peacock: I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I know all members of the House—those who speak in the House—appreciate the services provided by the staff of Hansard. I, for one, find that I do not speak in sentences, much as I think I am speaking in sentences and ordering my thoughts as I go along. When I read the initial copy of Hansard, or the Instant Hansard as we call it, that reaches my desk soon after I have sat down, were it not for the Hansard people who record and edit what we say here, I think posterity would judge us very poorly. Members owe a great deal to those people in our staff, who not only put down our remarks and sometimes our thoughts in a more orderly way than we ourselves present them, but—

Mr. Breithaupt: Can you imagine having to make sense of all this?

Mr. Peacock: —provide us with other distractions as well when we want to avert our gaze from your own presence, Mr. Chairman.

The member for Kitchener points out the difficulties of the job—and the hours are as long as ours—the working conditions, certainly in respect to the noise that must surround those members of Hansard who have to listen to the tapes that are replayed as they type the transcript; it must be an occupational hazard.

I would find myself under tremendous pressure and aggravation were I to work for long periods of time in that kind of environment. That is why I suggest to the minister that the compensation for the regular and full-time members of Hansard should be reviewed at an early date, particularly in light of the fact that the Hansard staff are now part of the civil service, and that the compensation should be commensurate with the responsibilities of the office and acknowledge the kind of working conditions that the staff are subject to.

Mr. Chairman: Hansard. Shall item 2 carry? Carried. Item 3, Clerk of the legislative assembly and chief election officer. Anything under this item?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I might.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would like to direct some questions to the minister in connection with the capacity of the Clerk of the Legislature as chief electoral officer. Within the last month a deputy returning officer has been appointed for the provincial riding of Sarnia. I am sorry, a returning officer has been appointed for the provincial riding of Sarnia.

I was given the news by reading it in the paper when I went home. Now, I want to direct some questions. One recognizes that there is some connotation. Government has the right to govern and has the right, of course, to choose certain of its servants for various responsibilities.

I want you, if you would, to tell me the name of the man who is the returning officer in my riding and how you concluded that he was appropriate for such position, what his background and qualifications are. That is a specific question I put to you. I want you to, if you would, give me the general policy of your department in connection with these appointments.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Why do you not tell them that you are the solicitor for CMHC in Sarnia?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That appointment is by order-in-council. The information which the hon. member is referring to is not within my office. I would think that the appointment is by order-in-council of the returning officers, as all such appointments must be on government responsibility. The government will be judged on the way the job is carried out by this man, the same as every other.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well then, I take it, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Yakabuski: For the same reason as you are the solicitor for CMHC in Sarnia. The member told me that last year.

Mr. Bullbrook: I take it, Mr. Chairman—it is good to hear from the member for Renfrew North, or South, or—

An hon. member: That is worth 20,000 years.

Mr. Bullbrook: In any event, I take it that the minister's response is that he again funds—he is purely a funding agency and his department is a funding agency and, as a result, this House votes money to him to carry out the responsibilities which are essentially the responsibilities of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are funding the office of the Clerk of the legislative assembly and the chief election officer. We provide the funds for the staffing of his department. His staff is involved here. There was a complement of 34 for the year ending 1971 and there are five increases—there will be a complement of 39. The funding of the election office itself is done under an accountable warrant. It so happens that the Clerk of the House wears two hats; one salary, two hats. He is Clerk of the legislative assembly and the chief electoral officer. That is his total title and his continuing office is in that regard, but the funding of an election is done through an accountable warrant issued by The Department of the Treasury to the chief electoral officer, who happens to be Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Bullbrook: I appreciate very much, Mr. Chairman, the minister clarifying that. I was obviously completely misled in my understanding as to the voting of money. In connection with the accountable warrant system, through what vote during the course of the estimates does this House vote funds for the payment, for example, of my returning officer in the Sarnia riding?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is paid out of the accountable warrant.

Mr. Bullbrook: I hope I am not wasting the time of the House. Perhaps other members are interested in this. An accountable warrant is one thing, but is the government not accountable through some ministry to this House for the expenditures concurred therewith?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are not asking for those moneys at this time. I think that expenditure could be viewed as a government expenditure not related to any one single department but to government. Whether there is an item in the Treasury I do not know, but certainly we are not voting funds for an election campaign.

Mr. Bullbrook: Or for the appointment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The expenditures are shown in the public accounts. There is an item in the public accounts of 1970, in which there are the Queen's Printer, $29,000, and accountable advances, $39,000. That would be for printing forms for the next election. Those expenditures were in the year 1969-1970.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would take it—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no money being voted in these estimates as part of the moneys to be expended for the next election.

Mr. Bullbrook: So, that your department, Mr. Minister, has no direct relation either to the funding or the appointment of returning officers in the ridings.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under item 3?

The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Is it appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to ask for a clarification of The Elections Act under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: The Elections Act?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Chairman, it would be my submission that this would not be the time to go into the question of The Elections Act.

Mr. Stokes: Where would one get this information?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would be done either by asking the question of the ministry or during the course of any debate on any Act that is introduced in relation to that.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister not responsible for The Election Act of this House?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I have not been able to find any authority for that assignment to the Provincial Secretary. I would be interested in knowing myself. My understanding is that the then Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) introduced the present Election Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 3 carry?

Item 3 agreed to.

On item 4, the legislative library, the hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister what consideration he or the chief librarian of the legislative library has given in respect to the recommendation of the select committee on standing orders and procedures of this House, 1969, which discuss the uses of a research branch of our legislative library at Queen's Park, similar to that provided members of the House of Commons in Ottawa?

When the select committee met in 1969, one of the two visits it made outside the building was to meet officers and members and staff of the House of Commons. One of the discussions that was most helpful in that visit to Ottawa in that summer was to officers of the legislative library who in fact were research officers attached to the library of Parliament, preparing background material for members of the House.

Apparently there was great latitude offered to the research officers. They were able to prepare background material on virtually any subject the members of the House of Commons might ask for, and a member of the House could use the material with or without attribution to the research office. He could get from it a great amount of information and material and he could have it written for him by the staff in an adversary style reflecting his own point of view or his own political philosophy, which he might not otherwise be able to obtain from his own caucus or from government information sources.

That was a recommendation of the select committee of this House, that the government look into the feasibility of the establishment of a research office attached to the legislative library of Ontario, delivered to this House on October 1, 1969.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the report of the select committee and the visits and the recommendations. I think it boils down to a decision with respect to an approach by those hon. members who have been here for some considerable time. For example, in the case of the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn), he would have been here during the course of the whole development of the individual caucus offices.

I think that when he became a member of the Legislature there were no moneys at all for caucus offices. I think he was the whip at the time—I do not know—and any research that was done had to be done either directly or through whatever facilities were provided by the legislative library, with the assistance mainly of the press clipping service and their provision of some books and periodicals.

Then there was developed a funding of caucus offices, which has reached some considerable proportion, as can be seen by the next vote—I think it is almost in the neighborhood of $700,000 for the operation of caucus offices. It has been felt that the emphasis on research should be done through the caucus offices. There are X number of dollars made available to the caucus offices and they can decide on their own emphasis and what kind of staff they want to engage, whether research or supportive staff.

There is a certain appeal to the research staff attached to the library, but unless it was of such size that there would be researchers available almost at any time there could very easily be a conflict as to the assignment of a

researcher to any particular member. So the assignment with respect to research now becomes a caucus office responsibility, where they can work it out with members of their own caucus and their own priorities instead of having to work it out as between members of the three parties.

Mind you, the research staff of the caucus offices have available to them all the resources of the library. I have not been in contact with the library this past year to the degree I was in the past, of course, but certainly the thrust in the past was to develop full legislative services both as to books and periodicals and the facilities for research such as the reading rooms and the work offices, and the stress for research was to go in the caucus offices.

It would take quite a policy decision, to be arrived at by the government and, I assume, by the government in consultation with the leaders of the other two parties, to determine in what direction any additional resources will be put, whether it will be in that kind of research or augmentation of the resources made available to caucus offices.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the emphasis the minister speaks of on the appropriation to caucuses as the source of research services for members is entirely the wrong emphasis. There are certain services that are available to members or ought to be available to members that should be theirs in their right, not in the right of their caucus, not in the right of this government or the Legislature, but in their right as individual members of the House. Research services available and common to all members of the House is one of these, in my opinion.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member then would have the money taken out of the sessional requirements in the next item and move it into the legislative library. That is his position; it is a position which others do not concur in. Does the hon. member understand that in the following vote, sessional requirements, are X number of dollars allocated for research?

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the minister is completely obtuse. The matter I am speaking of is an independent, directly funded programme of research associated with the legislative library, which now does no research at all in the real sense of the word. It provides members with material, titles, documents, periodicals and so on, but it does not do actual work of research in the sense that most people use the term these days, I am speaking of the kind with which the minister should well be familiar—where if he would take the time he would be familiar with—which is done by the legislative library in Ottawa on behalf of all members of Parliament.

There, too, in Ottawa each caucus receives an appropriation from government just as in Queen's Park here in Toronto, each of our three caucuses gets a direct individual appropriation from government. It is agreed upon, or perhaps brought down by the Prime Minister, and then accepted by the other party leaders. Each in turn decides what use it will make of it. We, on our part, apportion some of it to research. We apportion some of it to secretarial services—and we will speak of that perhaps on item 6 in somewhat more detail.

I want to say to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that the size of the appropriation does not permit that each member of this House have adequate secretarial service and adequate research service, whatever caucus one speaks of. I doubt that members of the government caucus, well served as they are by their appropriation, need to allot as great a proportion to secretarial service in light of the numbers they have outside the ministry. Their total number is reduced by the size of the ministry. It is reduced by the number of private members who sit on boards and commissions and have, therefore, full-time secretarial service. A much greater portion of the appropriation to the caucus of the government party can go to services other than secretarial. In the opposition caucuses, a larger proportion goes to research than possibly in the government. It has to, because there have to be certain services afforded the leaders of each of the opposition parties. Research is one of them. In my own caucus the amount of research that is done is very large. It tends, however, to serve the leader first and the entire caucus second, rather than the individual members.

I say to the minister that the needs of the individual members—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I could speak to the member's leader for him.

Mr. Peacock: Oh, I speak to him often myself. We certainly agree on this particular aspect of it. He sat on the select committee with me, Mr. Chairman, and visited Ottawa at the same time as the rest of the members of the committee. He is quite familiar with the research services available to federal members of Parliament, as I am.

A case remains for individual members of the House to have available to them independent, fully expert research services outside their own caucus. The present arrangement can go on if the minister wishes, the caucuses deciding what is apportioned for their own particular research needs. Certainly those will remain; each of the caucuses wishes to develop its own research material and lines of inquiry along its own particular political way. That certainly will remain.

I say to the minister that he should once again take a look at the recommendations of the select committee, that he ask his staff to get in touch with the parliamentary librarian in Ottawa and find out the cost of implementing such a service in the legislative library in Ontario. It will not be anything like the money the minister has suggested. He has got a very large appropriation for sessional and other requirements; it would not take very much additional amount to finance a research office. I suggest he not dismiss it but take another look at it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member I am not dismissing it. We are having a discussion and dialogue back and forth. It is a recommendation of a committee that spent some time going into it, and I have the report before me and the specific recommendations.

The committee had a recommendation about an annual report to be filed through the chairman of the standing orders and procedures committee. Now there is no such committee by that name, but there is a committee on procedural affairs. I do not know whether there has been any discussion in that regard before that committee.

I do say that when we are voting $700,000 in sessional estimates, the way that $700,000 actually came into being was that the stress was on research. As members of the opposition parties in particular made the pitch for caucus office support, they focused—in fact, they devoted all of their attention to the necessity for research to be made available in the caucus offices.

Very little emphasis in the original discussion was put on supportive staff and in the initial stages it was very minimal. My recollection is that the money in the NDP office was about $3,000 for supportive services, as compared to engaging one researcher at, say, a salary of $12,000. But, as the years have gone by, the amounts have gone up from an initial amount of about $70,000 at the most to $700,000; so we now have the kind of facilities that have been provided for and which will be described by the minister—maybe have been described by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Peacock: It has nothing to do with the appropriation at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I walk through the members' offices I see all of the secretaries, the supportive staff; I see the duplicating Xerox machines. Whether the next extension, instead of further supplying additional moneys to the caucus offices for more research there, is that the moneys be diverted to the legislative library for the development of this sort of neutral type of research, is something which I think is open for discussion by all members of the Legislature acting as I think they want to through the leaders of their caucuses.

I think the two things cannot be completely separated because a decision will have to be made on what pathway would be served and I think it might be useful to have the librarian work out some sort of a proposal. I have not seen outlined anywhere a proposal that would meet the requirements of the hon. member. He has set out the need but just how that need could be dealt with; how many people; how they would be assigned; is it on a first come, first served basis?

Is there an allocation for one hour per person until you go around the circle for a project? When you are dealing with human beings in the area of political research, you are dealing in one of the most sensitive areas that we have within the ambit of our legislative deliberations.

Mr. Peacock: The minister, of course, is highly incorrect, Mr. Chairman, when he speaks of the emphasis being on funds for research services, at least in this Legislature. The emphasis in this Legislature on services for members has, of course, been in respect to the lack of secretarial staff which is now roughly—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Reviewing for the hon. member the historical developments of this $700,000; at one time there were nil dollars available and when it was nil dollars, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and the then leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) used to make very eloquent and very passionate addresses on the need for the members of the opposition to be serviced by their own research—to be funded for their research facilities—in order that they might

be able to meet on an equal basis some of the research facilities available to government supporters.

Mr. Gisborn: But the north wing development has nothing at all to do with the appropriations.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The $700,000 also has nothing to do with the north wing. That is for supportive services. I am not even commenting on the physical facilities. That comes within The Department of Public Works. I am talking about the dollars voted to the caucus offices for personnel and services under sessional requirements.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 4 carried? Carried.

Item 5, legislative post office. Does the item carry? Carried.

Item 6, sessional and other requirements. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Perhaps I can continue that remark at this point, Mr. Chairman. I would say to the minister that the emphasis throughout this session has been the attempt to get adequate secretarial services for members. We now have a ratio of approximately one secretary to each two members in my caucus. That is a result, of course, of our decision to try to allocate or appropriate some of our funds received from the government to research and some to services to our own members.

As long as the government insists that it will deal solely through the appropriation-to-caucus method of financing services and will not recognize the right of each individual member to a certain minimum standard of service—such as the one I was speaking of on the previous item, the research service attached to the legislative library or, in this particular case, a full-time secretary for each full-time member of the Legislature—then we will have to continue to juggle what we get from the government among our various needs. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if this Legislature is to mature in respect to services to members then the government will have to recognize that there are certain minimum standards to be met on behalf of each member. Secretarial service is certainly one of them.

The government has already recognized franking privileges. We now have no limitation—and I am not aware that there ever was a limitation—on the number of pieces of mail a member may send out in regard to constituency or legislative business. There certainly should not be the kind of limitations we now work under in regard to secretarial service.

Very fortunately, the new members' offices have been completed in time for members of this House to enjoy them before the dissolution of this Legislature and I, for one, Mr. Chairman, for the first time in my membership in this House, can make a phone call in private. It is the first time, since January of this year. My appreciation for that perhaps lies belatedly with the previous Prime Minister who came around, after a great deal of labour and effort, to recognize some of the needs of members. I think he recognizes them to a much greater extent now that he is once again a private member sitting in seat No. 1 and having to cope with his volume of mail and the other aspects of life as a private member.

Mr. Chairman, can I turn briefly to reiterate the position I put on the record last session when we dealt with this vote. That is the dissent I have with the method of treatment of members' indemnities and expense allowances under The Income Tax Act. I was prompted to raise it again by the recent increases in salaries and expense allowances for members of the House of Commons in Ottawa.

When we debated this last session, I put it to the minister and a number of other members in the House, that the tax-free status of our expense allowances should be terminated. The members of the House of Commons and Senate and members of the provincial Legislatures are the only citizens who enjoy this particular tax-exempt position in regard to expenses they incur while they are engaged in their responsibilities. I draw to the attention of the minister—I know that at least one of his colleagues is familiar with it, a pub'ication of the Canadian Tax Foundation entitled "Taxation of Members of Legislative Bodies," produced in 1969 by Horst G. Wolf, in which he sets out in a very thorough way the development of the attitude and philosophy of the compensation for members of legislative bodies and shows that far from being a consideration of the exclusive or particular status of members engaged in public business, the tax-free status of our expense allowance was a result of very high rates of personal income tax imposed under the income tax during the Second World War.

In order to increase the indemnity of members of the House of Commons this was the method resorted to. An additional amount given as an expense allowance was to be exempted from taxation, because, in the first

instance, when indemnities were paid to members of legislative bodies they were paid on account of expenses, not as salaries. So that we have moved well beyond that position, Mr. Chairman. We now in effect receive a salary, and we all regard it as such, whether or not we are engaged here full-time, or spend part of our time in the House and part in some other occupation. What we receive here is a salary and the way in which we are compensated for our expenses should be as recommended by Carter and should be as recommended by the Smith committee on taxation in Ontario, chaired by the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. White), at that time a private member.

Last year I did not read from the publication I referred to, but let me cite a few paragraphs of it at this time. The author notes the British experience and he says:

> The British taxation authorities have taken a much broader view of the duties of the members of the British House of Commons. Although it has never been tested in the courts, their view has consistently been that those duties are necessarily itinerant—that there are two branches of a member's place of business: his constituency, and Westminster.

Accordingly the British authorities have viewed certain kinds of expenses as allowable deductions under the British income tax rules.

These are the kinds of allowable deductions from taxable income allowed a member of Parliament at Westminster: First, the additional cost of living away from home when engaged in parliamentary duties, either at Westminster or in the constituency, but not in both. Second, the cost of stationery, postage, telegrams and similar items incurred for parliamentary duties. Third, the cost of secretarial and clerical assistance. Fourth, travelling expenses on parliamentary duties, (a) within the constituency and (b) between Westminster and the constituency, being the excess over the cash allowance made for members in respect to travel by car. Fifth, other necessary expenses incurred for parliamentary duties, such as, for example, the cost of hiring rooms to meet constituents, of pamphlets, etc., informing constituents of the member's parliamentary activities and subscriptions to the local agent or party association in return for which the member obtains help in his parliamentary work. Those are five areas exempted from taxation when the member expends part of his income as a member of the Commons on those activities.

Of course, here in Queen's Park some of these are already exempt, since they are not reported as income. In that sense they are exempt, and I would not propose that such things as postage, or franking, or the cost of printing a member's reports to the riding be placed on our T1 slips as allowable or taxable expenses.

I do say, however, that all of those expenses which The Income Tax Act otherwise makes allowable and taxable on behalf of all other taxpayers should be so shown on our income tax return, and then the deduction made as justified under the income tax rules that apply to everyone else.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): You cannot deduct expenses from salary, that is the problem.

Mr. Peacock: Now, the government of the province of Ontario gave this matter consideration when salary and indemnity changes for members of this House were before it. But at that time Ottawa had not given any leadership whatsoever, had not indicated any change in its position, but to continue along with the historical one of exempting the expense allowance from taxation. And I got the distinct impression, Mr. Chairman, that had Ottawa moved to accept in full the recommendations of the Beaupré commission, which Prime Minister Trudeau established, and from which the recent salary and expense allowance increases of members of the House of Commons and Senate are derived, then this government would have had no choice but to act, and find a means of implementing the same kind of formula, the same manner of treating Ontario's legislative members' expense allowances also.

I think, though, that this government should make the move in any event. But for whatever reason the leader of the government in Ottawa has not accepted that particular recommendation of the Beaupré commission, that the expense allowance exemption be terminated, and that members of Parliament be asked to submit accountable expenses for payment, I, for one, would have no objection to that system.

The second point in its favour, Mr. Chairman, is that it would not impose the present arbitrary maximum on certain members whose expenses do, in fact, exceed the limit of our present expense allowance, and it would not be, in effect, unearned income for others who do not require the full expense allowance. And therefore an accountable expense, or voucher system, using a per diem rate for

normal out-of-pocket expenses such as parking fees and meals, and a maximum per diem rate for accommodation at the lowest rate available—and most members are familiar with where the lowest rate available is in this town—would be two aspects of the accountable expense which could be very well implemented, and the taxation officials at Ottawa would have no difficulty whatsoever in exempting those from taxation.

Guidelines would have to be worked out in respect of other matters such as a member's expense in travelling in his constituency over and above what he receives as a mileage allowance directly from the Provincial Secretary; expenses he incurs in staffing or renting or equipping a constituency clinic or office, which certainly ought to be recognized and is recommended to be recognized in the publication of the Canadian Tax Foundation that I have referred to.

In those respects, negotiations with Ottawa would probably have to be incurred. However, there really should not be any fundamental obstacle to implementation of the recommendation either in line with what Beaupré or Carter recommended.

I will just finish by quoting what Carter said in his report:

> Members of Parliament should be treated on the same basis as other employees and so should be required to bring their allowances into income, and at the same time should be allowed to deduct their expenses of earning employment income, including election expenses. We would expect that it would be accepted that the regular place of business of the member of Parliament is his riding so that all expenses incurred while in Ottawa and in travelling to and from Ottawa would be deductible, as long as they fell within the limits established for such expenses.

Those words of Carter, I believe, were also endorsed by Smith, so we have two very impressive recommendations to put behind this proposal I am making to the minister. What is more, Mr. Chairman, we have a public dissatisfaction and frustration with the way in which the whole matter of members' indemnities and expenses are handled both at Ottawa and in the province.

Surely it is time for a uniform formula of adjusting members' salaries and expense allowances to be implemented all across Canada at both the federal and provincial levels. For instance, it should not be that members' salaries and expense allowances should be adjusted at any time during the life of a Parliament or Legislature. Surely it could be agreed upon that only during the first session of a Parliament or Legislature that salaries and expense allowances could be adjusted. Surely it could be agreed upon that the limits of the increases in salary should not be greater than the increase in either the consumer price index of the previous year or the limit put on the application of the consumer price index to the pensions of senior citizens under The Old Age Security Act; that would be a just relationship for increases in members' salaries.

Given that these increases are made year by year, over the life of a Parliament of four or five years, that there is on January 1 an adjustment of three, four or five per cent, or whatever, we will finally get away from this unacceptable and publicly onerous position of having to vote very large increases to members of legislative bodies at odd and irregular points in time.

There has to be a regularity to the adjustment. There has to be a standard to which the increases can be tied and there has to be some independent evaluation of the worth of the work of members. There should be no adjustment made except in the first session of the Parliament or Legislature. There should be a limit on the size of the increase, tied to some particular standard such as the consumer price index or that part of it allowed under The Old Age Security Act. And the increases should be regular—small but regular, year by year.

The only major reassessment of a member's salary or expense allowance should be made around the beginning of each Legislature or Parliament. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that with my retirement from active political life something of what I have said will find greater favour with the government than it has in the past.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for at least the second time has put on the record his views very clearly and very explicitly. My recollection is that the last time there was a similar debate the member for London North said that we should look to the federal government to see the direction in which they would be going, and that it would be unwise—I forget the term—for us—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The member did not use that word, surely?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to move in that direction until they have, and of course they have not. The hon. member has now put on the record his point of view.

I would only like to make one comment about adhering to any increases to the consumer price index. I do not know whether one could guarantee the increase or the workload to the same price index because—

Mr. Peacock: The minister would not want to gear it to the productivity index?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko —certainly a situation in which a member of the Legislature, such as the hon. member, feels the necessity for a full-time secretary to look after his constituency business and his responsibilities as a member is a far cry from the kind of workload that must have been involved in this House 50 years ago, 30 years ago or even 10 years ago as compared to today. We have no idea what the workload over the coming years will be but the hon. member has put a very cogent argument on the record.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 6 agreed to?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On item 6? The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: On item 6? I do not know. I just got in here. I want to know if the minister could tell me what is happening with regard to the licences for liquor up my way?

Mr. Chairman: That has nothing really to do with this.

Mr. Sargent: When do we talk about it?

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 is the legislative services programme, sessional and other requirements.

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is a service.

Mr. Chairman: Members' salaries and things like that.

Mr. Sargent: A lot of you fellows are not going to get your salaries unless you—

Mr. Chairman: Really, that topic has no place in this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Where do we talk about the liquor control board? In your vote?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not in this vote. That is not in these estimates. I outlined at the beginning of the estimates that it has been traditional in this House to have a debate when the report of the two boards is tabled as an item of order or when any amendments are introduced to the legislation or in the course of the budget debate.

Mr. Sargent: Well, when will that be? I want to know when that is going to be.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When the order of business of the House is decided and that decreed.

Mr. Sargent: When are you bringing in your report to discuss this? You should know. You are the minister. When are you bringing in your report?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not bring in the report. The boards table their reports through me.

Mr. Chairman: This has nothing to do, of course, with this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. This is public business. I want to know when we can discuss it.

Mr. Chairman: It is nothing to do with this particular estimate.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if that is the only item of public business that is in the mind of the hon. member, there are all kinds of public—

Mr. Sargent: Now come on! I have asked a very important thing for my riding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —there are all kinds of public business that can be discussed in this House but not during the course of these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 6 agreed to? Carried. This carries vote 1704.

Vote 1704 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the studies of the estimates of The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, now that the estimates have concluded I wonder if I could prevail upon the acting leader of the NDP to do a favour for me? I am sorry that the member for Huron-Bruce did not give me sufficient notice but I have here a little something for the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). It is addressed to Mr. Donald MacDonald, constituent of Bellwoods riding. The message is, "You need all the love you can get." It was sent from

Sentimental John. Would the acting leader be good enough to give it to the member for York South for me?

Mr. Peacock: It is lucky the member for York South is not here.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has got to be kidding. He gets paid $18,000 for that kind of nonsense.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I shall see that the member gets it.

Mr. Yakabuski: If the member for Grey-Bruce had got here earlier he could have got one, too.

Mr. Sargent: I doubt it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! the hon. minister has the floor.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to stand in my place at this time to present the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. In introducing these estimates, I should like to thank Dr. Edward Stewart, who was the deputy minister for the department during the first two months of these new responsibilities of mine, and to say how pleased I am also to have Mr. Harold Walker who was the Deputy Minister of Revenue, now as the deputy minister of The Department of University Affairs. I should like to thank also the assistant deputy minister and the branch directors for the help they gave me during those rather traumatic early weeks.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce) The minister pulls them along with him.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on the first day of my ministry, I announced that we expected more scholars per dollar and I am able to give a brief report to the House on the progress we have made in this very important undertaking in the past 11 or 12 weeks.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): The minister may have more bodies per dollar.

Hon. Mr. White: I would draw to the members' attention that this simple phrase encompasses both a quantitative element in the word "dollar" and a qualitative element in the word "scholar."

Mr. Pitman: That is questionable.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it is not and I would hope to persuade my hon. friends in the course of these estimates that there is no conflict in the objectives and, in fact, that they may be mutually supporting.

I am going to offer to the House, in a very tentative way, certain figures which indicate a reduction in what expenditures would otherwise have been. I am reluctant to apply the word "saving" to this particular set of figures because, in point of fact, we are expending a very much larger sum of money in support of the universities than we did do in the past year and to that extent the absolute cost has gone up very appreciably. These are, however, reductions from what those increases would otherwise have been if the existing programmes had been continued without alteration.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The minister means if the Premier had stayed on as minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I think perhaps I will run through it very quickly, Mr. Chairman, emphasizing once again the tentative nature of these figures. The first set of figures have to do with the fiscal year 1971-1972, and the total of $24.5 million is broken down as follows:

Graduate fellowship programme—reduction, $1.5 million.

OSAP—a reduction, all other things being equal, of $4.5 million.

Formula operating grants—a reduction of $6 million. And that subtotal, which is a reduction on operating account 1971-1972, is $12 million.

Capital support—a reduction of $12.5 million, for a subtotal for this fiscal year of $24.5 million.

The government has also announced that the unit value has been reduced from the $1,820 recommended by the CUA to $1,765, thereby reducing what the expenditure would otherwise have been by $14 million. By taking two years instead of one to bring the part-time grants to the full-time equivalent, the expenditure in 1972-1973 was diminished by $2.5 million for a grand total of $41 million.

There are those in the province associated with the universities, Mr. Chairman, who think that this dimunition in resources will lead to some decrease in quality. I am firmly convinced that this need not be so and I

will tell a couple of stories in an attempt to illustrate how close a control—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Does the minister mind if I go? I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. White: We will miss the hon. member. I was counting on him to really make an input into this debate.

The first story was told by Ivan Illich and I have had occasion to use it before. In France, they had kept records of reading of attainment at a certain level of the school system since Napoleonic days. Seven or eight years ago, Ivan Illich did some research which indicated to him that the level of attainment had gone up over a period of time, as more resources were expended on this particular subject. He said to the French educational authorities then that if they continued to put resources into the reading programme, attainment would not increase further, but rather would go down. According to the story as told to me, the authorities said: "Oh, you must be out of your mind. It cannot happen." He was back in France two or three years ago and they said, "Well, we put more resources into this programme and instead of getting higher levels of attainment, for the first time ever, these attainment levels dropped off."

I think we observe this, if you do not mind my using a homey analogy occasionally, in our own daily activities and I think we see if resources are too freely available to us, that the expenditures become less wise and the tenor of the operation drops off.

Another story is rather revealing, I think, and may be of interest to some members opposite.

Mr. Nixon: Is that a homely example?

Hon. Mr. White: I will elaborate on that later in private, yes.

Mr. Pitman: Do you agree with his education philosophy?

Hon. Mr. White: Well I certainly agree with some of it to a point, yes. I certainly agree with some of it to a point, and I am hoping that we can develop that more fully.

Mr. Pitman: I am pleased to hear that. He wants to pull down all the schools.

Hon. Mr. White: That is why I said to a point.

Mr. Pitman: You did not go very far wrong. I was afraid of that.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I have been talking along these lines for the last 10 weeks and I have not heard a lot from you on the subject.

Mr. Pitman: I will be glad to send you my speeches and articles.

Hon. Mr. White: Well at any rate the other story I think is interesting.

Mr. Nixon: More scholars for the dollars.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Are you not ashamed of that? That kind of a slogan?

Hon. Mr. White: That is the inference one can take nonetheless.

The other illustration is very interesting, at least to me. It has to do with a story told to me by Mrs. Jane Jacobs, whose son is taking graduate studies in the physics department at the University of Toronto. A major project has to do with the effect of low temperature, high volume environment on crystallization. For this purpose they have been using metals, not because they study metals but because they study crystallization and certain metals give them the crystals they are seeking.

The head of the project, being a far-sighted man, recognized sometime in February or March that there might be some further constraints placed on resources for universities, so he telephoned the head of the department of metallurgy—according to the story, as told to me by Mrs. Jacobs—and said, "Would the department of metallurgy be interested in some of the work we are doing with metals in this particular project?" The answer was, "We certainly would. We would like very much to work with you."

And so one can anticipate the two departments working together now for the first time, decreasing the financial costs and increasing the quality of output. At any rate, this will no doubt be a continuing thing which we can debate during the course of these estimates. And now, Mr. Chairman, I stand ready to defend the estimates to be presented here, and I invite the comments of those hon. members who are interested in the affairs of this department.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): I suppose it is not quite 6 of the clock. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a bit longer than the minister took.

Mr. Gaunt: Give us a few homely stories.

Mr. Lawlor: He took a short time because he has a lot to defend.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off dealing with costs as well, then move into a very specific issue at some length. I think we have to realize we are talking about a lot of money—hundreds of millions of dollars—and I would like to state the steps I think this government should take very soon to ensure that what happens in our universities uses the taypayers dollars in the best way.

I just cannot bring myself to say that phrase of the ministers. It has a ring of something about it. It sort of ties in, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to do the minister an injustice here but I see a distinct Tory philosophy emerging as we approach the election. One listens to the new Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) lacing into the 16- and 17-year-old young people in this province, labelling them and sort of trying to stimulate animosity toward them.

One listens to the new minister of housing, and one realizes that he too is moving in against those who dissent in our society in a non-violent way implying that there is violence involved as he did today—totally irresponsible. Now we have the new Minister of University Affairs who may be just a Conservative as opposed to that type of Tory I thought went out back in 1890, but who thinks up phrases like "more scholars for the dollar."

It is an anti-intellectual position that is emerging, a position that is saying, these type of people really have too much to say in our society, let us just put them down a little bit and let us fan up public opinion. I am very worried about this. As the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) has just said, I am probably worried about the attack on me too to some extent. I hasten to point out I have not taught at university for a couple of years. As a matter of fact, I do not know of a university that would hire me now!

Let me move into the area of cost. I would say to the minister simply this, in the way of my conclusions, as opposed to the details of the research I have done in the past. This organization, called the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, in our opinion in this party, has not, since it was established over eight years ago, created a centralized decision-making body to plan for the full use of the millions of dollars of educational television facilities equipment and its high cost and specialized manpower. Here is an area of duplication and waste that has been quite extensively documented over the last two years and yet th Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario has still failed to come to grips with that type of cost-saving efficiency.

For example, is the University of Windsor going to be allowed to establish yet another ETV production facility with the taxpayers' money, while there has yet to be published a report on why ETV teaching at Scarborough College is still unsuccessful and the expensive equipment so underused.

The university presidents cannot even agree to create their own television council, which can do anything more than "on request, advise and assist." Public funds are being wasted in duplication, inefficiency and underutilization and nobody, not this minister and not his advisory committee under Dr. Wright, is subjecting this to systematic scrutiny. That is point number one.

Mr. Chairman, a wider point of duplication of ETV facilities is among the community colleges, the universities and the secondary schools, and local private television facilities. It is a much greater problem that has not been met by this government.

We all know the example at the Lakehead where we have Hammarskjold High School with its own television production facilities. Just down the street at Confederation College of Applied Arts and Technology there is yet another ETV production facility and over at Lakehead University yet another ETV production facility. The capital equipment alone in these three institutions under the two ministers responsible for education in this province is well over $1.5 million. Yet there is no rationalization. There has not been presented an effective evaluation of the extent to which those production facilities in those educational institutions can be integrated and planned for maximum use.

Furthermore, the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario has not yet, eight years later, evolved central review and control procedures in the highly competitive and costly field of library acquisitions. The centralized indexing that the Committee of Presidents has evolved is no substitute, absolutely no substitute, for co-ordination and co-operation in acquisitions. The by-product issue, if you like, Mr. Chairman, is the practice of the university libraries in Ontario of hiring US jobbers to buy their books thereby

buying around publishing houses located in the Province of Ontario and reducing their profits and ability to generate Canadian material even more. That is a very important point, Mr. Chairman, and I think that anyone who says the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario have made a significant move into rationalizing this area is really full of baloney. There is no way that the Committee of Presidents can even enforce such co-operative procedures. It is up to the government to provide that enforcement.

A third point, Mr. Chairman, is that the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario has failed, in conjunction with The Department of University Affairs, to plan the rational expansion of graduate programmes among the 14 provincially assisted universities. It is appalling that from the spring of 1967 to the autumn of 1969 over 50 new Phd and MA graduate programmes were approved by the Committee of Presidents' council on graduate studies.

It is appalling because the graduate council of the Committee of Presidents is, by its own admission, "devoid of any planning function" concerning co-operation on the best possible use of limited resources to provide the physical requirements for graduate work and research buildings, laboratory equipment, library material and so forth.

The council appraisal of academic standards of proposed graduate degree programmes is not, and cannot be, a substitute for planning—the harmonization of the ambitions of the 14 individualistic universities. Nor is the Committee of Presidents new subcommittee on what they call "discipline assessment" much more than a gesture since "each interested university would be competent to determine its own course of action." No effective self-imposed enforcement of collective decisions is even envisaged in the proposal of the Committee of Presidents.

Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, the public has no idea of the extent of the wastage of funds at this level of education by unnecessary duplication by expensive, often parochial, competition for prestige graduate programmes. I include, by the way, the professional fields as well, such as law.

Mr. Chairman, it being 6 of the clock, I do—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if this is a convenient place to break.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

Rideau regional hospital policies dealing with patients placed in employment, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 1911

Spadina Expressway appeal from Municipal Board ruling, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Nixon 1911

Decision re location of old fort in Thunder Bay, questions to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Good 1912

Decision on Pêche Island acquisition, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peacock 1913

Application approval from Blue Mountain Air Park on escarpment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis 1913

Telegram stating Ford relocating portion of Windsor engine plant in Cleveland, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Lewis 1913

Stopping purchases of OHC units beginning January 1, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 1914

Land purchase from Marentette Brothers for E. C. Rowe expressway in Windsor, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Ruston 1914

Application for loan at end of March by Lake Erie commercial fishermen, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Spence 1914

Amending Canada Assistance Plan to allow municipalities more discretion, question to Mr. Wells, Mrs. M. Renwick 1915

Cutting off welfare assistance to 16- and 17-year-olds and to draft dodgers, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid 1915

Proportion of $2.2 billion borrowed by Ottawa being used to refund issues, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Deacon 1917

Abuses in sale of fireworks being health hazard to small children, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Deans 1917

Programme with medical officers of health to reduce VD, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Deans 1917

Use of temporary help industry to avoid welfare benefits accruing to employers, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Bullbrook 1918

Grant to Sudbury Boys' Home, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Martel 1919

Elderly persons' tax assistance programme, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Good 1919

Application approval from Blue Mountain Air Park on escarpment, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Lewis 1919

Operating tourist reception centre in Windsor on year-round basis, questions to Mr. Guindon, Mr. B. Newman 1919

Considering increase of Ontario minimum wage, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Gisborn 1920

Rental arrears in Ontario Housing Corporation, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid 1920

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, concluded 1923

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White 1953

Recess, 6 o'clock p.m. 1956

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 47

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock the member for Scarborough East had the floor. The hon. member may continue.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I was commenting on the efficiency of the expenditure of public funds in the universities in Ontario and I was stating that there are a couple of things the government can do to improve the efficiency of the expenditure of those funds.

The first point I made was that the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario in the last eight years had really not been able to achieve a degree of co-ordination of decision-making in the allocation of resources that is necessary, and I noted that the Committee of Presidents had been totally unable to plan the rational use of educational television facilities and programmes in this province.

Secondly, the Committee of Presidents had not evolved a central review and control procedure in the highly competitive and costly field of library acquisitions. Thirdly, I noted that the Committee of Presidents had failed, in conjuction with The Department of University Affairs, and its advisory committee under Dr. Wright, to plan the rational expansion of graduate programmes among the 14 universities which are provincially assisted.

The next point I would like to make is that the formula financing in the area of operating costs with regard to the universities has been an important cause of the competitive and unco-ordinated expansion of graduate degree programmes in the province. As you well know, sir, formula financing was one of the so-called innovations that was brought in by the former Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) under the guise of having some rational way of allocating funds among universities in the province.

Now because each university receives four to six times more government money for each student in graduate studies than for each undergraduate student, and because each university is completely free to spend the total funds it receives from the government in any way the university chooses, there is a powerful financial incentive to each individual university to create graduate programmes and to compete senselessly for graduate students. For some universities, the expansion of graduate programmes was a condition of financial survival, the government grants for some graduate students being used to subsidize projects, academic or otherwise.

In short, we believe in this party that there is a strong case to be made that the financial incentive effects of forms of financing have not only seriously distorted a reasonable balance between undergraduate and graduate programmes but has stimulated intense and sometimes bitter competition among the universities at a time when co-ordination and co-operation are required to ensure the best use of hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds. Again, we believe that until standardized university financial records are made available to the public, we simply do not know what proportion of the expenditures of the universities is spent on graduate programmes, thus making a penetrating cost-benefit analysis of such expenditures somewhat difficult.

I add for the minister's benefit, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary to allocate the overhead among the various programmes so that we can arrive at the real cost of the programme.

One area where this has been done quite effectively, I understand, is at the University of Toronto in the medical school. There was a serious attempt there to realistically allocate the overhead costs to the medical programme to determine the real costs of that programme.

The next point I would make is that because of these arguments I have made—and especially the ones relating to graduate programmes—we in this party propose, and have proposed in the past, the establishment of a single planning unit for post-graduate degree education in Ontario. We believe that this planning unit should have legal power to

enforce its planning decisions in this high-cost area of education among the 14 provincially assisted universities. Budget control would be centralized and funds would be distributed not by some weird ad hoc formula with undesirable and costly incentive effects but according to an explicit programme of co-ordinated expansion.

I can see this body actually phasing out some particular graduate programmes on particular university campuses after rational assessment of the needs of the province and Canada had been made for the 1970s and 1980s. In short, the 14 universities of the province would give up their individualistic decision-making power over the expansion and direction of graduate programmes to a collective body in which they, the universities, would have a slight majority of members. Such a policy, we believe, would save a great deal of money in the years to come.

Those are the proposals that we have made in the past to achieve a more rational use of funds without infringing upon what we believe to be the necessary autonomy of the universities.

I would like now, sir, to turn to a major theme and dwell on it at some length. This has to do with the de-Canadianization of higher education in the province.

We believe that there is an intricate relationship between the issue of the de-Canadianization of our universities and the phrenetic and costly expansion of graduate programmes in the last seven years. I suppose the single point that I would like to leave in the mind of the minister and the government and the members in the House, Mr. Chairman, is this question: Is there really any sense in spending about $400 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money in this province on our universities each year if, in doing so, a significant proportion of those funds is being used to swamp the teaching of a legitimate school of Canadian thought in philosophy, economics and social science, as examples?

What is particularly enlightened or internationalist about merrily importing American professors, using American textbooks and American course materials and examples in certain departments in certain faculties in specific universities in this province?

While the minister can state that he has a concern about the taxpayers' money in the province, we believe that the fundamental question of the purpose of higher education in terms of the Canadian context must be examined first and foremost, and the remarks I would like to make from now on, sir, have to do with that very question, and a particular aspect of that question.

Is it really worthwhile spending all this money if one-half of the PhD candidates in Canada, and in this province, are non-Canadian? Is it really worthwhile spending all that money? Is it really worthwhile spending all that money, when between September, 1969, and September, 1970, when 1,400 new appointments were made at the 14 provincially assisted universities, less than half were jobs that went to Canadians? Is it really worthwhile spending all this money to generate jobs at this level for non-Canadians? Is it really worthwhile spending all this money on expensive graduate programmes when only half the students in them are Canadian? Surely something is out of balance.

Is it really worthwhile spending all this money on Laurentian University when fewer than half the teaching staff are Canadian? Is it really worthwhile spending all this money on York University when half the teaching faculty are Canadian? Is it really worthwhile spending all this money on McMaster University when only half the teaching staff are Canadian?

Is it really worthwhile spending all this money, Mr. Chairman, when 40 per cent only of the teaching staff in the humanities are Canadian citizens? What are we educating for if we are not educating in terms of the Canadian context?

Mr. Chairman, I have made many remarks and comments on this issue of the de-Canadianization of our universities in this province and I would simply put on record at this time the references in Hansard from the past few years. You will find extensive remarks for 1969—the date, November 25; Hansard number 226; pages 8867, 8868, 8880 to 8882. For 1970, on June 10, in Hansard number 97, you will find extensive remarks on this issue, pages 3850 to 3852.

What I would like to do this evening, Mr. Chairman while I have the floor, is to put on record a number of specific examples of specific departments in certain universities in this province where it is very clear what is meant by the de-Canadianization of those departments.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Does the member represent some special pressure group in the educational system of Ontario known as the Canadian University Teachers? Is that

his position? Or does he represent a segment of the population of Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Scarborough East is making his speech.

Mr. T. Reid: I excuse the hon. member for Riverdale, Mr. Chairman. He will not be around after the next election.

The point I want to make is this, sir, that last year in this House speakers from both the NDP and from this party made it quite clear that what we need is information on the citizenship of teachers by department in specific universities. What is necessary to have are those specific statistics, without giving the names of the faculty members involved. It is virtually useless to simply have overall statistics by departments.

What I want to do tonight, sir, is to drive home, if you like, a single point: that this minister must require the universities of this province to give to the public through him and through this place the citizenship breakdown by department in each university. The only exceptions to that, as I can see it, are those departments where there are fewer than five teaching members, where one can identify very closely the names of the individuals involved. And I want to make my case in great detail tonight.

The first case—I will switch them around to the interest of the hon. member for Riverdale—has to do with a university called York University in which I hold a position of assistant professor of economics on a full-time leave of absence. And the case study there is as follows: At York University the average for the university is that less than 50 per cent of the staff in 1969-1970 were Canadian citizens. Another interesting point about the university is that for new appointments last year Canadians comprised only 42.8 per cent.

The point to be made there is that during the year when this was discussed as a serious public issue in this province, York University hired even more non-Canadians than the average for the university at that time. In other words, instead of doing something to rectify the situation at York, the university in effect made the situation even worse.

I would like to deal with a specific department so I can let the minister know what is involved when there has been a non-Canadian takeover of a specific department. The department at York University which I want to discuss is the department of sociology and anthropology. Today this department is 18 per cent Canadian, 47 per cent American. That is to say,. 16 professors are American citizens, six are Canadian citizens, there are seven UK citizens and five citizens from other countries. In short,, there are 34 members on staff in that particular department and only six are Canadian citizens.

I should add that these figures are obtained internally at York and not from any action from the minister's predecessor, who refused to get this type of statistic from the universities.

What are the consequences of this de-Canadianization policy in this particular department, where only six of 34 full-time members of the staff are Canadians? Well, here is the case history for this year, and I would like to be very specific and deal with a specific course in that specific department at that specific university. It is social-sociology 343A, entitled "Race and Ethnic Relations."

I would like to read excerpts, Mr. Chairman, from the content and purpose of this course. In this the contents were described by the teacher of that course. This is what it says the course is about and I quote directly:

> This course will stress two major questions: What kinds of factors make some race and ethnic relations positive while others are much more negative? What are the effects of partial ethnic prejudice on both the dominant and the minority groups? What are the causes of negative attitudes in both groups?

The outline continues:

> In exploring these questions most of the first semester will be focused on a study of extensive current literature and events regarding the American Negro. As the course develops some attention will be given to a wide variety of other ethnic and racial groups: French Canadians, Indians, Indians in Canada and the US and Jews as a minority group in various cultures, among others.

The outline continues:

> First semester readings are heavy in quantity but light and interesting in quality. All focus on the Negro-white situation in the USA. Many are autobiographical and most deal in a personal way with the situation.

The course outline continues:

> The basic purpose of the course plan is to give students a sense of involvement, a personal feeling and concern about at least

> one racial problem. Consequently, the whole thrust of the first semester is to give this personal depth feeling for one racial problem, that of the American Negro and white. The second semester we will deal with other ethnic and racial problems.

Then the outline goes on, Mr. Chairman—in concluding this—to note that "the library will not have adequate material on some of the more obscure groups" mentioned in the second part of the course outline, such as French-Canadians in Quebec, and so forth.

It concludes that papers will be due the second semester. Basically, you are expected to follow a brief description of what your minority group is, with a paper comparing them to the American Negro as a minority.

What happens, Mr. Chairman, is that some of the students were wondering about this course and what its purpose was to them as Canadians and one student wrote this in the student newspaper:

> The time has come for Canadian students to reject the old standby reasons for not dealing critically with Canadian problems, that there is not enough Canadian material yet.

The student continues:

> There is plenty of written material on Quebec to be had as well as first-hand accounts from those who live there.

The student continues:

> Why is not the York sociology department digging this material up? Where are the courses on Quebec, the Canadian Indian, the Italian immigrant? We are being asked—

continued the student:

> —to tolerate a situation where such courses are absent while at the same time courses are being offered on the United States, not to mention Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Middle East. The time is long overdue for the sociology department to examine its warped sense of priorities.
>
> The students last year made it clear they wanted to talk about Canadian problems and they wanted to hear first-hand from those people who know most about those problems and are actively combating them: Michel Chartrand in Quebec, the Just Society movement in Toronto, and the various Indian federations from coast to coast. Yet little has been done. How many more times do we have to ask?

There is the course outline, Mr. Chairman, and there is the response of some students to it.

And this provoked a very wide-ranging debate at York University. One student sat down and analysed the course outline that was given to the class and, in the analysis of the course outline, the student made it very clear that, in his opinion, this course, and other courses on race and ethnic relations, are being taught at this university in this particular department the same way they are taught in the United States, with the American situation being used as a standard by which we judge other racial problems. In the course outlined it was clear the students taking that course were not to look at Canadian problems without using the US model as the guiding light.

In their second-term papers they had to take a Canadian minority group and compare it to that American example. The student added—and I quote directly, Mr. Chairman:

> One would think a course on race and ethnic relations taught in Canada would have as its primary, albeit not exclusive, objective the increasing of student awareness about problems in Canadian society.

The student adds:

> How fitting, in the midst of increased turmoil in Quebec and continuing misery on the part of the Canadian Indians, Eskimos and Métis, Canadians are instructed to develop a sense of involvement, "a personal feeling and concern"—to quote the course outline—"about a US problem."

Mr. Chairman, the point there is that these students were saying they wanted to study sociology, they wanted to study the question of race and ethnic relations, but they saw no reason why they could not study that sociological theory with a Canadian perspective. And they noted, very clearly, that they rejected the reply by the particular faculty member involved that, if they did not like that course why did they not take some other course, by noting that there were no other courses available to them on a full-year basis.

They noted that the instructor for this particular course said, "Well, if you do not like this course why not take sociology 343B?" The student notes that that alternative has only one Canadian book on its required reading list of a total of six books.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the point is that in that de-Canadianized department of sociology

and anthropology last year, students who were interested in the discipline of sociology could not study theory using Canadian examples or Canadian case histories. They were forced, if they wanted to take sociology, to study the whole question, in this particular area of race and ethnic relations, in terms of the American model.

Now I think it is important that one puts the dilemma that these students at York University went through this year in this way, and they put it in their own words, Mr. Chairman, and they have done it in sort of a Feiffer cartoon which they carried in their student newspaper Excalibur. They have a student talking to the faculty member involved, and this is the dialogue, and it points out the crisis we are in in very many departments across this province. Here is the student asking the professor this question: "Why does the sociology department have the lowest percentage of Canadians—17.6 per cent—and the highest percentage of Americans—47.1 per cent—of any department in the university?" And the professor replies: "The reason we have so many American professors is because there are not enough qualified Canadians." The student asks: "Why are there not enough qualified Canadians?" And the professor replies: "Well, very few undergraduates are enrolling in the four-year honours programme in sociology." The student says: "Why are not more Canadians enrolling in the four-year programme?" The professor replies: "Because much of the content in our department is not oriented toward Canada, and students do not find it relevant." "Why are courses not oriented toward Canada?" "Because we have so many American professors and so few Canadians." "Why are there so few Canadians?" "Well, very few undergraduates are enrolling . . ." and so on.

And that is the type of thing that is happening, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): It is fallacious reasoning as a starter.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): You cannot spoil that when it is in comic form.

Mr. T. Reid: That is the type of thing, Mr. Chairman, that is happening in department after department.

Hon. Mr. White: You think that is a logical presentation even in a comic strip? I am astounded.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the minister will have plenty of time to reply after I get through about five more of these.

Mr. Randall: Holy mackerel.

Mr P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Why do you not do it in the corridor?

Mr. T. Reid: Because I am a Canadian and I am speaking in this place.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. T. Reid: That is what was happening in that department.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why does the official opposition make it so easy for you?

Mr. T. Reid: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the Canadian professors in that department decided that there ought to be a full-year course on Canadian race and ethnic problems, and that professor proposed that there be such a course taught at York University.

So that teacher put forward a proposal, and what happened? The anthropology section of that department rejected the request to teach a full-year course on contemporary Canadian Indian problems. They said, you know, just teach half a year, do not teach the whole-year course. And one of the main reasons the department gave for not allowing—this was on February 11, Mr. Chairman—a full-year course to be taught on the Canadian Indian is that other Canadian universities have such programmes so there is no real need to develop one at York. And of course when you go to other universities they say some other universities teach these courses so they do not need to have one there.

The proposal for that course was rejected on February 11 at the anthropological level in the department. It then went up to the full department level and again it was rejected. Finally the student body up there decided that that particular professor deserved some support and made it very clear that they would be involved in such activities as boycotting classes and really criticizing the department unless it was possible for that course on Indian relations in Canada to be taught.

Mr. Chairman, what happened was that eventually after about four or five appeals during which that particular professor, who happens to be a Canadian citizen, was subjected to very difficult problems in that department decided that yes, indeed, because there were so many students who wanted to take that particular course, they would allow that professor to teach it.

The point I am making in that case study or profile, Mr. Chairman, is simply that this

type of thing is happening in our universities, this type of fight for Canadian content in the curriculum is happening. In departments where there are so few Canadians, there is often no voice to make proposals for Canadian content courses or courses which are indeed theoretical, but which could use Canadian examples to a very great extent. The type of situation in that department is one in which the position of the Canadian who is making the proposal is very difficult and often very, very unpleasant. That is happening, and I suggest it is happening, sir, because only six teachers out of those 34 teachers are Canadian citizens. It is the lack of a Canadian presence in that particular department when Canadian students in that particular case at York are not able to study sociology with a degree of Canadian content.

The next area I would like to turn to—a specific example—Mr. Chairman, is the faculty of law at the University of Windsor. Again, this is a very specific case profile, if you like, of what happens when decision-making in a particular department or faculty is controlled by non-Canadians.

Hon. E. Dunlop (Minister without Portfolio): Discuss it with MacGuigan.

Mr. T. Reid: Just wait until I finish with this and then say that.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: Oh, I cannot bear it.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): Getting wiser, if you did not wait.

Mr. T. Reid: You know it is going to be a long evening—

Hon. Mr. White: It cannot be any longer than it is.

Mr. J. Renwick: It certainly started out that way.

Mr. T. Reid: —because there is going to be one real point made—

Mr. J. Renwick: Any possibility of having the committee rise and report?

Mr. T. Reid: —and that is, that until this Minister of University Affairs, under the former Minister of University Affairs, decides to get detailed, factual information concerning the de-Canadianization by department—

Mr. J. Renwick: From what law school?

Mr. T. Reid: —no one in the province can take him seriously, when he protests that he intends to do something about this issue. Let us look at that law school. I have prepared some remarks here quite carefully, I can assure the House. In my opinion, the domination of a Canadian university law school by non-Canadians from a single foreign country is at least as serious as the foreign domination of a political science department or a sociology department, such as the one at York.

Other people believe it more serious. For example, a professor of law wrote to me a few days ago to say, "A law school is the most easily damaged and the most sensitive educational institution in Ontario in relation to de-Canadianization." Here, Mr. Chairman, are the relevant facts concerning the domination of the faculty of law at the University of Windsor by professors who are citizens of the United States.

Fact number one, excluding the dean, five members of the law faculty have tenure. This means they have received special appointments by the university to the "cabinet" of the law school. They are the top management—

Mr. J. Renwick: Oh, come, come. That is not the meaning of tenure and the member knows it.

Mr. T. Reid: They are the top management decision-making group. However, unlike a business firm, they are secure in their positions. They cannot be fired.

Mr. J. Renwick: The member is attacking a system of tenure now in the universities.

Mr. T. Reid: Second, four of these five tenured law professors are citizens of the United States.

Third fact, three of these four tenured American professors, including the assistant dean, live in the United States and commute across the US-Canadian border.

Mr. J. Renwick: How many came from south of the Mason-Dixon line?

Mr. T. Reid: Fourth, there are four American citizens on the staff of the law school; all four of them have tenures.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Pretty funny how the cabinet—

Mr. Randall: Hate those Americans.

Mr. J. Renwick: How many are Republicans and how many are Democrats.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not commute, Stan?

Mr. Yakabuski: Stan has been awful good to you.

Mr. T. Reid: Fact number five, Mr. Chairman. The fifth fact is the law school has three places on the senate of the university, the small academic governing body of the university. The dean is an ex-officio member. Those remaining two senate positions available to a law school are occupied by Americans. One of the American law professors on the senate is chairman of the senate nominating committee, a committee which on May 11, 1971, nominated the other American law professor on the senate to the senate committee on integrated studies.

Fact number six. The chairman of admissions of students to the law school is an American. He is also one of the law school's representatives on the university senate.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, pretty soon he will admit only Americans.

Mr. T. Reid: A candidate for admission to the first year of the course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Laws is "required to take the law school admission test which is prepared and administered under the supervision of the Educational Testing Service," to quote the law school's calendar for 1970-1971. The calendar, Mr. Chairman, however, does not note that the Educational Testing Service is an American corporation located in Princeton, New Jersey. The calendar states that this specific test "is required for admission to most law schools in the United States and Canada, including the University of Windsor."

Fact number seven, Mr. Chairman. A third American law professor is the law librarian. In December, 1970, the law students had this to say in their student newspaper, The Oyez, about the law library material and I quote:

> Our library stock is a fine array of material. Unfortunately, the emphasis is misplaced. An over-abundance of dust-gathering American primary material is of little value to undergraduate Canadian law students. It is time-consuming and annoying enough to search without avail for a Dominion Law Report but to know that thousands of US Law Reports have been purchased to the neglect of providing an adequate number of copies of English and Canadian material is properly infuriating.

It might also be noted that at the May 10, 1971, meeting of the board of governors of the University of Windsor, it is noted in the minutes that: "Following the presentation of the provincial budget to the Legislature, the Minister of University Affairs has sent specific confirmation for the following points."

One of those points, Mr. Chairman, is this:

> Provision of another special initiating grant of $100,000 for the faculty of law, requested particularly on behalf of the law library, was approved with a notation that this was the concluding such grant.

I think it is fair, Mr. Chairman, to ask whether that special appropriation approved by the Minister of University Affairs of an additional $100,000 for the law library at the University of Windsor is to be used to collect yet more American material or whether it is going to be used to collect Canadian material?

Mr. J. Renwick: The government could not possibly spend it on Canadian material. There is not that much around.

Mr. T. Reid: For making such statements and for arriving at the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that there is American domination of Windsor University's law faculty, the present dean of the law faculty, without disputing the factual statements which I have made in public, is quoted in the Windsor Star, on May 18, 1971, as saying the following:

> I think that Tim Reid is an unscrupulous demagogue who is prepared to use facts unscrupulously in the same fashion that Hitler did. I think it is racist and certainly is the worst type of chauvinism, which I thought we have overcome since World War II.

Mr. J. Renwick: The member is unscrupulous. I would never call him a demagogue. He cannot arouse me.

Mr. T. Reid: The dean's remarks led the Windsor Star to state in an editorial on May 19 that: "The dressing-down Mr. Reid received from the dean is well deserved."

Mr. Chairman, I submit this to you, to the minister, and to the members of this House. The dispute that I have with the dean and the Windsor Star's editorial writer really rests on the following question: What is meant by "domination"? The verb, "to dominate," Mr. Chairman, means, and I quote: "To exert the supreme determining or guiding influence on," or "to occupy a more elevated and superior position."

Hon. Mr. White: I observe the member is not dominating his party.

Mr. T. Reid: In my opinion, I have listed the necessary and sufficient facts concerning such domination of the law school at the University of Windsor. All four Americans on the staff of the law school occupy the elevated and superior position of tenured professors. Two occupy seats in the senate and another is the law librarian. The chairman of admissions for students is an American. Against this is one tenured Canadian, plus the dean, who apparently sees nothing wrong with such domination.

That is the cabinet of the law school, Mr. Chairman. Four American citizens, three of whom live in the United States, and two Canadian citizens. These are the senior people, those who occupy the elevated and superior position from which they exert the supreme determining or guiding influence of what happens in the law school.

When somebody asks who runs the Ontario government today, the reply, in the textbook sense, is the cabinet. We do not reply, "All the 69 members of the Tory caucus," because what is meant when we are asked who runs things is the decision-makers.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. T. Reid: The people who chair cabinet committees—

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. T. Reid: —not the people who chair standing committees of the Legislature. That is what is meant by domination.

The dean of the Windsor law school can appoint 50 Canadian citizens as non-tenured special part-time lecturers and non-tenured full-time assistant professors. But unless he also changes or enlarges his cabinet, the basic decision-making domination will not have changed, because the top level, as in any foreign subsidiary or branch plant in Canada, will remain dominated by non-Canadians. I rest my case on that analogy.

I conclude by stating simply that I find it strange, after making these facts public, that I get called a racist, a demagogue and a latter-day Hitler by a dean of a law school located in Canada.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He does not know any better.

Mr. T. Reid: I want to make it clear that the dean of the law school at Windsor has it within his power to take positive steps to alleviate the present situation. He does not have to ask the tenured US professors to leave the teaching staff. He does not have to demote them. He does not have to ask them to give up their tenured positions.

Instead, he could do two things in a positive way. First, he could encourage the rotation of the two university senate seats and encourage the rotation of other senior decision-making positions in the law school among the other members of the teaching staff of the law school even if they are not full professors. Second, over the next two years he could appoint at least four Canadians as full professors with tenure, either from among his existing staff or by new appointments. That is the second example of why it is important to know the facts about citizenship and curriculum and control of decision-making departments, not simply by university or by conglomerates of departments in this province.

Mr. Chairman, the third example has to do with the teaching of English literature at our universities. I will just give the minister the following facts. The examples are from a number of universities. The first example is again from the University of Windsor, interestingly enough.

There is a magazine at the University of Windsor called the University of Windsor Review. It is a literary magazine. The editor is an American citizen. A study of last year's publication of the University of Windsor Review reveals Canadians very sparsely represented as contributors. It reveals, moreover, that about 70 per cent of the contributors are US citizens. There you have the literary magazine of the English department dominated by American contributors.

Another example is at the University of Toronto in the graduate department of English, which is the largest graduate training department in Canada. For the year 1970-1971, the current year, it offers graduate students a choice from 106 courses, Mr. Chairman. Only one of the 106 courses is concerned with Canadian literature. A Canadian wishing to prepare himself with a graduate degree for high school, community college or university teaching in Canada with a specialty in Canadian literature from the University of Toronto, cannot do it.

Moreover, the University of Toronto graduate English department accepts a high proportion of non-Canadian graduate students at a time when 14 of the 20 largest English

departments in Canada are estimated to have 50 per cent or less of their staffs Canadian. The University of Toronto graduate department of English offers nine courses specifically stated as concerned with US literature and about six others with US content, and only one having to do with Canadian literature.

Robin Matthews noted in an article concerning the situation:

> A department of the size and importance of the University of Toronto graduate department of English should offer 12 courses in Canadian literature if it wishes fairly but modestly to represent knowledge and a search for truth as manifested by the Canadian literary imagination in Canadian history.

What are the facts? The largest department at the graduate level in the area of English literature has only one course having to do with Canadian literature.

We have covered an example from the University of Windsor in the area of English literature; we have covered the graduate department of English at the University of Toronto. Let us take a look at Waterloo. Let us look at its English department.

At the University of Waterloo, Mr. Chairman; in the English department, at the undergraduate level, there are nine courses to do with the literature of the United States of America.

Many other literature courses contain heavy representation of US literature. Only two Canadian literature courses are listed. Why is this important? Why have I picked upon the area of English literature and chosen those three examples?

Mr. Chairman, I can find no better spokesman on this, with a lot more credibility than I have on this issue, than Earle Birney. It was in an article, interestingly enough, in the Toronto Telegram for today, and I am sure the minister has read it.

Just let me put these very brief quotations into the record of this House as to what is happening in the area of English literature and Canadian literature in our universities as seen by Earle Birney, one of our foremost poets.

He says this—and I will try not to editorialize on what he says. He gave a speech and this is from the Toronto Telegram, an article by Dennis Eisenberg entitled, "American Invasion may crush Canadian Art and Culture," Dennis Eisenberg states this—it is about a speech that Earle Birney made in the United Kingdom and I quote directly:

> The voice of Canadian art and culture is in danger of being crushed by an American invasion, warns the "grand old man" of Canadian letters, Earle Birney. Students from the United States are growing in numbers and influence in Canadian universities and in many departments of English studies. Americans particularly are now in the dominating majority.
>
> As a result there is a growing tendency to concentrate on the works of American poets and writers and Canadian effort is being neglected or overlooked . . .
>
> The crushing of a Canadian voice in literature is a pity because I believe in the value of maintaining the cultural voices of small countres. It adds to the richness of all literature—

And Birney continues:

> Perhaps the economic takeover of our country is irreversible, but there is no need to believe that we must all become American in thought as well. The Americans moving into our universities tend to put down Canadian culture. Their arrival in our country is almost a kiss of death for a true Canadian voice in literature . . .

Continues Eisenberg, summarizing Birney's speech:

> As a result of being frozen out of their own country, many Canadian writers come to Europe to form a sort of expatriate school.

And in concluding the quotation from the article, Mr. Chairman, Eisenberg said that Birney blamed the way many universities in Canada failed to encourage native-born students to develop this full literary talent.

I suggest, sir, that without the opportunity to study our own literature in our universities, particularly at post-graduate level, we shall not exist as a culture, let alone as a nation.

The final example concerning the area of literature at our universities in Ontario is from York University, unfortunately, and it is a letter of resignation by Gwen Matheson, a lecturer in English at Atkinson College of York University.

I would like to quote some very short but succinct paragraphs from Gwen Matheson's letter of resignation from York University and her remarks have to do with the teaching of literature at York in Atkinson College.

She says:

> This is my resignation from the American studies course at Atkinson College in which I was to have been a tutorial leader under an American director during the coming term. Up until the completion of last spring of a three-year period, during which I am both a part-time lecturer in the York English department, and a part-time instructor in the York humanities department in Atkinson College, I have never complained about the courses to which I was assigned, including those in American studies and those which included American material.

Then she lists a number of reasons on why she resigned. She says this:

> I wish to protest against the overemphasis on American studies of all kinds, as well as American attitudes and methods, at York University and throughout Canada, while Canadian studies and interests are still, relatively speaking, in a state of gross neglect. Therefore—

Continues Gwen Matheson—

> I do not want to take any further part in what I regard as a kind of brainwashing, the effects of which I have had the misfortune to observe in my students during three years in the York humanities and English departments.
>
> I believe that it is more important for Canadian students to learn about ideas and writings of those who are making history and producing both literary and critical works in our own country, than to concentrate the greater part of their attention on the intellectual climate and problems of the USA—

She notes in a positive way:

> Perhaps it is sometimes even more valuable for Canadians to view American problems from a Canadian point of reference, rather than strictly according to American interpretation. Ultimately a truly international world perspective must supersede our national one, but the immediate concern of Canada is its survival as a separate entity from the USA.

That was her first point in resigning. Her second point in resigning is this.

> I wish to protest against the fact that an excessive number of Americans and other non-Canadian academics are in positive positions of authority—such as those of course director, department head, and administrator—when there is an increasing number of Canadians of equal qualifications, and often better qualifications with regard to knowledge of the Canadian environment, who are at present either in part-time or junior positions—

—the point which I have made about the law faculty at Windsor. She says:

> I am only pointing out the grim facts that the proliferation of American courses at the expense of Canadian courses, coupled with American authority in our academic life, could lead to a further influx in the US to the neglect of Canadian training and talent.

The point there, Mr. Chairman, is an essential one, As I noted before, there was a higher proportion of non-Canadians hired at York University last year than the average for the university as a whole.

In other words, what Gwen Matheson has said seems to be coming true. When there is a domination of decision-making at the high level of decision-making within a university department, it tends to widen the sphere of influence, it tends to increase the hiring of non-Canadians. It tends indeed, sir, as I shall point out with an example from McMaster University, to result in straight discrimination against qualified Canadians who apply for the job.

Gwen Matheson makes one more point in her letter of resignation from York University, and says:

> I wish to protest against the fact that I was put into a position—

in this particular department, at this particular university—

> —where I was being forced into teaching an American course if I wanted to teach at York University at all. Last year I even submitted an outline of a course in Canadian studies, in the areas of literature that I would like to teach, including names of other York teachers who would offer their assistance in this project.

Needless to say, she was turned down flat.

One of the other remarks that she made in her letter of resignation, which I will conclude with on this particular case profile, Mr. Chairman, is this. Gwen Matheson says in her letter of resignation, protesting against the de-Canadianization of that particular department at York, she says:

> Perhaps some day if a truly adequate Canadian studies programme, with room for a variety of approaches, is developed at

> York and elsewhere, there will be a place for many Canadian academics who share my situation. Meanwhile, plans for more Canadian course content and a search for the best Canadian talent, both native and naturalized, should be priorities, and non-Canadians invited to assist.

What she means there is something very simple, Mr. Chairman. In the Province of Quebec—and the minister knows this—with the great expanse of the universities there in the 1960s, the government and the universities were faced with the identical problem that Ontario was faced with. But in Quebec, the provincial government invited many non-Canadians, non-Quebecois, to come to the universities to teach, but they made it clear that they were to come for short periods of time and their basic purpose in being there was to train Canadians to take over from them after a reasonable period of time. So what you find in Quebec today is that the non-Canadians who came, came with the clear understanding that they were welcome to come but their main job was to ensure that after a period of time, say four or five years, they would have trained and brought along Canadians who would take over the decision-making in those universities. I suggest this is what we should have done in this province.

Another case profile, again dealing with specific departments in specific universities, has to do with the department of political science at McMaster. These statistics, of course, did not come out in the material that the Minister of University Affairs last year requested from the university. He refused to ask them for statistics relating to specific departments. But that is where the problem is: averages obscure the real situation in certain departments. At the political science department at McMaster, the facts are pretty straightforward. The department has four Canadians out of 18 full-time teachers. Twelve are Americans. The chairman is an American and the chairman insists that the department does direct most of its recruiting efforts at finding almost as many Canadian applications as American ones, but he notes that generally there are not enough competent Canadians available. That is an opinion of a chairman of a department of 18 members, of which 12 are American and four Canadian.

The interesting thing is that when Howard Lentner was making these statements over CBC national news, someone called Philip Resnick spoke out and made it quite clear that the chairman of the political science department at McMaster University would not even grant him an interview to be considered for a position on the McMaster faculty. I think it is important to note that Philip Resnick is rated by his professors at the University of Toronto, where he has done his Ph.D., as an outstanding graduate student. He applied for a position in the department of political science at McMaster and was not even granted an interview and subsequently an American was hired. Let us make it clear that we are talking about a highly qualified, first rate, Canadian academic. Resnick then went on to be hired by the University of British Columbia political science department which political scientists, regardless of which university they are at in this country, consider to be one of the best political science departments in this country.

Resnick said about his experience with McMaster: "If I am good enough for UBC, there is no reason in the world why I do not even merit an interview at McMaster University."

This is the type of situation that has to be brought out to the minister to convince him that it is not enough simply to find out what the ratios are in terms of citizenship, by university or by conglomerates of departments. He must say to the universities that the public has a right to know what the situation is, department by department.

The public has a right to know when qualified Canadians are not even granted an interview when they could drive down in an hour to be interviewed, whereas an American who flies from California at the expense of the Canadian university, is granted an interview.

An hon. member: Does he subscribe to that?

Mr. T. Reid: No, I am just trying to make an impression on this minister, as I give him credit for still having an open mind.

Hon. Mr. White: I understand what you are doing. Do not worry. It is spelled c-h-e-a-p.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to quote to the minister from a very well-known conservative philosopher in Canada called George Grant. This is what George Grant says about the situation at McMaster—in fact, I understand that George Grant even said that he would resign from McMaster University unless the political science department started hiring Canadians. Remember the situation in that

department at McMaster: 18 full-time teachers, four only are Canadians and 12 are American citizens. We are talking about a balance here. We are talking about domination, and this is what George Grant says.

He says: "Americans say they are sticking out for professionalism, but they identify professionalism with the way political science is done in the United States, so it is inevitable Americans will come here." And this is the type of thing that must be understood very carefully. Let us look at another case profile. Let us look at the department of philosophy at the University of Waterloo. Here we have 20 full-time teachers; two are Canadians. One of those Canadians is Dr. Leslie Armour and he has been at the University of Waterloo since 1962; but now, Mr. Chairman, he plans to leave Canada and take a teaching position in the United States. The simple reason for him leaving the department of philosophy at the University of Waterloo, in which there are two Canadians out of a full-time teaching staff of 20, is that he finds life intolerable as one of only two Canadian professors in the philosophy department with 19 full-time faculty members, 13 of them citizens of the United States of America.

It is important to realize that Leslie Armour's qualifications are first-rate. He has tenure at that university and one of his colleagues at that university made it clear where he stood on the question of Leslie Armour in a sense being forced out, squeezed out, of the department of philosophy at the University of Waterloo. That gentleman's name is Jerry Malzan, a mathematics professor at Waterloo; he says that Dr. Armour angered his American colleagues last year when he spoke out against the Americanization of the philosophy department at a public meeting and called for a Canadian approach to teaching philosophy.

Since then, says Professor Malzan, Dr. Armour has been subjected to deliberate harassment. He is not being notified of committee meetings. He is not being notified of departmental meetings and departmental meetings have been scheduled during his seminar periods. Also, difficulties are being created for his graduate students. Professor Malzan states this and he has stated it publicly.

> It seems fairly clear to me, on the evidence, that he is being forced out and the department is only too happy to see him go because he is a thorn in their side. He is one more obstacle cleared away in their takeover of one more university department.

One reason, I think I should add, why Professor Armour has left—and I have had long conversations with him about this—very clearly is that he believes there is a school of Canadian philosophical thought. And yet, I have here in my hand a letter from the chairman of the department, dated August 7, 1969, addressed to the vice-president, academic, of the university, in which the chairman says: "Our curricula and courses almost certainly show no non-Canadian bias. There is no Canadian philosophy as such."

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a partial manuscript of Professor Armour's book concerning a Canadian school of philosophical thought. It outlines the main themes of philosophy in the Canadian context and quotes, for example, such interesting articles as one called, "Philosophy in Canada," written in 1962 by a Canadian called Irving, in which there is an analysis of the main sweep of Canadian philosophy into three movements.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be a philosopher but when a Canadian in a department of philosophy of 19 members is told by the chairman of that department that what he teaches does not exist, I cannot blame that man for leaving.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is what a philosopher would say, is it not?

Mr. T. Reid: I cannot argue on the philosophical basis with the hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the thing the member can say most about, that which does not exist.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the next profile is one of my favourites, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Here is a situation where, as we know, there are about 168 full-time teachers and 33 per cent are American citizens. Again, when we get into an analysis of decision-making and domination there, we find the following situation to exist at the Ontario institute. When we look at the curriculum department, which is responsible for deciding what is taught in Ontario schools, we find that it is headed by an American with a staff of nine Americans and six Canadians, only one of whom holds a Canadian PhD. We find that the head of the most important OISE department, research and development, who is, therefore, in a position to decide which projects get money—and that is the whole direction of the institute—we find that he is an American citizen. We

find that the number of Canadians employed at OISE has dropped alarmingly, from 80 per cent of the staff in 1965 to barely 50 per cent today. We find that any Ontario high school teacher who hopes to become a vice-principal must get his indoctrination direct from OISE. He can qualify today only by attaining a master's degree in education from OISE.

Let us look at the curriculum department at OISE, Mr. Chairman. It is the second largest department at the institute and it has a primary responsibility for curriculum formulation of the province. Here is what we find. We find that in that department the major emphasis has been placed on foreign languages leading to the development of a modern language centre. But notice this, Mr. Chairman, none of the faculty in the centre is French-Canadian. None of the faculty is Italian, Greek or Indian. None of them is representative of any of the large non-English-speaking groups in Ontario. You should note that there is one native Germany and there is a Canadian citizen educated in Toronto and at Cornell, and he is a French-Canadian expert.

We have a situation at OISE, Mr. Chairman, in which of approximately 160 teachers, 33 per cent are Americans and there is not even a French-Canadian there. There are two people who are bilingual there, but no Canadian from Quebec. It is that type of situation where, when we have a teaching institution like that in the graduate field of education, literally, with no courses about the Canadian fact that we are a bilingual nation, that we are a bicultural nation in the very real sense—by bicultural I mean French and English—where when we find that the problems of education for the Italian adults and children in the city of Toronto, for example, are ignored because there are no people who can converse in that language, then we must ask what is the relevance of OISE. What is the relevance of what OISE is doing to what we want to do with this society and as a culture? Why spend that $11 million or $12 million each year on this institute when it is actually, I think, fostering the breaking down of a viable cultural identity in this province.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Hear, hear!

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It is a figment of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Davis) imagination and we will get to that shortly. I look at it and we will get to it.

Hon. Mr. Dunlop: The member will?

Mr. Bullbrook: He went to Berkeley on a sojourn of his own and clearly came back with that clearly.

Mr. T. Reid: That is about it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I look at you. You know who I am looking at—you do. And we will get to him the next time.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I am being very specific here. I am trying to make it very clear—

Mr. Bullbrook: You spend it like it is going out of style.

Mr. T. Reid —that when you look at a problem like this, you must look at it in great detail. We are still dealing with the question of the institute. There is a person there who is chairman of the department of adult education called Robby Kidd, a Canadian. When one talks to staff people at the institute, when one talks to students, and people, by the way, Mr. Chairman, who have left the institute for the same reason the people are leaving some of the teaching staffs of Ontario universities, one gets the following type of information about Robby Kidd's very desperate battle to do something about maintaining OISE as a research centre relevant to Ontario needs, relevant to Canadian needs. The quotations that I am about to put into the record of the House, sir, come from—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this department makes no grants for research purposes to OISE.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank God the minister works with us. We thought he was working against us.

Hon. Mr. White: I pointed it out four times to the hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is nice to know he is with us anyway.

Mr. T. Reid: I am very pleased that the minister has made such a profound statement.

Mr. Bullbrook: After all that material, that is what the minister was responsible for. It is a fact of life over there.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister has made it clear in answer to a number of questions that I have put to him in the last three weeks that the Ontario Institute for Studies

in Education spends, in terms of its operating budget, approximately $11 million or $12 million a year and $4 million or $5 million of that goes into the graduate programme, and this comes out of the minister's budget, and is accountable for by the University of Toronto. The records of this House will show that. The division that Robby Kidd heads—I do not even have to make the second point, Mr. Chairman. It is very simply that the question of what is taught in the curriculum is of concern to this minister and comes under this minister's budget. One does not even have to refer to research in this regard, except to say that quite often the research that is done determines the courses that are taught, as the minister well knows.

Dr. Robby Kidd was commenting on a report that Dr. David Brison made concerning the future growth and development of the institute. These are the comments, Mr. Chairman, Robby Kidd made about Brison's report. He says this:

> The report is not or seems hardly to be founded in the real world of education in Ontario. At no point does the report refer directly to the problems and opportunities of education in Ontario or Canada. Why is such consideration irrelevant? Have we no concern with these basic questions as we plan for the future of OISE?

Dr. Robby Kidd continues:

> The report implicitly pays tribute to much that we owe, and we owe much, to American scholarship, but it seems to have forgotten or seems to be oblivious of what we can learn from European experience or from our colleagues in Asia or from our participation in what is called the third world or even from our fellow colonials, the Australians.

That is what Robby Kidd said about the report that was prepared by probably the highest-level group appointed to look at the future and growth of the institute in 1970.

Dr. Kidd has also made a comment, in conversation, on the talk about there not being enough qualified Canadians to staff OISE or any university in this country, that it is a lot of nonsense.

He directly contradicts what Dr. Jackson told us several weeks ago in the standing committee on human resources. He said that 10 years ago—and this is a point that I made earlier—when French-Canadian universities faced the same problem, they invited a temporary staff from all over the world to train Quebecois until they were qualified to fill the posts themselves. Robby Kidd has said that he would be in favour of a system that would give able Canadians an opportunity to work in Canadian institutions, including OISE.

There is another person at the institute, Dr. Greenfield, who does not share Robby Kidd's concern with the relevance of OISE to the question of our cultural heritage and the perpetuation of our values. He has said such things as the following. I take my quotations from a publication called, "New Canada," volume 1, number 5, September, 1970. Dr. Greenfield is chairman of the department of education and administration.

It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that in 1969-1970, there were five Canadians, in addition to Dr. Greenfield, and nine Americans in his department. For the current year, he has hired four more Americans and one Canadian which totally belies what Dr. Jackson told us in the standing committee on human resources such a short time ago. Here is a quotation attributed directly to Dr. Greenfield in this publication. It says:

> Since Canadian society is not a unique and uniform entity, it may, with justification, be regarded as a variant of American society.

I find that insulting.

But that is the way in which he views the purpose of the institute. What I am trying to tell the minister, Mr. Chairman, is that the Canadians in OISE are waging a losing battle. There have been five resignations of Canadians, not because they have not got the qualifications, but because they disagree with what OISE is doing in terms of its relevance with the education system of this province. They disagree with the graduate programme which all teachers must go through if they want to become principals, for example, of high schools in this province, because they do not see its relevance to our society and to Canadian society.

Mr. Chairman, the minister might well wonder, and my leader has received, I should add, some quite nasty letters from people who really do not want to have too much to do with some of the things that I have been saying as spokesman for this party.

Hon. Mr. White: It nurtures the member's paranoia.

Mr. T. Reid: Say that for the record, please.

Hon. Mr. White: It nurtures the member's paranoia. He was quite pleased to get those letters.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Are the paranoids after the minister again?

Hon. Mr. White: The member was quite pleased to get those letters.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that not a tragic response? From a minister of the Crown, that is all he can contribute. Is that not frightening? Really! The Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. T. Reid: No, I do not enjoy them.

Hon. Mr. White: I thought, from your smile, you enjoyed getting them.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let us tell the minister. What pomposity.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, there are the specific case profiles which I wanted to put into the record of this House. To the best of my knowledge, sir, they are factual.

I have tried to keep the emotionalism which I feel out of the record of the House. I am simply asking that this government, in the short time that remains to it to govern this province, look at these detailed facts, department by department, and ask themselves in all honesty whether those facts merit consideration of public policy in this province, and a response.

Now, before the hon. minister—no, I will not attribute motives. Before more people use such derogatory terms on our position, and on me personally, as racist and so forth, I would like to make it clear that our positive proposals in this regard are very moderate and mild.

Let me make it clear to the minister that what I consider to be much more extreme proposals have been made by people who feel just as strongly as I do about what should be done. I mean the resolution by the delegates to the national symposium on Canadian universities, calling on the federal and provincial governments to limit the number of foreign nationals teaching at Canadian universities and colleges.

They want legislation limiting the number of foreign nationals on the teaching staff of any post-secondary institution to 15 per cent of the total staff. This is called the 85 per cent quota group.

And this recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is made in all honesty. They can document 25 more cases such as the ones I have briefly dealt with this evening—in which they can point out discrimination against Canadians applying for jobs. They can point out the inability of Canadian students to study issues concerning Canada and so forth.

And they have reached the point where in all honesty they believe there should be a quota placed and enforced through legislation.

The proposal that we have in this party, Mr. Chairman, is, I think, a proper one. I think it is a moderate one. I think it is a policy of persuasion, of public exposure. I think it is a reasonable policy for a political party forming the government in this province, to follow, and I would like to put it into the record of this House.

Our policy is this—and it is a far cry from the 85 percenters—we would require each university in Ontario to have Canadians make up at least a majority of the teaching staff within two years. This would affect only two universities in this province, Mr. Chairman—York University and Laurentian.

Secondly we would encourage, with financial incentives, the hiring of qualified Canadians in the 1970s so that each department in each university would have Canadians as a majority of its teaching staff within three years, with this ratio reaching the two-thirds level in six years.

The operative word there, Mr. Chairman, is "encourage."

Thirdly—and this is where we get into the concept of public accountability on the issue—we would require the president of any university that did not meet these standards to appear before the standing committee on human resources of this Legislature to explain why his university has not achieved the standard.

Mr. Bullbrook: Hear, hear! Without reservation, hear, hear!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Glad to hear from the member for Sarnia.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Well said!

Mr. T. Reid: The member for Sarnia makes a lot of sense, Mr. Chairman, unlike the member for Riverdale.

The Canadian public has to know why the situations which I have described exist, if they continue to exist after the timetable a Liberal government will implement.

My own view is—and it is the view of our party, Mr. Chairman—that this approach, which combines encouragement with financial incentives, with public accountability and

explanation, that this approach, for most of the de-Canadianized departments—that is, where Canadians account for fewer than two-thirds of the teaching staff, that this policy of ours would do two things.

One, it would mean that no present non-Canadian teacher need be let go because of his citizenship. The policy of the Liberal government is phased in over six years and present non-Canadians could, if they wish to become part of our country become Canadian citizens and have a commitment to our country.

The second thing it would mean is that for some departments or faculties, such as the law school at Windsor, which are excessively non-Canadian because of an excessive policy of hiring anybody but Canadians in the 1960s, a policy of "qualified Canadians only" would have to be adopted or no additional staff could be hired in those departments. In our opinion, there are too many first-rate Canadians being denied teaching positions in Ontario universities and too many less-than-first-rate non-Canadians being hired at this very moment.

And the final comment I will make, Mr. Chairman, in concluding these remarks is that in addition to this type of public accountability and by new incentives to hire qualified Canadians, a Liberal government in this province will make funds available for the study of Canadian issues and problems to a much greater extent.

This would mean, for example, Mr. Chairman, that a philosopher such as Leslie Armour, who gets squeezed out of an Americanized department of philosophy at the University of Windsor, would be given a grant of good proportion to write his book on the history of Canadian philosophical thought, instead of being forced to leave Canada.

It would mean, for example, that the Indian studies programme at Trent University will receive proper funding, so there could be research combined with teaching in the area of sociology, having to do with ethnic and cultural relations. It would mean that we would have a commitment, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that we do not lose our culture and heritage because we do not have enough guts to stand up and fight for it. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. White: Before the hon. member starts, would it be wise for me to respond now to the rather obvious remarks of the Liberal critic, so that we can get into a more profound discussion about the deeper issues of education in this province after these popular points of view are dealt with? Would that be the way to do it?

Mr. Nixon: The minister should try to make it better than his introduction to the estimates, if possible. Certainly, he should try to be a little more profound than his introduction to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. White: In that case, I will take a long-handled spoon and try to find some nutrients in the very thin gruel served by the member for Scarborough East. I will start by saying I detest nepotism and favouritism in every form.

Mr. Nixon: Nepotism?

Hon. Mr. White: And when I hear described these isolated incidents within the great university community of Ontario, I am not at all well pleased A couple of weeks ago, I went before the television cameras and spoke to representatives of all news media to say that I thought it was well within the rights and was the responsibility of the standing committee on human resources to have the dean of the law school from Windsor up here to explain why he has a disproportionately large number of American professors.

But my friend opposite, who had to be aware of my response—in fact, I think it was generated by a question from him—prefers to stand up in what I consider to be the most despicable short-term political fashion and attempt to gain some number of votes in a way that can only be injurious, I think, to the universities and, unless I am grossly mistaken, the Liberal Party.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): But the minister is not sure.

Hon. Mr. White: Now I am going to deal point by point with the matters he brought up, but before I do so let me read a little item from the Etobicoke Guardian of December 3, 1970:

> Public utterance and private action do not always compare well, as we discovered when it was announced that MPP Tim Reid, one of the loudest "publish Canadian" advocates, recently brought out a high school text of selected economic readings published by Holt Rinehart and Winston of Canada, a wholly-owned, American-owner, subsidiary of the New York firm of that name.

This, I think, puts the hon. member's comments in a somewhat more understandable context.

Mr. Nixon: That is ridiculous. Ryerson Press was not available.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a brief point of personal privilege. Would that be possible?

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member would state what privilege he feels has been breached, I will undertake to—

Hon. Mr. White: You were caught with your hand in the candy jar.

Mr. T. Reid: This is a continuation of the remarks the Premier made in the House. Do you want the facts now?

Mr. Chairman: I want to know what privilege the hon. member feels has been breached on his part, parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is misleading.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I am trying to figure out the order.

Mr. Lawlor: Privilege as an editor?

Mr. J. Renwick: Was the name of the firm wrongly pronounced?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think the point of personal privilege—

Mr. Lawlor: What was the Canadian content of your books?

Mr. T. Reid: It is very high. The personal privilege is that the minister has drawn into question my credibility as a spokesman on the issue I have just discussed, because one of my publishers in the last eight years is a wholly-owned American subsidiary. I think the minister's implication is that because I would allow an American publisher to publish a book of readings on high-school economics, that therefore I am disqualified from speaking on the issue.

Mr. Chairman: I cannot see where any privilege that could be conveyed or conferred upon any member of the Legislature individually or collectively has been breached.

Mr. Nixon: Other than that the minister was out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I cannot see any breach of privilege whatever.

Mr. Lawlor: He is easily stumped.

Mr. T. Reid: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister therefore—obviously I am going to have to put this in the record sometime—could I ask the minister to—

Mr. J. Renwick: Who were your other publishers?

Mr. T. Reid: Peter Martin Associates, the University of Toronto Press and the government of Canada.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is up on a point of personal privilege, he maintains. I would like to hear the point of privilege, if there is one. So far, he has not given me one.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, I wish the hon. minister would give me one, so that I can rebut it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the hon. minister has the floor then.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, for me to belabour that point. We know the motivation of the member opposite, and his colleagues, in this particular issue. Now, then, I would like to deal point by point, and it should not take very long. I certainly—

Mr. Nixon: What do you mean—"the motivation"? You mean to offer an alternative to what you are doing or not doing? You want to describe the motives more fully.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I am going to be dealing with that. I will be dealing with this. Would you like to say something before I begin?

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Why do you not say something? That is what you are paid for.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, well I am going to.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not blame you for being cross, though.

Mr. Nixon: Well, what are you talking about? Motives—are you suggesting that motives are incorrect in that they offer an alternative to do what you are not doing?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: I am suggesting that the Liberal Party has done here tonight what I have seen it do week after week for 12 years—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I see. You are worrying about them.

Hon. Mr. White: —and that is attempt to catch today's prevailing gust of popular opinion, without any regard to principle or long-term policies or well-thought-out platforms. And that is why the NDP are chewing them to pieces.

Mr. Ruston: And in your policies you are free to have all the—

Mr. Nixon: Well, you get on the television and agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. You agree when it serves your mean purpose. Get on and talk about motives.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member made a number of references to the Committee of University Presidents, by which I assume he means the Council of Universities, they having changed their name a month or so ago. And I quite understand that the Council of Universities has not been well able to come to grips with the duplication of equipment, including television education equipment, and perhaps not with a centralized control of libraries, and perhaps not with graduate programmes or undergraduate discipline assessments.

Mr. Nixon: Your predecessor has been trying to get that since 1965.

Hon. Mr. White: And I think they will not find it possible until such time as they are given a very clear signal by the public or the government, and we have attempted from time to time in recent months to give a—

Mr. Haggerty: It will not come from the government. That is for sure.

Hon. Mr. White: —clearer signal of our interpretation of public will and public needs by making a number of changes. For instance, we are not paying grants for post-graduate courses unless those courses are given approval by the Minister of University Affairs and, of course, he is dependent in this decision to a very large extent on the committee on university affairs.

Mr. Nixon: Pandering to your desire for cheap publicity.

Mr. T. Reid: Is that not nepotism?

Mr. Nixon: The minister takes the staff from one department to the other. He left the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) with practically nothing.

Hon. Mr. White: We have—requested, I think is the word I would like to use—that there be a central clearing house to determine well in advance the actual number of applicants into not only the first year but each year in the university curricula. We have in other ways asked the Council of Universities to assume responsibilities which we think are in the public good.

I quite understand how that council finds it difficult to take this initiative unless they are given some such clear signal by those who purport to be the representatives of the public at large.

One of the reasons I like a heterogeneous form of university governance is because I think in having a wide variety of institutions each with a somewhat different bent, each with certain specialties, each with special atttibutes, each can challenge the other to a higher level of performance. It is this very element of competition which we observe in other settings to be so productive and which I would not care to destroy in the quest for some more homogenous and blander and perhaps some slightly more efficient system of universities. It is too high a price to pay and I think we can give encouragement and inducement without overriding the good judgement of the presidents of the universities and their academic colleagues.

My Liberal critic has criticized formula financing. I remember when Churchill said that democracy was the second worst form of government and I think I would have to concede that formula financing is the second worst form of financing.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Agreed.

Hon. Mr. White: Having said that, I ask the question, do you want to go back to the arbitrary system we had before formula financing, at which time somebody, the government, directly or indirectly, sat down with a pie of a certain size and cut it into different-sized slices with, I think, the loudest member at the table getting the largest piece of pie? I do not think we want to go back to that, although if my hon. friend is urging that we do so I would like to hear him say so very clearly.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add that there is a third alternative, which I outlined quite clearly, certainly in the area of graduate studies and that is—

Hon. Mr. White: I will deal with that in a minute.

Mr. T. Reid: —but the implication the minister made was that I was for the old system where the friends of Leslie Frost got the most money. I do not like that system. I do not suggest that we return to it.

What I do say is that in the area of graduate studies, where the incentive effects are the most severe, there should be a single planning unit and with the majority of its members from the universities that would decide on the rational allocation of the funds.

Hon. Mr. White: As I mentioned a minute ago, we have informed the universities that we are not going to approve any more graduate programmes until that discipline has been rationalized. If, in a certain situation, the university affected thinks that a programme should go forward they can appeal the matter to the committee on university affairs. The minister will be called upon to rule on that appeal and, quite frankly, I would expect to follow the recommendations of the committee almost always.

In my letter of April 27 to the university presidents I informed them that we would, likewise, be re-studying and reconsidering and perhaps readjusting the factors for different courses, in evidence of which we announced a change from the one-sixth factor to the one-fifth factor for part-time students during the next two years. We will be scrutinizing those factors because they can induce inefficiencies, as was suggested.

So far as standardized financial records are concerned, we have put this request to the universities and I would hope to have financial records available for presentation on a uniform recording basis early in 1972.

The logic that the formula financing leads to US textbooks from Holt, Rinehart and Winston and other American publishers and to US professors is beyond my personal comprehension. I can only conclude that there is no logic to that particular line of argument. I followed it with very great care and it is the kind of roundabout reasoning which I recall being taught in a survey psychology course, circa 1942, was fallacious reasoning.

Now my hon. friend touched on the purpose of university education, and he pointed out that we are not investing these enormous sums to train foreign Ph.D. candidates. I think that is correct to a point. We are doing it to educate young men and women—and indeed, older people too. We are doing it exclusively for Canadians, I suspect. As a matter of fact, I do not suppose one could have a really first class graduate programme if every member of the class were from Ontario.

Then, in buttressing his remarks, he used figures which were not correct and which I would now like to correct for him.

Mr. T. Reid: What is the source?

Mr. Yakabuski: Misleading the House?

Hon. Mr. White: He said that only half of the students were Canadian. In point of fact about one-third of the students were non-Canadian. About half were from outside of Ontario, and I suppose he has mixed up his two ratios.

Mr. T. Reid: What is your source?

Hon. Mr. White: I am dependent in this regard on Dr. Douglas Wright; the chairman of the committee on university affairs.

Mr. T. Reid: Is that a published report?

Hon. Mr. White: Do not quarrel about it too much before I check the figures through.

Mr. T. Reid: But he is the minister; I think there is a difference.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I will publish it if that will make the member feel better. I have asserted it, which I think the hon. member for Riverdale would concede is a form of publishing.

Mr. T. Reid: Was it a survey?

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member made reference to teachers engaged between September, 1969, and September, 1970. I have here a report published in print form entitled "A Summary of Sources of Faculty Appointments" for the period September 15, 1969, to September 15, 1970, and I observe that that assessment of appointed is: Canadian 698, US 279, United Kingdom 179, Commonwealth 62, other 190, for a total of 1,408. I would be very glad to see the Canadian proportion somewhat higher than it is.

Mr. T. Reid: My facts were right then?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I think not. Because I wrote down that the hon. member said that less than half of the professors were Canadian. Yes, I will have to concede his figures were right in that instance.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: Now, my Liberal critic spent quite a long time describing various courses in four or five Ontario universities—

McMaster, Waterloo, University of Windsor, York, Laurentian. If there is favouritism taking place on the basis of race or religion or nationality, or old school ties, I think the standing committee of this Legislature has every right to inquire into it. But what I would like to be very clear about is this: Does the hon. member for Scarborough East want me to appoint the professors, yes or no?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the minister's remark that there are more than simply two alternatives, and I have outlined what we consider to be viable means for achieving—

Hon. Mr. White: No, the member said if they did not meet the quota he would call the university president before the committee. I am saying, "Go ahead and call anybody you want right now."

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. White: Does the member want me to decide?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the minister asked me a question, and we could have a long debate about how effective is the standing committee on human resources, particularly when an opposition member such as the NDP representative or a Liberal representative wants certain things done. The history of that committee, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, is that we find it impossible to get the chairman to do the things such as the minister is suggesting.

We asked, for example, that we look at the community colleges, which was unilaterally cancelled. It will take the minister's power as the Minister of University Affairs to take the initiative if he wants to back up his suggestions. It is as simple as that. If the minister wants something done, he can get it done. We cannot. We are just opposition critics.

Hon. Mr. White: You have much opportunity as a private member on those standing committees, I can tell you that.

Now do you want this minister to decide what books are to be acquired by using the special grant to the University of Windsor law school?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straight. The students in their publication made it quite clear that, in their opinion, the purchasing practices of the law library at the University of Windsor have resulted in too much American material and not enough essential Canadian material. That was their statement. The minister then makes available another $100,000 without any evaluation of what the previous money had been spent on.

I think it is a valid question for the minister to ask the dean of the law school—or the president of the university, if he does not want to deal directly with a particular dean—for a report on the allegations made by the student body of the law school concerning the inadequacy of the law library with respect to essential Canadian documents. I think that is the proper thing for him to do. It is public accountability.

Hon. Mr. White: Does the member for Scarborough East want me to determine the course offerings at the Ontario universities? Yes or no?

Mr. T. Reid: These questions are much too complicated, as the minister knows.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Certainly not mine.

Mr. T. Reid: The member for York South is at York now, is he not?

The point is a complicated one, Mr. Chairman. I thought the case profiles I brought before the minister made it clear that once you increase, if you like, the voice for Canadian studies, whether it is in political science at McMaster, law at Windsor, philosophy at Waterloo and so forth, once you increase the number of people who are concerned with their country, with Canada, then the material will flow from that. That is the simple argument.

Hon. Mr. White: We are concerned about this matter and I am going to read once again from a letter written on January 29, 1971, by the then Minister of University Affairs, now the Prime Minister, which went to every university president in this province. It reads as follows:

> You are aware, I know, of the growing concern within Ontario about the degree of influence that seems to be asserted on Canadian society by a proximity to, and close associations with, the United States. Of particular concern in some quarters is the relatively high proportion of American professors who have been appointed to positions in our universities and colleges. In this connection I am sure that you read, in the copies of Hansard that were forwarded to you, the fairly lengthy debates

which took place on this issue when the estimates of The Department of University Affairs were being approved last spring and fall.

I am very conscious of the fact that a university must give full consideration to a teaching candidate's record of scholarship and achievement, as well as his nationality, when considering him for an appointment. I am also aware of the shortage of qualified Canadians that has existed in many disciplinary areas, particularly social sciences, during recent years. Nevertheless, I feel that most citizens of Ontario would be reassured if they could feel that academic openings in our province were being offered, wherever possible, to qualified Canadian candidates and that the overall balance in faculty members was becoming more markedly Canadian.

Your co-operation in working toward these objectives during the current period of faculty hiring would be much appreciated.

I have not had any evidence so far that in the hiring following January 29, 1971, that this request has not been given very serious and effective consideration. The illustrations which have been put forward certainly precede that time, and generally speaking precede the interval of concern which has arisen in the last year or so.

Mr. Pitman: Is the minister aware of the problems that arose over that letter? In view of the fact that the letter seems to be in complete opposition to the human rights code, this indicates that the universities cannot in fact determine whether their applicants are from another country or not.

In other words, the university presidents got themselves into the situation of a dialogue with the minister as to how they got around that piece of legislation.

Hon. Mr. White: I do remember something about that. There is a matter of adjustment involved here. We all have seen instances where a professor from a certain university insists on having colleagues from that same university. It now seems to me to be the obvious responsibility of the dean or of the senate or of the administration to take hold of instances of favouritism like this.

But for the Liberal critic to pretend that this typifies the Ontario university system is misleading, perhaps deliberately so, and I think the reasons for that particular attack at this moment in time are rather obvious to everybody in this room and do not reflect very much credit on him or on his party.

Mr. Pitman: Did that matter get straightened out, though? I do not know.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like—could I make just one brief comment? I tried to make it very clear to this minister—I understand he has difficulty understanding these points sometimes—

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, I understand what you are talking about.

Mr. T. Reid: I made it quite clear that it is very important to the people of this province not to just have the aggregate statistics by universities—

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, I understood all that—

Mr. T. Reid: —on which to make decisions reflecting public policy—

Hon. Mr. White: Call in the dean of law and question him.

Mr. T. Reid: —but it is a necessity to know specifically in which departments the problems lie. And my examples had that single opint to make—that we can no longer simply generalize. We have to look at particular departments and particular universities, if we are to understand what the issue is.

An hon. member: You had better forget it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It took a while to get here—

Mr. J. Renwick: It will be well worth waiting for.

Mr. Lawlor: Nous sommes arrivons. I first of all would like to congratulate the minister on assuming his new portfolio and mantle. I think he would agree with me that while I was his critic in Revenue, that at least this is a department one can get one's teeth into. There is a great deal of matter.

I was disappointed in two things tonight. One was that whereas his predecessor who is now Prime Minister of this province, was the most unphilosophical of men, dealing for a number of years with the most philosophical of departments, why the minister himself on his ascension to office did not see fit tonight to make some kind of statement or enuncia-

tion of his fundamental beliefs with respect to education.

The trouble with education in this province lies with the ministers of this portfolio; the trouble with the previous minister was that he did not have any vision. He had no pivotal focus upon which to operate. He acted pragmatically and ad hoc from day to day with whatever was suggested to him in terms of expansion.

He had no notion where education was going, what it was all about, what we are trying to do, what kind of a man you were trying to produce at the end of the day, what kind of people we were to become—Athenians of the north or a bunch of troglodytes as we generally are. Which one is it?

And here this minister stands up—at least his predecessor in office had the courtesy to give, year after year, fairly lengthy résumés of the highlights, the new policies, those things which were in the wind, what was happening in the department. Surely we deserve that in this side of the House.

And surely it is a kind of discourtesy for the minister to blandly stand up there and vouchsafe no offerings whatsoever of all the nitty gritty in his department. The minister sits on his haunches and makes no presentation.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I am very hopeful we can get into a philosophical exchange on the purposes of education and how these purposes can be realized. In preference to imposing a long harangue on the House, à la Scarborough East, I have elected to introduce these ideas and notions vote by vote as we go through.

I think we can develop the various ideas, whether they be allocation of capital resources or the need for graduate studies, or whatever, in a way that will be equally meaningful and more interesting to most of the members of this Legislature.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I do not think so. What, as a matter of fact, I propose to do in this type of estimate, is stand back and survey, contemplate and surmise with some degree of gravity, I trust, what education is all about and what it ought to be in this province, prior to launching into the specific and concrete items of which people are so fond, or entering into these things without orientation.

I want to give, with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, a bit of a backdrop, so to speak; a kind of philosophy of education that leads to tentative probing as to what has gone wrong, what is happening. Why all the alienation? Why the student unrest? What validity is in their position—because there is a certain amount. What is the malaise, if you will, within the university and within society, the university being to some degree the mirror held up to society. It is one of its most vital and sensitive points, namely, its intellectual acumen, its ability to balance out, its ability to cut with the intellect into the definition of things. That is what I think this department needs, at least as I say, in a groping way to begin with, and then we can launch into the several items.

In order to get into that subject, I want to point out that there are generally in the modern world, two schools of educational thought, many sub-species, of course. On one side there is the traditionalist and on the other side there is the modernist. And I agree with neither side. As soon as I find there is something appealing in both, probably far more—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): That is par for the course.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, that is intelligence for you, lad, because you do seek to discriminate a little bit, instead of opening your mouth and taking the fish down holus-bolus, as you are sometimes inclined to do.

Mr. Kennedy: You swallow the fish.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I swallow the golden eel.

Mr. T. Reid: An old tadpole.

Mr. Lawlor: You should at least take a look at the beast before you open your mouth. In this particular regard, what is particularly at fault and what is on-going in this province because of the chaotic, uncontrolled expansion really of the past recade, without having any central thread with which to bind things together, what has happened is that we have come into the era here of what is called by George Grant Clark and most educationists today, the multiversity.

The multiversity on the whole, from the point of view of the traditionalist, is a bad thing. It is a bad thing on a dozen counts. It is bad on the basis of its impersonality; it is bad on the basis of its excessive specialization; it is bad because it has no coherent principle whereby the university is run. It is bad because it forswears itself to industry and to big business and to big government;

it is bad because the professors within it are no longer dedicated to the task of learning, because they have given over to consulting services, to their own particular self-indulgences.

It is bad because of the effect upon the student body within a multiversity, if a multiversity means, as apparently it does, that the sole and prime purpose of education is to produce trained seals, to produce people in a particular profession or in a particular manner of service to the community. If it means it is, in effect, some vast factory like Ford in Dearborn, then it is a sausage-producing machine—it is so vast and so unwieldy that it has no coherence. It has no ideal.

It goes every which way and every possible direction seeking to appease the hungers and wants of the labouring population. The people want jobs. If its sole objective is the training of people to make money, then all the great universities of the centuries are in disrepute or disregarded or only given lip service and that is what George Grant talks about in terms of the multiversity.

There is good cause for us to pause and you are creating a multiversity throughout the Province of Ontario. You have given sanction to it. This is your baby that you have inherited. I would ask you to give very great thought to what the consequences of so doing are, and the resistance that you are meeting and will meet within the universities quite legitimately—not because of reaction; not because certain people at Trent University are bohunks; not because they are conservative in the wrong sense of the term.

Your university has peculiarities in this way. What of Waterloo Lutheran for that matter? Or even Guelph, to a point, or even McMaster as I read in the vicar's brief, particularly if you take a look at the minority report in that brief. These are the dead-end of conservatism, of traditionalism.

This is the kind of people who say, you know, that we ought to return to the old standard; that a liberal education in the old mode à la Oxford, à la Gutenberg was to study the classics. It was primarily a literary type of education; one dedicated to the study of classical literature and to the old authors and poets.

That is fine and I would not give it up but the point is that they have, to an extent. They do become ivory towers and they do become aristocratic and elitist in their conception. They get schooled people who are not interested in that kind of thing, or only moderately so. They say this is the prime purpose of the university.

There is another tradition within that liberal tradition which says that the literature of our race is not the primary thing but the philosophical context, the great philosophical writers, from before Plato, from Heraclitus clean through to Merlé Ponti in the present day. That is where the focus ought to reside. I am more inclined to that particular position. The literary—while it may speak, teach a person to write well, to speak extremely well—has too much of an imaginative content, it allows for too much play. There is not enough concentration; there is not enough logical toughness. And one of the factors in contemporary education, if to be so at all, is intellectual toughness, an ability to concentrate over long attention spans, the business of using logic always in the process of articulation.

At least that education taught that. Whereas the multiversity—the law schools with which I am more acquainted, for instance, are great factories for turning out lawyers, men with very little culture—intellectual, moral and social barbarians. Educated troglodytes, I say. They are people who have been exposed to a great deal of education in terms of money spent on professors' schooling and the emporiums which they have it in and who will come out defective in all the things that matter to the relationship between human beings and to the cultivation of the mind.

The whole tradition is being lost, going down swamp at the present time. I think that anybody who is cognizant of these things must forfend against them and throw his weight within this Department of University Affairs to obstruct this peculiar form of Americanization.

I will not have a hangup like the member for Scarborough East, almost fanatically and nauseatingly going over the business of Americanization as though it were our prime fault. Our prime faults lie elsewhere. For instance, in educational philosophy the prime fault lies not with the Americanization but with scientism in the contemporary scene. The great power of contemporary science has inundated and flooded over us and has turned everything to its purposes. This does not happen to the Einsteins, Lord knows, but it happens to the run-of-the-mill scientist and to all institutions which are infected by the virus of too great scientism. That is that science is the be all and end all, that what it produces is to be worshipped, that the

modes of knowledge that it cultivates through scientific method are the only true knowledge, that the knowledge they gain from the heredity of the race, from the common observation of mankind, from our accumulative traditions, one with another, is the common knowledge that the man on the street has no validity. This is the knowledge that the philosopher talks about when he sits, not in a laboratory, but in his armchair and contemplates the full plenitude of what human experience has taught us. That knowledge is played down.

It is called reductionism. Everything that has afflatus, everything that is spiritual, everything that men reach out to in terms of aspiration, in terms of doctrines like souls and whatnot are reduced to bodily functions, are reduced to conditioned reflexes, behaviouristic modes, various kinds of material predictable, mensurable, mechanistic references. Everything—the higher always explained in terms of the lower, and never the reverse. At least the people who stood behind the tradition of liberal knowledge held to the higher. They did not repudiate the lower in any of its aspects. They simply held to the higher. They had some faults in their position. There was an enormous amount of ivory towerism involved in this particular, but it need not be.

There is no necessity and no reason why liberal knowledge and liberal education, the full development of all the cultivation of knowledge, the so crucial knowledge of history, should not exist. There the modern education is the multiversity, because of its strong insistence upon contemporary science, where the only thing that is important is the living reality of what is being produced in the test tube, or being tested. The past has very little validity in science. But the past has enormous validity for the full development and for the understanding of myself and yourself in terms of human development and the humanities as such.

And it is a reverence for, not only life but the past, a deep reverence, not to be mesmerized by it. It is no basilisk's eye. It is to be worked with. But this is repudiated, and I notice in the minister's department, not so long ago, there is some question about just where historical studies stood, as to whether there should be any particular emphasis put upon them.

The thing that is wrong, as I see it, with that position, for which I have great affection mainly, is that the liberal one, even in its traditional stance, thinks that there is nothing new under the sun. It thinks that the thing that a man is searching for is certain permanences, that in the universe of human nature there are things that are perennial and everlasting, and I cannot believe that. I think the central fact that we have learned—and it is a rceent knowledge in the human mind—is change, that all things change. There are various types and levels of change, and I will go into them, but there are two levels.

Obviously, there is a change in the material where you get the fluctuation, where a cocoon turns into a butterfly, but you also get the on-going, everlasting, unending change that goes on inside you and me, and infected by environmental pressures. If you were a boy growing in Turkestan and raised in that atmosphere, you would have grown up with the mentality and the habits. You would be completely unlike John White, although your name might be somewhat like that.

It is the understanding that there is an ever deepening, ever moving, internal life, that there is no permanency and there are no points of fixity. The belief in the liberal establishment that there is betrays it, and betrays it for the young, who know, sort of viscerally, that things do not stand still, that there is nothing abiding.

Even if you got into theology, I think you would have to have a different notion of God than the one of the old white man, white-bearded man sitting on a throne in certain fixity. There is no immutability even there. The problem with this is that there has not arisen a philosopher in the western world, or anywhere for that matter, who has been able to articulate what I am saying, who has been able to explain the permanency in change, the fact of self-identity in the midst of an on-going flux. Nobody has been able to do it yet. I think the best minds are beginning to grope in that particular direction and we will have a basic breakthrough greater than anything established by Kant, from the first man who makes the fundamental articulation of that particular vision as to what I mean. So change is fundamental however you explain it, and it is the basic fact.

George Grant has an article on the curriculum—which he says is the heart of the university, as everything depends on its curriculum. I hope you have been able to see that article. It has been published in a number of journals that I have seen. He goes after what is called the value-fact distinction and, again, this is part of scientism, a part

of the reductionism of contemporary science think by people who know damn little science being taken in by its particular methodology and thinking that the observational hypothetical techniques used there and the experimental ones of an empirical time used there have sole validity. Therefore, that fact, that the accumulation and on-going presentation of fact, is the simple job of the university, whereas values are something emotional, subjective, relativist. There is no objectivity, there is no way of intercommunication. The fact is that philosophy in the last 20 years has gone through a terrible period of internal travail over this whole issue and it is now coming out at the far ending saying what has pretty well always been said that this is false antithesis, that value relationships are just as rational, just as articulatable, just as arguable, just as provable, just as demonstrable therefore, as the factor relationship so earnestly espoused by the so-called value-free exponents of sociology or the sciences or the brains of logic in a university.

The business of seeking to be the modest professor lifted above the world of common things and not having to make value judgements, which would somehow restrict a thing, is total nonsense and part of the reason for the failure of the contemporary university and a good deal of the reason for its intellectual flabbiness and for the failure of it to attract any relevancy in the minds of its students and partly the reason why they are turning against the university and why that whole thing should be profoundly scouted.

In order to bear out some of these things that I am saying, I turn to John Henry Cardinal Newman who, in his book on university education, is a mine of material and good grace in this particular regard. He opposes the fact-value relationship, saying that value is a fact, fact is a value, and that all men have their values and they impart them into everything they do and do not pretend that you do not. The whole problem is to be intelligent enough. This is probably one of the first steps in education—to be able to reflect the fact upon your premises, upon what you start with and be aware of what your initial starting points really are, instead of borrowing them half-baked from somebody else away down the line.

The whole point about the university is to make a man critical first of all of himself and of the whole society. The university, Northrop Frye has said this in a very splendid way, exists as the churches exist and they both fail to do one thing: to be critical of the society in which they are, to hold it up for assessment, to scapple it, to say where it goes wrong. And the university, in becoming a multiversity, becomes bland. Its profesors are all hired out as consulting teams. The minister and I know well they operate in the taxation committee. Remember the afternoon on which the professors appeared, hired by big companies to argue tenuous and often fallacious propositions? And does the minister remember when the man we happened to hire who, of course, was somewhat more neutral in this regard, took them to pieces? This is a most questionable procedure within the universities.

But to return to Newman. He is talking about what this liberal education is supposed to do—and I will pause here again. What I am saying to the minister tonight is this: To the extent that the university is not liberal in my sense of the term—and I try to give a fairly clear definition of what that is, segregating it from the old liberal position—if it is not liberal, then all the work that the minister does and all the money we vote here is a waste of breath and a waste of that money. Because at the end of the road we are producing people who are not fully developed human beings, who are often brutal in their mode, who are often educated snobs, who are often people so taken up with their own vanities that they are unsocial, completely impossible to live with. They are people whose contribution to society is pernicious, because they have no standards, the ethical realm has completely bypassed them. They are people who are infecting and poisoning young minds insofar as they dedicate them on to mercenary paths solely, and the whole civilization decays.

On the whole, there is no greater focal point of rottenness than the schools, and particularly the universities, with their impact upon the whole society, and particularly what are usually and, I would trust, by and large the best minds that we raise among us. Infect those and in two generations the country will go downhill. "That perfection of the intellect," Newman says, "which is the result of education and its beau ideal is to be imparted to the individuals in their respective measures, is the clear, calm, accurate vision and comprehension of all things as far as the finite mind can embrace them, each in its place, with its own characteristics upon it. It is almost prophetic. This is the liberal mind. It is almost prophetic from its knowledge of history. It is almost heart-searching from its knowledge of human nature. It is

almost supernatural charity from its freedom from littleness and prejudice. It is almost the repose of faith because nothing can startle it. It is almost the beauty and harmony of the heavenly contemplation so intimate it is with the eternal order of things and the music of the spheres."

Contrast that with Berkeley. Contrast that with the multiversity. Contrast that with the more heinous side of the dark face of the student radical movement.

In Berkeley, after they had that initial riot of two or three years ago, what they imported into the curriculum was contemporary studies, and they became rather silly, some of these studies. In every department of that university they forced the administration to introduce a course upon Vietnam in one aspect or another.

Now it is all right to be contemporaneous and right up to date, but to so pervert the purposes of education as to require the department of chemistry to give a course on Vietnam—admittedly, with respect to the chemical elements that were going into Vietnam—strikes me as a breakdown of order, as a breakdown of intelligence, and of the university itself.

But this is what happens, and so what is the university trying to do? It is trying to grasp the first principle and to set upon those things that have perennial importance, both as ideas and in the relationships of human beings. It is trying to generate a temper or attitude of mind, a thoroughly tempered intelligence, made in the fire of dialectic and the tough discussions—not the bland stuff that we get around here—where you really go after a position, where you take it apart, inch by inch, and prove that this tough interrelationship, which we very seldom experience, is a peculiar task of the university and when you make a statement, the statement is forced back upon you.

Everybody knows how the chief model of this particular enterprise was Socrates, the father of education. He was the one who taught us how to think, what thinking processes consist of—the holding up to examination of things we most fervently believed in for a thorough-going review and for them to be torn to pieces—they really do not stand up against the realities, all our fatuous little myths, all our self-created delusions. That is the task of education—to penetrate them and explode them.

Is that what the universities are doing? Is that what the law schools of the province do? Not in my opinion. Doctors emerge from the medical faculties complete epitomes, completely stripped of any presentation.

What do they know, most of them, except that man happens to have great energy of mind and a little human vanity? He knows something about painting and music and architecture and the great classics and the works of literature and contemporary writers and he reads a little poetry here. A man well-rounded, educated, who has read and thought and travelled and known people and gone to realms of gold and come back. How many doctors do you know like that? Damn few.

They just do not teach that way at the university and it means a total failure. It means that our taxpayers' money, insofar as they do not produce people of this kind, is going down the drain because that particular mentality in the whole society too—its resistance to social change, its affirmation of itself, its goals of accumulation—all these things deeply infect society itself.

Well, I was going to have a brief discussion with the minister as to whether in all this there is a thing that every educated man should know. Whether a man could not call himself educated if he did not know it. You know, the only thing that ever comes to mind when I was thinking about it is that the whole of the English-speaking western world depends upon one very shallow thread—Shakespeare.

Is it not true that, wherever you look in the universities, there is only one core, one writer, one that has universal prominence—William Shakespeare? It is a pretty slight and slender thread upon which to hang a whole civilization—one poet—because in the old days you know, it was biblical lore.

In the old days it was a little Cicero and a little Quintilian and some others thrown in for good measure, because these guys could think and they said things beautifully. And so much so—so quintessentially were they able to do it that they lasted down the centuries as models for men of how to think, of how to go from position to position and how to express things in a way that moves men's hearts, persuades their minds, and that is education.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): How about the Bible?

Mr. Lawlor: And the Bible. They dismiss the Bible now. The multiversity knows nothing of the Bible. The last thread it has with civilization is a little bit of Shakespeare—

"Love's Labour Lost" or something like that. The increasing barbarization that is taking over is infecting our whole life under this head.

I am going to launch, Mr. Chairman, into another level of this topic. It is very close to 10:30, I wonder if I may adjourn the debate?

Mr. Chairman: Does the leader wish to make a commment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the motion for adjournment is put, could the House leader indicate to us—if he knows—what the order of business might be on Thursday?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I would like to answer that slightly facetious question and say that on Thursday we will probably deal with second readings, go into Committee of the Whole House on the taxation bill, and then return to the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House leader if he would as eloquently advise us what is going on in the House tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We are not sitting, if the usual procedure is followed.

Mr. Singer: No, he said "if."

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, continued 1961

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1987

No. 48

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 27, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon in our galleries we have students from St. Mary School, Welland; from the W. T. Lang Senior Public School in Wallaceburg; and from Holy Spirit Separate School, Agincourt. Later we will have Bloor Collegiate Institute students, students from Kingsway College in Oshawa; and this evening from Dryden High School in Dryden.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Robert Andras made certain statements at a so-called national conference of public housing tenants, which appeared in the press on May 24 and 25.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He is the most paranoid minister in the cabinet; and there are a great many.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Included in the statements were some derogatory remarks related to the provincial housing programme.

An hon. member: —the minister will hear a lot worse than that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For several years our government has co-operated with the federal government in the initiation of housing programmes for persons on low income.

Mr. Lewis: For which they paid 90 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will find out about that in a minute, if the hon. member will just be quiet for a short time.

These arrangements, Mr. Speaker, have been very successful, and as far as we can ascertain the federal government has been quite happy with these programmes and has also considered them successful.

Indeed, from 1965 until the present time, Ontario Housing Corporation has developed some 31,629 units over and above the 6,200 units which had been built by the federal-provincial partnership in the previous 15 years. At present there are some 23,000 additional units under development and construction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It sounds like an old statement of the former minister (Mr. Randall).

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a total for Ontario or about 61,000 units in over 200 municipalities. I submit, sir a very successful programme—

Mr. Lewis: Not really.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and indeed, probably the outstanding social housing achievement in north America.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a creditable programme. Tell us about the housing portion of your Throne Speech—tell us about the $520 million programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will tell the opposition all about it.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should flesh out his statement a bit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why Mr. Andras permitted himself to engage in the kind of criticisms that he did. It was suggested at the conference that the federal government pays more of the cost of social housing than the provinces, and therefore it should be able to dictate terms to us.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Will you tell him to make his point? What is he trying to say?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will observe the proceedings of the House. He will stay in order himself and allow the minister to conclude his statement.

Mr. Sargent: Can any of them make statements like this when they want to?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of order. He is out of order himself, and he will please give the minister the

courtesy of listening to whatever the minister has to say.

Mr. Lewis: It is a preamble to the federal-provincial conference, that is what it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it was suggested at the conference that the federal government pays more of the cost of social housing than the province and therefore should be able to dictate terms to us. In fact, this programme cost the Ontario government and its municipalities more than it does the federal government.

While it is true that the loans are presently shared, 90 per cent federal and 10 per cent provincial, it should be kept in mind that these are just loans and are paid back with interest. The only actual costs involved are subsidies and administrative expenses. As the federal government does not share in the administrative costs, in fact it does not pay as much for housing as does the provincial government and its municipalities.

We are fully in support of tenant associations. Indeed, as I mentioned in the House the other day, it would be foolish for any agency, be it an employer or a landlord, private or public, not to take advantage of the ideas that can come forward from the people with whom it deals. But suggesting, as Mr. Andras did, that tenants be given a two-year lease and not to increase their rentals in that period of time, thereby increasing taxpayers' subsidies when a tenant begins to earn more money, smacks of a grandstand performance by Mr. Andras and lack of consideration for the millions of hardworking taxpayers who must pay for the subsidies. Indeed, the vast majority of our tenants understand this even if Mr. Andras does not. He is quoted as saying: "It would give you a chance to pay dental bills, things like that."

Mr. Sargent: If the minister allows that, he will allow anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, public housing was designed to give temporary help to those persons who work but are unable to find accommodation within their earning ability, and to many who need social assistance generally.

I would only say to Mr. Andras, if he is anxious to assist in this way we think that it is most commendable. But the way to accomplish this is for his government to first follow a policy of full employment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And secondly to raise the direct assistance to the needy and those on fixed incomes like veterans' pensions.

Mr. Nixon: The minister had better get a membership in Action Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Such assistance should not be hidden in housing subsidies, particularly when most of it is paid by the provincial government and the municipalities.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, come on!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Is the government going to raise the Social and Family Services allowances?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Public housing, as I have said—

Mr. Sargent: Who is going to pay it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —was developed for people unable to pay their full way in today's market. I want to make it perfectly clear that the vast majority of our social housing tenants are responsible, hardworking people—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Who said they were not?

Mr. Lewis: Not responsible enough to sit on the board!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —who in most cases do not feel that some of those who express extreme and sometimes even ridiculous points of view, or attempt to destroy property including the OHC headquarters, are their true spokesmen. We certainly believe that Mr. Andras is out of step with reality when he recommends the following in which he said—

Mr. Sargent: At least the member for Don Mills (Mr. Randall) would take the blame for his misdoings. This minister will pass the buck.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Andras said:

> Tenants should seek positions of power in housing corporations and not just token advisory committee jobs, as proposed by Ontario. If tenants are going to go on boards, we hope they are going on with full voice and full authority.

Let it be noted that the opposition, almost to a man, applauded that statement of Mr. Andras.

Mr. Singer: Let it be noted very carefully.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggest that if Mr. Andras thinks it is possible to run a public housing programme such as Ontario has, which houses 120,000 persons—one which is growing daily—by having tenants control the operation; then, sir, I invite him to become the landlord. Let him take over our operation so that he will not only, as he claims pay the piper, but call the tune.

Mr. Sargent: He probably will if the minister keeps running it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Indeed, we here would be most happy if he would become the landlord and involve himself in the very difficult task of the day-to-day administrative details of this operation.

Mr. Nixon: He provides the funds.

Mr. Lewis: Let it be noted that the opposition applauds, almost to a man.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would be glad to give our present 10 per cent loan—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is a most reactionary fellow—more so even, than the member for Don Mills in the back row.

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote that speech?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we would be glad to give our present 10 per cent loan to their 90 per cent loan and save the administrative costs as well. Anyone responsible for the mismanagement—

Mr. Sargent: Will the member for Don Mills give the minister a job at Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —of Rochdale is not, I submit, in a position to give advice—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to give advice to an organization such as Ontario Housing Corporation.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is scandalous!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Andras' recommendations are uninformed, naive and totally impractical.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is finally writing his own material.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, if in fact Mr. Andras is speaking for his government—

Mr. Singer: So is this minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I am ready within 24 hours to negotiate with him to take over all of our units.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let him become the munificent landlord in a munificent manner and undertake the ownership and operation of public housing in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Is this an ultimatum the minister is giving him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Indeed, I do not intend to let Mr. Andras picture me or the staff of OHC as hardhearted and insensitive to the needs of our tenants—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which is totally untrue. So I ask Mr. Andras to come on in and take over the operation. The idea of Mr. Andras referring to "oldfashioned Ontario thinking stalling—"

Mr. Sargent: I will bet the minister cannot read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "Old fashioned Ontario thinking stalling housing reform" is absurd, having regard for the excellent record established by Ontario Housing Corporation. Ontario has pioneered such innovative programmes as:

(1) The leasing of land to reduce down payments;

(2) Using builder proposals to encourage private enterprise to build public housing;

(3) The encouragement of systems building, an innovative industrial concept.

Mr. Nixon: Tell us about Malvern!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell the hon. member that, too.

Mr. Nixon: Tell us about innovative administration.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In terms of property management matters—

Mr. Lewis: It is so silly. How can the minister expect us to listen to it? It is not relevant.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has not said anything anyway, so he might as well sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know. Only the leader of the NDP has speeches which have substance.

Mr. Lewis: All the House is waiting to hear the minister say something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. leader of the NDP had better keep in mind it was those kinds of tactics which made his party replace the previous leader; and he will be replaced for the same reason.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of tactics?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The minister's is a pathetic case for a minister of the Crown.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is bringing the whole government down. It is the first time the Premier (Mr. Davis) has stopped smiling since he entered the Legislature. He is ashen-faced. Look at the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). Did the members ever see the Treasurer look like that?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the opposition would give the minister the opportunity to complete his statement, perhaps he would do so.

An hon. member: The member is strictly out of order.

An hon. member: It is a ministerial statement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Will the minister complete his statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in terms of property management matters, the corporation's record is just as excellent. It has been the model for many housing agencies on this continent.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the minister want to drop it then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To determine the irresponsible nature of Mr. Andras' statement, let us examine the record:

(1) Prior to any statement by the federal minister, Ontario adopted the policy that social and recreational facilities should be included in the design of the new projects. As a result of our representations there was a change in federal policy in this regard. As well, Ontario has been a leader in upgrading some—

Mr. Nixon: That is not what they say up in Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —of the older projects, particularly those previously designed by the federal government, such as Regent Park.

Mr. Nixon: That was before the minister was on the city council.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue: (2) It was Ontario that drew the inequities of the previous rental scale to the attention of the federal government. This resulted in a new scale announced by the federal minister in his guidelines of April, 1970, to which he referred the other day.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To emphasize our concern, Ontario has frozen public housing rents across the province for two years until changes were made in that rental scale.

Ontario, with one other province, was the first to implement the new scale which in part reduced maximum rent from 30 to 25 per cent of income and introduced a number of new income exemptions.

(3) At the same time OHC developed a new simplified lease which is being further amended after consultation—

Mr. Lewis: Voluntary, yes. After this performance, I think the minister should talk about it all on his own.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —with tenant groups, housing authorities and CMHC.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I fear you are allowing ministerial statements to be rather seriously abused. There is nothing of policy utterance or of content in what the minister is saying. He is engaged on a specific point of personal privilege or of order in relation to a statement made by a federal minister. It has no relevance to ministerial statements as we understand the proceedings in this House and it is unnecessarily provocative in terms of the content of this House. I ask you to contain the minister.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member that he and the other members of this House are perfectly free and do, at great length in this House as all members do—express matters such as the hon. member is complaining about now.

Mr. Sargent: It is not the same thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Not when the member formerly has the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the rowdy House would become a statement. He is making one and insofar as I am concerned it is perfectly in order. He is now setting out the matters with respect to his department's achievements, the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That is a budget speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will resume his seat until I have completed, then he may rise again if he wishes.

Mr. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister can speak on the budget—

Mr. Speaker: Insofar as I am concerned, the minister's statement is in order and he will proceed to complete it.

Mr. Sargent: A very poor interpretation.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it not your understanding of the rules governing ministerial statements that they be brief, factual and non-provocative?

Mr. Speaker: That may very easily be what the order says. It may very easily be said also that in the question period there be no preambles and no something else.

Mr. Sargent: Who are you to change it?

Mr. Speaker: It may very easily be said that a great many things may be done and should be done. It has been impossible, apparently, in this House to do those things, so there is a certain amount of leeway, and it has not been Mr. Speaker's fault entirely.

Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I have some concern for the type of statement the minister is making but nevertheless it has now come to something which I think is quite proper. There is no reason in the world why he should not finish it, and I would ask him to finish it and then we will proceed with—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): He has not come to it? What happened to the first 10 minutes?

Mr. Speaker: —what the members think is more appropriate business of the afternoon.

Mr. Sargent: It is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, if I may.

It has been constantly stated—and I would like a ruling on that sir—that some of these statements should be made in the budget speech. Obviously, if the minister is going to be restricted to making these statements in a budget speech, it would mean that after he has spoken in the budget debate, if there were any statement made by a member of any other government or anyone else about this government the minister would have no opportunity to make a statement in this Legislature and would therefore be forced to go to the press gallery. This, in fact, the Legislature would quite properly object to—

Mr. Nixon: There would be none of the members here to listen to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because I had not made the statement in the Legislature, first.

And secondly, sir, in my view this is brief, having regard for the many things which were contained in the statement made by the federal minister. As for it being provocative, sir, I have said nothing here which has provoked any member of the opposition. I have said nothing about any member of this Legislature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they feel they should defend the federal ministry, they are then providing the provocation here and not I.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now may I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Singer: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, rule 23, dealing with order of business says: "Statements may be made by ministers relating to government policy, departmental action and other similar matters of which the House should be informed."

The minister is doing none of those things, Mr. Speaker, and it is my submission that the minister is, in fact, out of order.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the minister is doing exactly all three things and he will complete his statement.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder the House is a shambles.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, Ontario, with one other province, was the first to implement the new scale which in part reduced maximum rent from 30 to 25 per cent

of income and introduced a number of new income exemptions. At the same time, OHC developed a new, simplified lease which is being further amended after consultation with tenant groups, housing authorities and CMHC. The revised lease—

Mr. Singer: It is not even correct.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the revised lease, which will be in a very simple form—

Mr. Singer: The minister is misinforming us, as well as everything else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —will be introduced this summer when present annual leases expire.

Ontario, to assist the tenants, changed its lease from a monthly to an annual term. Under this improved lease, rents are not increased if income rises during the lease period but are normally decreased if income declines. A two-year lease is too long, in our view, considering the dynamics of the economic and social welfare of people in public housing. Salaries change; conditions change and a fixed rent, adjusted only when income drops over a two-year period, would create inequities amongst the tenants themselves.

Mr. Nixon: And every now and then the minister would want to get a bailiff to throw somebody out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is easier on all parties—

Mr. Singer: This is something that if they did it, they did it a month and a half ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to review the situation annually, renewing leases so that continued tenancy is no way jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to respond this way, but I could not leave the statements unanswered as they were made in public. In retrospect, I am sure Mr. Andras will realize some of the statements he made would have been better left unsaid, and to ensure continued co-operation and better understanding I am meeting with him in the very near future.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is a joke.

Mr. Trotter: That will be some meeting.

Mr. Nixon: This will be better.

Mr. Sargent: The minister had better quit.

Mr. Lewis: And now to rescue the shambles of what went before, a little statement on what is to come.

Mr. Speaker: Well, perhaps we might have some order then for that purpose.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Does the member feel the need of a rescue as well? I would be willing to oblige.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I announced the government would convene an Ontario Conference on Economic and Cultural Nationalism to be held from June 23 to 25 at the Medical Sciences Centre at the University of Toronto.

The conference will have placed before it a wide range of viewpoints to help put into perspective the many and diverse opinions being expressed about economic and cultural nationalism. The agenda is designed to bring forward relevant aspects of the debate, including philosophical, economic, cultural, legal and industrial points of view. From these the public will gain a greater knowledge of these important matters and the government will become further acquainted with the informed views of people who have given a good deal of thought to these complex and emotionally charged issues.

We have been fortunate to obtain distinguished speakers and panelists and can anticipate a thought-provoking discussion. In all, there will be five sessions, beginning with a dinner session on the evening of Wednesday, June 23. With the exception of a keynote address, the addresses to sessions will be followed by panel discussions of the various points raised. An open question period will conclude each session.

The topics, speakers, chairmen and panelists are as follows:

The conference will begin with the keynote address by the president of the University of Toronto, Dr. Claude Bissell. Without attempting to prejudge the outcome of the conference, Dr. Bissell will attempt to examine some of the critical issues inherent in any discussion of economic nationalism and continentalism.

Discussion on the morning of Thursday, June 24, will focus on the costs of economic nationalism. The two speakers will be the vice-president of MacMillan-Bloedel Limited, Mr. R. W. Bonner, and Professor Stephen Hymer of the New School of Social Research, New York.

Mr. A. Peacock (Windsor West): R. W. Bonner.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: The former Attorney General of British Columbia.

Mr. Peacock: The former Attorney General of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, the former Attorney General of British Columbia. The chairman of the Thursday morning session will be the vice-chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, Dr. Sylvia Ostry. Joining Mr. Bonner and Professor Hymer as panelists will be the deputy chief general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, Mr. R. M. McIntosh, and the president of Acres Limited, Mr. Norman Simpson.

The afternoon session of Thursday, June 24, will attempt to put the issue of Canadian nationalism in perspective. The two speakers will be the chancellor-elect of the University of Toronto, Mrs. Pauline McGibbon, and constitutional expert Senator Eugene Forsey. The chairman will be the dean of law at the University of Windsor, Professor W. Tarnopolsky. In addition to the panellists will be the principal speakers, the executive director of the Provincial Council for the Arts, Louis Applebaum; York University history professor Ramsay Cook; and Toronto sculptor Gerald Gladstone.

On Friday morning, June 25, the conference will deal with economic nationalism as part of Canada's future. The speakers will be the secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Labour Congress, Mr. William Dodge, and the president of the Steel Company of Canada, Mr. J. P. Gordon. The chairman will be the president of the investment firm of Harris and Partners, Mr. W. B. Harris. The panelists will include Mr. L. R. Wilson, an economist with Labatt's Breweries Limited, and Mr. F. E. Cleyn, president of the textile firm of Cleyn and Tinker of Huntington, Quebec.

The conference will conclude on Friday afternoon with a summation by the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council and dean of administrative studies at York University, Dr. James Gillies.

We have invited key organizations, Mr. Speaker, and associations to nominate delegates so that a cross section of the public will be represented at the conference. In all, we expect 350 delegates.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): How many from northern Ontario?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Does the minister regard that as a cross section?

Mr. Lewis: Does he really think that is a representative grouping? Does he?

Mr. Stokes: How many from northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are some from the north.

An hon. member: Quite a number.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The federal government and all provincial governments have been invited to participate. Municipal and regional governments will be represented, as will each party represented in this Legislature. Other delegates will be nominated by the chambers of commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and the Canadian Labour Congress, and the academic and cultural fields. A number of young people from universities and high schools will also attend, so that we may also hear from this important segment of the population. This broad range of delegates will result in a fruitful exchange of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward with enthusiasm and confidence to this conference. While I do not expect we shall arrive at any definitive answers, I believe that the informed views which we shall all hear will contribute greatly to the understanding of these important issues and will provide the basis for decisions which may be made by this and possibly other governments.

Mr. MacDonald: Eddy Goodman has been frozen out again!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, he will be invited.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A good Tory, we have got to invite him.

Mr. Nixon: Will Eagleson be there with a delegation of hockey players?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the General Welfare Assistance Act is designed for the purpose of ensuring that anyone without access to other resources will have a source of support to enable him to maintain himself with the basic necessities of life.

Recently, many municipal officials, local welfare administrators and private citizens have expressed concern over the lack of discretion at the local level as to whether a

person between 16 and 18 years of age should receive general welfare assistance.

Mr. Speaker, amendments passed by cabinet yesterday are designed to provide this discretion, in keeping with the broad intent of the legislation. One change restores to the welfare administrator the discretion to request the young person to obtain a statement from the school he is attending that it is desirable for him to continue his studies. This will be part of the criteria for determining the eligibility for assistance of any young person attending school.

The intent of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that needy students are eligible for general assistance when they are making an effort to do well in school and should stay there rather than be forced to quit and seek work.

The second change gives to the welfare administrator additional discretion in determining whether young persons who are living away from their parents' home, will be eligible for assistance.

The new provision will make ineligible a person under 18 years of age who resides away from his parental home where his parent or parents are willing to support him if he returned to live in the home. However, such a young person would nevertheless be eligible for assistance where the welfare administrator decided that it would not be in the young person's best interest to return to the parental home.

The welfare administrator could, for example, exercise this discretion where the home environment is not suitable. This will be determined by the administrator after making the appropriate assessment of the home.

In giving this discretionary power to the local municipalities who are familiar with the needs and resources of the young people who are applying for general welfare assistance, I do so with—

Mr. Sargent: The trouble is they are not using their discretion.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —I do so, Mr. Speaker, with the confidence that this programme will be administered with humanity and fairness so that those in true need will not be overlooked. All young people who are genuinely looking for work or pursuing their studies and are in need will still be helped. I also envisage that by these amendments we can prevent, in some instances, the breakdown of the family unit.

These amendments reflect a growing need on the part of governments and social service agencies to examine their services to young people under 18 years of age. I would hope, as a result of the need to exercise judgement in these cases, that many municipalities will develop a greater involvement with other community social agencies in order to provide counselling, and other supportive, rehabilitative services to keep families together.

Mr. Speaker, I have a second statement which I would like to make. I am pleased to announce that we are changing our family benefits allowance for those older people who suffered a decrease in their payment because their spouse received an increase in April of this year in his or her federal old age security and guaranted income supplement.

Although these reductions in the family benefits allowance—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —have already begun, we are making these increases retroactive to April 1 so these people who are in this category will now be receiving the same allowance they were receiving before the old age security and guaranteed income supplement was changed.

In making these changes, we are also happy to announce that all those 65 and over who are not eligible for the federal pension and who are receiving allowances under our programme, will have their maximum allowances increased by $30 monthly.

The elderly in our society have special needs. More and more in recent years, Mr. Speaker, we have come to recognize these needs and we have worked to accommodate them. The federal government, by increasing the old age security payments, has also increased the security of our senior citizens by acknowledging their special needs and position.

We at the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, are pleased to make this special provision for the needs of the elderly in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: That was a ministerial statement. That was all right.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker this morning I am advised that 11 guards employed at Millhaven penitentiary were charged with assault. There is a total

of 22 counts of assault and bodily harm with respect to a number of guards, and common assault with respect to other guards. The charges were laid this morning under the direction of Mr. Clayton M. Powell of my department. The guards will be summonsed to appear in provincial judge's court in Napanee.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY RIOTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the Attorney General, has he any further information as to the explorations that have been undertaken under his direction, basically, that would indicate further charges would be laid in connection with the Kingston riots?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of information in my office about it, none of which I feel I should make public at this time simply because it may be prejudicial to trials that will be forthcoming in the future.

I noticed today a very serious error in one of the Toronto newspapers in an editorial in which certain allegations were made respecting the words of the Crown attorney in Kingston. I checked with the Crown attorney —or my office, at my direction, checked with the Crown attorney—the other day in respect of the press reports appearing in the Toronto Globe and Mail which were completely unfounded at that time, and I think I indicated, or I meant to indicate that to the House at the time. This morning the same error was committed by editorial writers.

It starts off, to refresh the memory of the House, sir, if they read the editorial page of the Globe and Mail:

> Nine days have passed since Crown attorney John Sampson of Kingston confirmed that some inmates of Millhaven prison have been told that they would be charged with offences.

I was quite concerned about that statement originally. Mr. Sampson reiterated to my office today that no such statement has been made.

I can say for the benefit of the House that when the details are made public I think it will be—apart from everything else—a very noteworthy occurrence in our legal history in respect of this type of offence. I am afraid that I should not say anything more at this time and perhaps may not be able to say anything even after the charges are laid, but I am sure the information and the circumstances and the reasons for what the editorial writers call an "unconscionable delay" will be very readily apparent at that time.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary question: Is it yet possible to lay charges in the murder of the two inmates at Kingston?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is exactly what I have been talking about for the last five minutes.

Mr. Shulman: The Attorney General was talking about the charges against the guards. What about the two convicts?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, my understanding was that the question related to Kingston penitentiary.

SPADINA EXPRESSWAY DECISION

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier.

Can he explain to the House whether the delay in the announcement of the cabinet decision on the OMB appeal on the Spadina hearing is due to a consideration of alternatives or has, in fact, a cabinet committee been established which is seeking out additional information from those people leading in the controversy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course what is determined and discussed within cabinet is quite confidential. The decision as it relates to the OMB appeal, or the appeal from the OMB decision, will be made just as soon as possible.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is not setting a date for it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is not saying next week though?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but shortly, very shortly.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: A further question of the Premier.

Can the Premier indicate to the House when he will establish some sort of a committee of review of the agenda for the

federal-provincial conference in Victoria at which members of the House can be apprised of the government position and certain information that the Premier indicated would be made available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I undertook to the members of the House that when we had an agenda formalized available to us that I would make this available to members of the House. I also indicated there would be an opportunity to discuss the broad constitutional situation. As to whether there will be items on the agenda at this moment relating to issues other than the constitution, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier make clear what he has said in public statements already that in fact it is the intention of this government to forego a continuing discussion on constitutional matters until such time as the financial relationships between the two governments are clarified?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement. I have stated that I believe the economic situation and the unemployment situation are matters of very great concern to the people of this province. I have written to the Prime Minister of Canada suggesting that these items be placed on the agenda. At no time have I stated that Ontario will not discuss the constitutional aspect unless the unemployment or economic matters are part of any consideration.

Mr. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not. The statement in the budget address by the Treasurer made it very clear that as part of any constitutional review matters related to economics, distribution of powers—and I shall be making this point—are relevant, but at the same time this will not preclude the Province of Ontario moving forward in a very co-operative spirit to resolve those matters that were discussed by the first ministers at the February meeting.

ALLEGATION OF PLANT CLOSURE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour, has he anything further to report on the layoff of 100 workers at the Ford plant in Windsor—400 workers?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the minister: Can the minister in his findings assure the House that none of the layoffs will be as a result of transfer of operations from the Windsor plant to the Cleveland plant, with the transfer of the manager from Windsor to Cleveland?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot make that assurance.

Mr. Sargent: How about looking into it?

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition completed? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In the array of luminaries, of those who support principles of economic nationalism at this conference, can he indicate to the members those among his participants who support the Committee for an Independent Canada?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Wafflers!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there will be representatives from the committee for the independence of Canada, or for an Independent Canada, who will be invited to participate. I do not think that any of the panellists, per se, are members of that particular committee.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary; having precluded a political position, which I well understand, the Premier then felt that one could have a reasonable discussion on questions of foreign investments in Canada by excluding the entire position reflected by the Committee for an Independent Canada, and other political parties?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Indeed, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Indeed, yes. Right! Mr. Speaker, may I ask how that view will be reflected, say, in the committee on costs amongst Messrs. Bonner, Hymer, Ostry, McIntosh and Simpson. Where, in the Premier's mind, will be balance be provided for a useful discussion at the conference?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I have not personally discussed the issue with any of the people involved in making presentations, I understand that as it relates to that particular panel, there is every possibility that Professor Stephen Hymer of the New School of Social Research in New York will not have

completely the same point of view as Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps Mr. Bonner might be supported by Mr. McIntosh, Mr. Simpson and others, not knowing what Stephen Hymer will say in his address.

Mr. Yakabuski: Is it Watkins the member wants?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I expect a number of them will have this material prepared in advance, so those who are panellists and those who are part of the audience—and I would assume that the leader of the New Democratic Party will be one of the two delegates from that representative group in this Legislature—will have an opportunity—

Mr. Lewis: We are still negotiating for three.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I see. I just assumed that being leader of the party, the member would usurp for himself one of the two official positions.

Mr. Lewis: I might.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member trying very hard? Well, I wish him success.

Mr. Lewis: We will vote on it in caucus.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know the members will vote on it, but if the vote does not go according to—I will give the leader of the New Democratic Party this undertaking—if he does not succeed in a vote in his own caucus, if he cannot control it, I personally will give consideration to increasing the number so that he could be accommodated.

Mr. Speaker: Any supplementaries? Order! Has the member for Scarborough West a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker; on balance, viewing the list of names with less prejudice, does the Premier not feel that the conference is fairly seriously distorted in the direction of those who see no anxiety about the extent of foreign investment in Canada, as opposed to those who are very concerned indeed about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think you could get many points of view on this and I really try to be quite objective. I have had just the contrary expressed to me—that there is a balance here related to a position that we should have greater control over our economic resource. As I say, I guess it depends on the point of view of the individual assessing those people who are participating, and I just do not intend to prejudge yet. We will determine this during the course of the conference.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier could have had Rotstein? You could have Eddie Goodman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Goodman will be invited, I assure the member.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Parkdale has a supplementary.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): The member for Scarborough West would not want to change.

Mr. Lewis: And I am not even suggesting Laxer or Watkins!

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering—

An hon. member: Do you need the right to ask?

Mr. Trotter: —when the Prime Minister arranged for personnel at this conference, if he made any effort to invite people who had practical political experience, be it Tommy Douglas or Walter Gordon or Kierans. Were they asked or were they purposely excluded?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of people who were suggested, as the member for Parkdale puts it who have had practical political experience. Just how relevant their practical political experience might be to this kind of conference I think is very debatable.

Mr. Lewis: What sort of exercise is this? This is just a supportive position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a conference!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a supportive position, Mr. Speaker. There is no question we will get as many varying points of view as there are people presenting them.

Mr. Lewis: No, they will not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly. They may not all agree with the member's.

Mr. Lewis: I would not mind but the Premier has excluded a whole range of opinion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of what position?

Mr. Lewis: Of the right position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And what is the right position? You see, the member does not even know.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire: Would the Prime Minister purposely exclude practical politicians regardless of party? Why; what purpose is there in doing that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We did not exclude anyone from that point of view at all.

Mr. MacDonald: This exercise is not designed for action. It is designed for delay and obfuscation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

ATTENDANCE AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions of the Minister of Trade and Development; one is less pressing.

Does the minister intend to make any advance estimates of attendance at Ontario Place this weekend?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Advance estimates of attendance? I have not made any yet and I do not intend to make any, but I am sure it will be pretty damned good.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister use the word "damn"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Oh! He is fairly exercised about this subject. It is not entirely characteristic. Good for him!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me tell the hon. member that attendance records to date have been well in excess of those which were anticipated in an official prognostication made a year ago.

Mr. Lewis: An official prognostication of a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Where did the minister find it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a good question, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell the hon. member. In order to get to the bottom of this, I finally found amongst many of my documents a review that was made by engineers for Ontario Place on the basis of parking and traffic; I found that on every day except one they were well in excess; and to date the overall attendance is well in excess of that which had been anticipated.

Mr. Lewis: I see. By way of supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member sorry about that?

Mr. Lewis: No, no. I want to know how the minister would know, since Mr. James Ramsay will not consult with him and since the bags are still over the turnstiles, as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the bags are over the turnstiles. Mr. Ramsay and I are in close consultation. I know what the figures are; they have been made public. I do not know why the hon. member tries to make this look like a big secret.

Mr. Lewis: I do not consider it a big thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say "thing"; I said "secret."

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): The figures in the prognostication cited by the minister, were they based on the completion of the Spadina Expressway?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Incidentally, would the hon. member tell me whether he favours the Spadina Expressway?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Downsview does.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: I made a statement on it.

Mr. Lewis: They are taking a poll of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Of the projected cost of the $23 million or $27 million or $40 million that it is going to cost—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Try 80; that is a good figure.

Mr. Sargent: Take a figure—that is the way the minister does things.

When is the minister going to prorate this thing across Ontario the same he has done it down there, and similar projects across Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: That is a very interesting question but it is not supplementary to the attendance at Ontario Place. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: They are not consistent, Mr. Speaker. They said there would be like spending across Ontario; where are they doing it?

Mr. Stokes: Sure they are consistent. They are all located in Toronto.

Mr. Sargent: Only in Toronto!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Randall: We are going to build a subway in Owen Sound.

Mr. Sargent: When are we going to get it?

Mr. Randall: We just had a big meeting with the groundhogs and they are starting to dig.

TENANTS ON BOARD OF OHC REGIONAL PROJECTS

Mr. Lewis: My second question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker: When did the minister change departmental policy about having public housing tenants on the board of OHC regional projects?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say anything, if I recall, about any representation on regional projects; I was merely making a statement. As a matter of fact, I know of at least one representative of a tenants' association who is on the housing authority because I saw her picture in the paper yesterday, with Mr. Andras—

Mr. Lewis: With Mr. Andras?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, sure. There is no policy against that.

As a matter of fact, if local housing authorities want to appoint representatives of tenants' associations to the housing authorities they are quite at liberty to do so. We are talking here about the suggestion that they be put on the board of the Ontario Housing Corporation. I do not know whether there has been any change in policy. As far as I am concerned I do not see this as a practical application of anything intelligent at all.

Mr. Lewis: The regional housing authority of Thunder Bay, established with the approval of the Ontario Housing Corporation, has a tenant representative on the board. How is it that that tenant is able to supply the role of tenant and landlord with the approval of OHC?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the Ontario housing authorities are not landlords. The Ontario housing authorities are in a position to advise the Ontario Housing Corporation in respect of projects and plans in their own particular area.

Mr. Peacock: Why do they collect rents then?

Mr. Lewis: How do they collect the rent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are not the landlords at all.

Mr. Lewis: They just collect the rent, a function not given to landlords, I take it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not see the connection, Mr. Speaker. I think it is quite clear. I say that in my view they have no place on the housing corporation itself, which represents the taxpayers at large, and it would put them in conflict because they would be both landlords and tenants. It is not too difficult to foresee what would happen if the tenants were in control of the corporation.

Mr. Lewis: It would be a much better corporation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, if I were a tenant—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I were a tenant representative on the Ontario Housing Corporation, my view would be that tenants should not pay any rent at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary of the Minister of Trade and Development: Is it correct that one of the directors of the Ontario Housing Corporation board has himself recommended tenant participation on the board of directors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am not familiar with that, Mr. Speaker. He may have recommended this. All sorts of recommendations come from boards, commissions, authorities and so on. But at some stage or other the

buck has to stop being passed. It stops right here and some decision has to be made. This was the decision we made in this case.

An hon. member: It is all right for Confederation Life, but not for Trade and Development.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough East have a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: In view of the minister's statement that Ontario Housing Corporation tenants should not even have one representative on the nine-man OHC board, would the minister kick a present member of the OHC board off if through circumstances that person became a tenant in Ontario Housing?

Mr. Speaker: This, of course, is a theoretical question, which is not permitted by our present rules.

Has the member for Grey-Bruce a supplementary? The member for Scarborough West.

OSHAWA LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister of Labour been able to bring the parties together in the Duplate dispute in Oshawa?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with the committee and the member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) the day before yesterday. I understand some progress has been made in that respect, yes.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what precision underlines the phrase "some progress has been made"? Has management agreed to meet with the bargaining committee of the union?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I do not have the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

STEEL PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a last question on my part, of the Premier: Does the Premier intend to investigate the announced increases on the part of Stelco and Dofasco for consumer steel?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government has no intention of investigating these price increases.

Mr. MacDonald: Certainly coping out on these issues.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

JAIL FOR NON-PAYMENT OF PARKING FINES

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Attorney General: When is he going to stop this medieval system of putting people in jail for the non-payment of parking tickets?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The Highway Traffic Act is an Act of this Legislature. The hon. member has been here now for at least 10 years and I have not yet heard him produce an amendment for the consideration of the House to amend that particular Act.

Mr. Trotter: It would get shot down anyway.

Mr. Sargent: I know the minister would agree if I did bring in a bill like that he would not give it his support anyway. I have never yet seen one of our bills going through.

But does the minister not agree that this smacks of the debtor's prison, in view of the fact that if you have a debt you go to prison if you do not pay it?

The lady in the case today owed $100. She did not have the $100, so she goes to jail. Now in the area of business, would you agree that if you cannot pay your bill, you do not go to jail; you owe the bill. Because of the fact you do not have the money, you go to jail, so you—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is this the case of my constituent living on Balmoral Avenue in the city of Toronto the member is talking about?

Mr. Sargent: I should say I do not know.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member does not know that much about it?

Mr. Sargent: But does the Attorney General not agree that it is ridiculous?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think there are lots of things that are ridiculous.

LACK OF FRENCH INTERPRETERS IN TIMMINS COURT

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

Did Judge S. R. Roebuck write the Attorney General's department in January of this year complaining about the lack of adequate interpretation from French to

English in the courts of Timmins in which he complained that this is a most flagrant abuse of civil rights?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Ferrier: In view of the fact that this statement was made in the press, will the minister make an investigation of the situation in the courts in Timmins about this and take action, if necessary?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member means an investigation about the press alleging what Judge Roebuck wrote in a letter to the Attorney General, which Judge Roebuck denies writing.

Mr. MacDonald: The alleged lack of services.

Mr. Lewis: No, no!

Mr. MacDonald: Alleged lack of interpretation.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Will the members be quiet for just a minute, please? I am asking about either one or the other—the one which Judge Roebuck denies writing, or the situation in respect of the interpreting services available in the court office in Timmins.

Mr. Ferrier: As a further supplementary—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I am saying, which investigation does the member want me to do?

Mr. Ferrier: First of all, has the Attorney General been in touch with Judge Roebuck to see if there is any substance to what he said?

Secondly, will he make an investigation of the situation in those courts to make sure that there are not flagrant abuses of the civil rights of the French speaking people in those courts?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to both questions. I have already made an investigation in both cases.

Mr. Ferrier: Would the Attorney General report to the House the results of those investigations?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If they wish, I can give members the details of the bilingual services available in The Department of the Attorney General in the whole district of Cochrane—I have got it right here now; but I think that would be a matter that would be better left for the estimates of the Attorney General.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Attorney General bluffing or does he really have it there?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Right here. Mr. Speaker, just in case that last remark did not get on the record then, the leader of the NDP asked if I was bluffing. If he wants the information, I will give it to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, the member wants it later? All right then.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ACQUISITION OF PECHE ISLAND

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the minister anything further to report concerning the purchase of Pêche Island?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works put in a bid on Pêche Island yesterday.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister care to inform the House of the extent of the bid?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be appropriate at this time.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that the bids have already been opened and that none of the bids has been accepted, so the price is public knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to look into that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A supplementary question: Is the minister willing to negotiate with the owners of Peach Island, or Pêche Island, in view of the remarks that were coming forth last night that although the government's bid was below the reserve bid, the owners were going to come forth to Lands and Forests with a new proposal? Is the minister open to a new proposal?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members know, the negotiations are carried on by the Ontario Department of Public Works and this matter will be discussed at the next meeting of the OPIB, which will probably be next week.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Yorkview a supplementary ?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): No, it is a regular question.

Mr. Speaker: If not, the hon. member for High Park was on his feet. No? The hon. member for Yorkview.

POSSIBLE MOVES TO STALL AUTO PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister.

In view of the announcement that standard-size Ford cars will increase in price by $400 in the United States by June—a move likely ot be followed in Canada—is this government, in view of the fact that most of the Canadian cars are made in this province, alone or in co-operation with the federal government, making representation to the industry to prevent such a massive increase in price here in Canada through more efficient production, such as the elimination of models, yearly model changes, and other similar devices?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, firstly the question of whether there will be the same price increase in Ontario or Canada is hypothetical, although I would agree it is probable. The government has not entered into any discussions, nor are we contemplating entering into discussions, with any of the automobile manufacturers as to the cost of their product.

Mr. Lewis: Nothing about steel, nothing about cars. The government worries about inflation. They make speeches about Ottawa. They are not credible. They are just not credible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Lewis: On wages the government is eloquent about guidelines.

DECREASE IN PUBLIC HOUSING STARTS

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform me why the public housing starts in Ontario from January to the end of April this year are running at a lower rate than last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not sure that the hon. member's facts are correct, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker, can the minister explain—to be specific—why there are only 2,531 public housing starts in Ontario from January to April this year, compared with an annual rate of 9,568 last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Apparently the hon. member has the information. I do not have to get it.

Mr. Shulman: I am asking why. Why? The minister can never answer the question.

Mr. Lewis: It was the impact of your Throne Speech, that $532 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How can the hon. member have a supplementary? I have not even answered.

Mr. Shulman: In view of the Throne Speech, with the great increase in public housing, is this fall in public housing not inconsistent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Mr. Lewis: Is it not inconsistent with the minister's statement today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Singer: No; the statement itself was inconsistent.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to end up physically building the houses himself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It would be delightful if the hon. member for Scarborough West would let his own members ask their questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

OHSIP SUBSIDY

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A question of the Minister of Health: In view of the statement by the Minister of Social and

Family Services in raising the benefits to those on social and family benefits, will the Minister of Health make sure that this increase will not remove either one of the recipients of social and family benefits from the subsidy allowable for payment of their OHSIP subsidy?

Just to elaborate, this increase may put them $60 over the $1,000 entitlement for 50 per cent subsidies. Will the Minister of Health take into consideration the change in that formula so they do not lose that benefit of subsidy?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

OBSCENE LITERATURE PROSECUTIONS

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General: Does the Attorney General intend to recommend a change in policy regarding clerks in bookstores arrested for selling literature that is supposed to be obscene?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I noticed the report in the noon paper and I was quite interested in it. I really have not given the matter serious consideration, but I would be glad to have the views of the hon. member about it.

Mr. Trotter: By way of a supplementary question: Could the Attorney General explain why it is that books that have been passed by Canada customs are used in evidence as being obscene by police forces that come under his control?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sure the hon. member is aware that simply because a matter is passed either by the Attorney General's committee on obscenity, or the Canada Post Office, or the Canada Customs service, it usually does not in any way influence the courts in respect to an obscenity definition relating to the Criminal Code. I am sure the hon. member is aware of that.

Mr. Trotter: By way of supplementary: Is it not true that these cases are brought before the courts by the police forces that are under the minister's jurisdiction? Is it not true that these cases would not even be heard if the minister's police did not take the action? I am asking the minister—does he intend to make any change in the administration of the laws, in the carrying out of the law, so there is not the ridiculous court cases that we have today in regard to this question?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Again perhaps the hon. member's definition of what is ridiculous and mine are something different. In any event, as I indicated I have not given that particular subject matter serious consideration as yet, but I am always glad to do so. If the hon. member has some informed constructive criticism I would be glad to have it from him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

ALLEGED PAY CUT FOR LANDS AND FORESTS WORKERS

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Is the minister aware that approximately 30 employees of The Department of Lands and Forests in the Swastika district have been informed that their pay will be cut by an average of about three per cent, effective June 1? If he is aware of the pay cuts, can he explain why they are necessary?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

Mr. Jackson: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister make himself aware of the reasons and inform the House?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

USE OF DEEP WELLS FOR INDUSTRIAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Mines. With regard to the new regulations, which the minister announced a couple of days ago in connection with the use of deep wells in Lambton for the disposal of toxic industrial waste, why has the government not imposed upon those companies using such wells the obligation to provide an alternative water supply in the event that the existing supply of water is polluted?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I think this

matter has been gone into in some depth and detail with the industry at large, and we felt that this was the best way to move—to phase out the disposal of toxic liquid waste material into the Detroit River system. This will be done, as it was pointed out in the statement of yesterday, by October 31, 1971.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: There will be a complete phasing out by October 31, 1971?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is where this is used under pressure. Where it is going under gravity feed, it will be a year later.

Mr. MacDonald: A year later?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: A year later for the gravity.

Mr. MacDonald: May I repeat my initial question? Even in the phasing out period, in the event that there has been a poisoning of the existing water supply by the disposal of toxic industrial waste—it can happen tomorrow—is there not an obligation on the part of the government to assure the farmers and others in Lambton county that they will be given an adequate supply alternative to the supply of water?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I must point out that there has not been a contamination of the water supply, as the member points out. This is not correct. But as I said earlier, we examined the situation and we feel that this is the best course of action to take.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

USE OF FORMER SITE OF MERCER REFORMATORY

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Public Works:

In view of the vote of the Toronto city council in regard to the use of the Mercer property, does the government intend to take any other action in providing the former Mercer Reformatory property for the use of young people during the coming summer?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have had no official request or notification of the action of the city council. I read the story in this morning's Globe and Mail. As I have said previously, we were previously to discuss and negotiate with any responsible elected body—I was thinking of either the city or Metro—that would be the group that would be charged with the responsibility of operating such an operation.

Since the city apparently has rejected the idea, it would appear that the city does not want it; in that case, as far as I am concerned, the property is no longer available because the city does not want it.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Inasmuch as the board of education has voted in favour and intends to send the minister a request to that nature, will the minister reply favourably to their request?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I have had no request from anybody. I also read in the press that the solicitor of the board of education said that they did not have the authority to undertake such a project. As far as I am concerned, it is a hypothetical question.

I have no idea what the board of education proposes to do; but if the city, which is the responsible body, which would have to supply all the services, says that it does not want it, then I do not think that the board of education, which may or may not have the authority to do this, takes precedence over the wishes of the city council.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary? The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: A new question, if I could put it to the senior member of the cabinet in place of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Which one?

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: To which ministry is the question supposed to be directed?

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to direct this to the representative of the Premier, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, if he wishes to address the Prime Minister, will do so when he is in the House. There is no one else in the House, as far as I am concerned, who I have been advised can answer for the Prime Minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Whatever it is we will take it as notice.

Mr. Singer: Tell us more about that lease.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member for Scarborough East not found out how the system works yet?

Mr. T. Reid: I do not know who is responsible.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member does not know who is responsible?

FACILITIES FOR YOUNG TRANSIENTS

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask a question of the House leader, Mr. Speaker. What steps is the government taking to ensure that there are adequate facilities for travelling young people this summer throughout the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr Speaker, I will take that question as notice. It would be a matter of policy which I think would have to be discussed with my colleagues in cabinet and therefore takes—

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Trade and Development can make a statement before the orders of the day explaining.

Mr. Nixon: He can fit that into tomorrow's tirade.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

APPLICABILITY OF LABOUR LAWS TO EMPLOYEES OF US FIRMS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Can anything be done about the fact that persons hired in Ontario to work in Ontario, but who are paid from American head offices, are not subject to our laws in relation to labour—specifically, they cannot collect holiday pay for example?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will check into that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

CONSTRUCTION OF LANDS AND FORESTS BUILDING IN WINGHAM

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Could the minister tell the House what arrangements the department has made with Kennel Properties Limited in the building of the new Lands and Forests building in Wingham? I presume it is a leaseback arrangement.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I will take this as notice and give the information soon.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

APPLICATION OF WELFARE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. In his announcement today about general welfare and its application, what does he mean when he uses the phrase "appropriate assessment of the home," to be made by the municipal welfare official in the determination of the granting of the allowance?

Hon. Mr. Wells: What we mean by that is the regulations have been so amended that they read—and that is a paraphrase—where the welfare administrator is of the opinion after making appropriate inquiries, that it is not contrary to his best interest—that is, of the recipient or applicant—to reside in the home of his parents.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker—in fact, I believe—that will mean the welfare administrator will be able to bring into play all those various social agencies that a good social service department has available to it, to make assessments of the home, provide counselling services and do the kind of things that can perhaps prevent a family break-up, or a young person going on welfare, when they do not need to.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does that mean the welfare administrator will then assume the role of calling a number of social agencies to make investigations and inquiries about the conduct of family relationships within individual homes? Is that what the minister means?

The phrase is very clear. The minister says in his statement, "This will be determined by the administrator after making the appropriate assessment of the home." What specifics will this assessment include?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the assessment will depend upon what ground rules each welfare administrator wishes to lay down within the general parameters that we have laid down in the legislation here. He will be able to use the resources available to him and the community to find out if the home situation is such that the person can or cannot live there, or if it is detrimental for that young person to be in that home situation. If he then discovers that

is the case, then that will be just cause for him to grant welfare to that person; but if he finds the opposite, then he will have a right or a responsibility to not grant welfare.

Mr. Lewis: Two very quick supplementaries to that, Mr. Speaker, just to understand it. What ground rules is the minister giving to the administrators themselves within the parameter of his ground rules? Why is he allowing them to vary, I gather, from municipality to municipality across the province?

Secondly, what municipal administrator across the Province of Ontario has the time, the money, the sensitivity, the expertise, the knowledge involved, to draw all these factors together to make that kind of judgement under the present system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker: I believe, of course, that a lot of them have the time, the knowledge and the sensitivity. They are a professional group of people, just as there are many other professional groups. Many of them have available to them the professional expertise, whether in their own department or in the community, to do this job properly. I prefer it done that way than in a holus-bolus way which is, apparently, the way it is being done now, where it is an automatic right, if someone walks in, and without any investigation or attempt to bring a family together, welfare is given automatically. Now you take your choice.

Mr. Jackson: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Jackson: In municipalities where the welfare administration is looked after by the town clerk, who has no expertise whatsoever in many cases, would the minister not consider in this case that the welfare person will more than likely just say, "we will refuse it" rather than go into all of the investigation that he is speaking of.

Hon. Mr. Wells, I would hope—and to paraphrase a Globe and Mail editorial of about a month ago—that those municipalities that have put their welfare and social service problems in this type of person would look around and get someone who has the sensitivity and confidence to handle it in the light of the kind of way it should be handled.

Mr. Jackson: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister making the financing available to these small municipalities so that they can hire the persons with the expertise?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well Mr. Speaker, there are provisions under the arrangement with the municipalities now to cover the financing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale has a question?

MALVERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Is there any possibility in the near future of the minister giving a statement as to the situation at the Malvern project? I understand they are still further behind than they expected.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is not only a possibility, there is a great likelihood of my making a statement very shortly on that situation.

Mr. Singer: That would go down in the annals with the other 20 statements.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Downsview does not usually get all steamed up until after the dinner hour. What happened to him today?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I do not necessarily agree with the editorial comment about being behind the situation where we had planned on it at this stage.

Mr. Nixon: No, his officials will inform him about that.

Mr. Trotter: A supplementary question: Does the minister have any idea how many—

Mr. Singer: The minister is at his worst.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So is the member.

Mr. Trotter: —housing units will be available to be occupied in the Malvern project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I could not hear the hon. member for the interruptions from the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Yes; pay attention.

Mr. Trotter: Does the minister have any idea how many housing units will be available to be occupied in the Malvern project by the end of 1971?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be making a statement on this—and I do not know whether it will be bland or provocative—I think we are going to have to wait until that time.

Mr. Nixon: The minister does not usually get so funny until after the dinner hour.

Mr. Trotter: Seventeen years.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Mr. Singer: He was better back in Correctional Institutions. There was not so much to get back at.

Mr. Nixon: And on city council!

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting the borough of Scarborough.

The commissioners of estate bills having reported that it is not reasonable that the following bill should pass into law, such bill shall not be further considered, as provided in standing order 61(e):

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the borough of Etobicoke.

Mr. Villeneuve, from the standing human resources committee, reported the following resolution:

RESOLVED,

that supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of The Department of Health be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972:

Department of Health

Departmental administration programme	$ 19,995,000
Public health programme	76,851,000
Mental health programme	190,074,000
Health services insurance programme	549,494,000
Health insurance registration programme	16,257,000
Ontario hospital services programme	136,881,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this bill are to strengthen or clarify a number of existing provisions in The Public Lands Act and to assign the administration and control of the construction of dams to the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 29, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister why is it necessary to bring in legislation just to stop up a through road or to make any change in the thoroughfares entering or leaving a provincial park? Could this not be accomplished just by a regulation to the existing Provincial Parks Act rather than an Act to amend it?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is there any other member who wishes to speak? This is a second reading debate, the minister will speak finally. Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill before the minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, presently what we have are warning signs and no offence is committed if persons who go into the park do not wish to obey them. We feel that for public safety and better management of the park people should obey these signs. If they do not obey the signs, it should be an offence in the same way as it is under The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed!

FORESTRY ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend The Forestry Act.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister what is the purpose of the amendment—it is not too clear—and what are supplementary agreements?

Mr. Speaker: Any other member wishing to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister may reply.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, as mentioned in the bill this amendment provides for supplementary agreements and the term of any supplementary agreements made. For instance, in 1967 the definition of forestry purposes was enlarged considerably and the definition includes the production of wood and wood products, the provision of proper environment controls for wild life, protection against flood and erosion, recreation and production of water supplies. The amendment was the legislative confirmation of the concept of the multiple use of the forests. In the Act, as it stands now, the agreements have to be for 20-year periods and, in view of these new agreements, which are mainly for recreational purposes and with conservation authorities and municipalities, it is deemed advisable that there should be shorter terms. They will be mainly five-year periods, so this is the purpose of this amendment.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed!

FISH INSPECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend The Fish Inspection Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment or two. The bill, I understand, simply sets our regulations or our statutes in parallel with the federal statute so that the jurisdictions can work closely together.

I do feel, however, that on the principle of this bill it might be worthwhile raising the matter of the inspection standards, particularly with reference to some of the areas which have rendered fish inedible or unfit for human consumption under the direction of this government and the government of Canada.

I refer specifically to that level, 0.5 parts per million of mercury, which many officials have said might be dangerous if, in fact, the fish were eaten under regular circumstances and probably to the exclusion of other protein.

Surely, when we are talking about fish inspection—and we see the powers of the inspectors, who in fact have closed down fisheries in many parts of this province—if there is some real reason to believe that these standards are inordinately high and that they could be changed without endangering anyone as long as it was understood that in cases of special diet the fish might possibly be dangerous if it were eaten in large quantities and to the exclusion of other protein, surely there is some mid-position between the closing down of the fisheries and the stopping of the sale of the fish from our normal fisheries in Canada. There is the danger, of course, of permitting fish that might be dangerous to human consumption.

Now if it is dangerous, and we must continue with a complete ban, of course there should be no question at all. But Mr. Speaker, this ban has been called into question not only by the minister who is moving this bill, but ministers and officials in other departments and at the federal level as well.

Maybe it is time that we should take another careful look at this. For example, we say in northwestern Ontario that you cannot eat the fish from those great sport fishing areas at all. I never heard of anybody up there making a complete diet of fish, and it may be that the danger from the pollution in these fish is much less than is indicated. We all deeply regret the mercury pollution which seems to be irreversible.

That is another issue, but certainly if qualified people feel that the ban has been sort of an overcompensation and it is perhaps unnecessary, perhaps we should advise that the inspection of our fish products be somewhat modified in this area. This is probably, Mr. Speaker, not an appropriate time when the minister could give his views specifically. But it has occurred to me when we see the great tourist outfitting establishments in northwestern Ontario closing down and these

markets completely cut off in a community such as Ontario, where the use of fish is of very minimal quantity in the protein diet anyway, it seems, perhaps, that there is an alternative that we have not considered carefully.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering in The Act to amend The Fish Inspection Act, why some provision was not made in it to control or to inspect or to regulate the use of fish that is handled through other than an agency of the Fresh Fish Marketing Board.

I am thinking specifically of fish that is caught by anglers whereby the minister, by his own admission, has said that there is no posting of signs to warn the public that there may be a danger from eating certain species of fish in areas that are contaminated by mercury, either through industrial or natural causes. I am wondering why there is nothing in the bill to make provision for the inspection of fish near the source—you know, where they are caught—rather than having to send them away. I understand that the only place at the present time for the analysis of these fish is out of the province; the nearest one, I think, is in Winnipeg.

There is no provision for an inspection station for people who, as a result of statements issued by the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, may be in danger from eating fish that have unusually high and dangerous quantities of mercury in them.

The minister has suggested that they are coming up with some kind of a formula whereby a fish below a certain weight or a certain length are going to be declared edible whether they come from a commercial fisherman or whether they are caught by individual anglers and sportsmen. I am wondering why there was no provision made in this Fish Inspection Act to provide some facilities for people who, whether it be information disseminated by this minister or by some other department of government that there may be a hazard from eating quantities of fish in certain areas. There does not seem to have been any provision made for passing out this information in a way that everybody who might have reason to eat fish may be fully and amply protected by some method of inspection or for anybody who might want to have an analysis made of fish from any area and from any source.

One final comment that I would like to make on the bill Mr. Speaker is, I am wondering, since the commercial fishermen themselves have expressed considerable reservation about the marketing of fish through the Fresh Fish Marketing Board—which is a sort of a joint project, or a joint corporation under the auspices of the federal Department of Fisheries and this department, The Department of Lands and Forests—and have been quite critical of the operation of that board, whether in bringing in this Act there has been any consultation undertaken with the commercial fishermen to assure them that everything in this Act is in their best interests and whether or not anything should have been incorporated in this Fish Inspection Act that the duly accredited representatives of the commercial fishermen have been bringing to his attention and to his fish and wildlife branch over the past several months. I am wondering if there has been any consultation with these people?

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to participate? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill, there are two of three principles enacted here that are new to the old Act.

Firstly, I might pose a couple of questions to the minister for clarification on these particular principles. Since the minister is in line with the federal Act, is the minister in fact going to be doing away with any duplication of inspection services, or are the minister's conservation officers located in the commercial fishing areas still going to enforce the minister's Act, or do they have power to enforce the federal Act? Similarly or conversely, do the federal officials move into areas that have been within the minister's own jurisdiction? Possibly, the minister might clarify that for myself.

I note one new word in the Act. That is the word "tainted," I wonder if that word has crept into the Act because of the mercury pollution or why that particular word has been included in the Act.

Further in the subsections, the minister is now getting powers to prescribe the duration and territorial limitations in terms and conditions for exempting classes and establishments of persons. Is the minister, through this section, saying that he now has the power to ban commercial fishing in certain lakes or parts of certain lakes? In fact has the minister been acting outside his authority

when he has banned the commercial fishing in certain of these lakes? If so, I think this puts a whole new onus on the department for the activities during the past year or year and a half since we have had this scare.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, first may I say that this Act deals only with commercial fishing, not with sport fishing.

With reference to commercial fishing, the 0.5 parts per million which is the level of mercury that is allowable in fish has been set by the federal Department of Health, the Food and Drug Directorate. I for one agree with the hon. member's remarks, and he knows a lot of my colleagues also agree, that this 0.5 parts per million may not be a realistic figure, especially today when a lot of the mercury in northern Ontario is from natural background levels.

However, this is the figure. We have made representations to Ottawa. The matter is under active consideration and we hope that sometime in the future this could be raised maybe to a higher level. But at the present time, this is set by the federal Department of Health and it is mainly set because a lot of the fish is exported to the United States.

The member for Thunder Bay made a few remarks, again with reference to the inspection. We are dealing with commercial fishing in this Act, we are not dealing with sport fishing. I believe the fish, though, that you buy in the grocery stores, to my knowledge, is inspected the same as meat. Meat is subject to inspection and so is fish. The standards are to be set by regulations after the amendment to this Act has been passed.

The member referred to the fresh-fish marketing board. I hope to have a statement within the next few days that should be very beneficial to the commercial fishermen, especially those in northwestern Ontario.

This Act, Mr. Speaker, I would think would meet the approval of the commercial fishermen because all we are doing here in this Act is more or less to conform with the federal Act, and these are the main provisions.

The member for Essex South made reference to having our own conservation officers. The definition within the Act of inspector is enlarged by including conservation officers, thereby removing the necessity of separate appointments for the provincial officers. He referred to the words: "tainted, decomposed or unwholesome" and again, the reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is to conform to the federal Act.

In the administration of the federal Act, which is complementary to the provincial Act, the federal department has experienced a number of difficulties and has recommended that the provincial Act be amended to bring it in line with the amendments that were recently made to the federal Act, and one of the principles of the Act, as originally enacted, was the prohibition of the sale of fish that were not "wholesome or fit for human consumption." Those were the words in the existing Act. They had difficulties in enforcement; there was a case that went to the courts, and it could not be enforced. So the difficulties of enforcement have arisen, and the federal department has found it necessary to use the words: "tainted, decomposed, unwholesome" and provide for the definition of these terms.

He also referred, I believe, to the last part of the Act, about the acceptance, and the reason why we are making the provision that we can make exceptions to the regulation, Mr. Speaker, is to take care of the plant and establishment of processors in appropriate cases. Processing facilities in the Province of Ontario vary from sophisticated plants in his area, like the one at Wheatley on Lake Erie, to very rudimentary cleaning plants in northern Ontario by our native population. It will be evident that we cannot apply the same standards across the province but our educational programmes in respect of the fish industry in northern Ontario should assist in bringing up the standards in the north.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of clarification. This was not the point I was making on that last section I spoke to regarding the duration and territorial limitations. I have been speaking in relation to the commercial fishermen themselves having that imposed upon them, and the minister relates this to the processors.

Could the minister clarify that more? Are processors going to be limited in certain areas as to where they can acquire fish from commercial fishermen?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Which section is that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Paterson: This is subsection (d) on page 2.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Subsection (d)?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, of section 3.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is this the section here:

Requiring and governing the issuance, form, renewal, transfer, refusal and cancellation of licences for establishments and persons handling, processing, storing, grading, transporting or marketing fish . . .

—and so on?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, is the minister, in fact, limiting the areas from where fish processing plants can acquire products from commercial fishermen, through this section?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is not my understanding, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, this will not apply to certain areas in the north where we have a lot of native people; we should not require them to conform to strict regulations.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

GANANOQUE LANDS ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 31, An Act to amend The Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Just one brief question, Mr. Speaker. Why is it necessary to amend the Act of 1961 and 1962? Why does the Minister need an alternate method of disposal of ungranted parts of the land described in the schedule of the Act? Why does all this become necessary?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason why we have to bring in this amendment is because the town has not seen fit to dispose of it themselves, so we have had requests from adjacent owners. It is a small parcel of land. It is an acre, no more than an acre, and there are adjoining owners and we feel that this landlocked parcel of land should be disposed of. It is not required for government purposes and it would make for better land management for the municipality and all concerned.

Since this was an Act which was brought in in 1961-1962, my understanding is that it is the only way we can deal with it, if the municipality does not wish to do so.

Mr. Stokes: It is Crown land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, it is Crown land.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Will the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed to.

CROWN TIMBER ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, there are several principles in the bill but most of them deal with licensing.

In the first section, my understanding is that this gives the minister the right to put out volume licences, and I am sure we agree with that. However, in the second section, we come to the point where certain operators of mills will, when they run short of timber, have a right to petition to the department for extra wood, or extra timber; and the department can say, to the present licensee of timber surrounding that mill, that he has to supply the mill. Well in my opinion it is a continuation of the third-party licensing agreements, and for many years we said that they should be totally eliminated. If the licensee has property or holding timber, and is not using that timber, then surely the department should take it away from him.

Under the present system, if the present licensee is forced into an agreement where he has to supply the mill, he still has the right to charge a fee, which makes the wood, in many cases, too expensive for the mill operators. It cuts down on the profits of the man who is seriously trying to provide employment. And I would say to the minister that section 2, in my opinion, should say to the present licensee that if he is not going to use that timber, then he gives up the licence and the mill operator or another licensee who will exploit the resources can take it over and exploit to the benefit of the people.

To go on into section 3, and it is also a continuation of the third-party agreement, and the minister has certain penalties to deal

with the licensee's refusal to obey a ministerial order under section 2. Well surely that section, if it is really going to have teeth—and again I must repeat before I go on, Mr. Speaker, that we would just as soon not have third-party agreements, they should be totally eliminated in my opinion—but if this section is going to have any teeth then we should do away with the system of fines, and when the licensee refuses to obey a ministerial order there should be just a total cancellation of the licence, so then the minister can apportion out the wood to where it is needed.

And I would say to the minister that the whole principle of the bill continues a system of licensing that has not worked, and in some cases has really been detrimental to the orderly exploitation of resources. And I would suggest that instead of trying to tighten up the third-party agreements he should eliminate them, and so that he would have a bill that has some teeth in it he should eliminate the two last sections. I would suggest that the minister look into it and maybe bring back an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a few comments that I would like to make on Bill 43. I have had considerable dialogue with the minister and members of his department as a result of The Crown Timber Act over the past several months, and I am wondering why the minister did not choose to use the volume agreement rather than the present method of allocating timber by licence, having regard to the needs of certain mills and certain operators for certain species of timber in given areas.

The volume agreement seems to be working well. I suspect that the only reason he falls back on the licensing of literally tens of thousands of square miles of Crown land is because he does not have an adequate inventory of the resources in any given area; so that he just gives them, as my colleague from Lakeshore would say, carte blanche the right to large feudal domains, having no regard for their needs of certain species or the needs of others who might be able to establish a very viable sawmill or plywood or wood processing operation if maximum use of our timber resources were made.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a good many of the users who have been in the business for many, many years—and I can think of one in particular, Northern Wood Preservers in Thunder Bay, who I am told have no licensed areas of their own of any significant amounts—are forced to go cap in hand and make agreements, third party agreeemnts I suppose, if you will, with the prime licence holders. I think it is fair to say that between 15 and 20 prime licence holders across the province have effective control over 100,000 square miles of boreal forest, and I think in many cases to the detriment of other people who are interested in getting in and establishing some kind of wood-using industry.

I think of what happened several years ago in the Sioux Lookout area, where there was some serious thought given to the establishing of a pulp mill in the area because of the tremendous amounts of unused allowable cut, I think that there was a licence transfer to one of the major companies which indicated a willingness to set up a pulp and paper mill in that area. The transfer was made—the minister chooses to call it a transfer, I choose to call it trafficking in licensed areas with no assurance by the recipient of those licences that anything by way of industrial development, by way of providing employment, is going to happen.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what happened in the case of the transfer of a large licence to certain companies in the Sioux Lookout area. Yet we are still looking for a plywood mill; we are still looking for a pulp and paper mill in the Sioux Lookout area and the minister and members of his staff had indicated for the last number of years that there is sufficient wood to justify the construction of a mill.

I think that as a result of the activities of the advisory committee on Quetico, it became quite clear that there was lots of elbow room for reallocation of timber limits to satisfy the needs of everybody in the business; and indeed adequate unused allowable cut for many more mills. But it seems to me that because a very few companies throughout the province had been able to tie up large tracts of land, much in excess of the amounts that they can ever use themselves even on a sustained yield basis, it makes very little sense to us in this party that the minister should perpetuate the kind of timber licensing that he has engaged in for the past number of years.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that some provision should be made in The Crown Timber Act that if, over a reasonable period of time, these prime licence holders have not indicated that they are prepared to use close to a maximum allowable cut on a given area, those licences should be returned to the

Crown and re-assigned to people who are interested in harvesting stands of timber of all species to provide much needed employment opportunities in many areas in northern Ontario. Particularly, we would have liked to have seen something in this, that The Department of Lands and Forests would have retained to themselves the power to allocate licences rather than a transfer of this authority in the hands of someone else whose own personal interest might not be in the best interests of a particular area or region or indeed the province itself.

I would like to refer the minister and the House to something that I raised during the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests: The exclusive right to two species, that the minister chose to call weed species, the hardwood species, which is the poplar and the birch. In most instances the allocation of this timber rests with the prime licence holder. The minister, for reasons that he has never been able to explain to me, has vested this authority in someone else who is a secondary user and who operates, you might say, under a third-party agreement. He has the right to play God insofar as the allocation of those two species to someone else who might be interested.

I notice the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs listening with some degree of interest. For his edification, it is almost like giving Weyerhaeuser Company, which operates close to his area, the power to say who gets all of the birch and all of the poplar in an area which is 15,000 square miles. The department has no say in who gets that timber. The department and this minister have given that say to someone else who can play dog in the manger to the detriment of other users and other people who are seeking employment and who could provide some viability to certain areas.

The minister has indicated that this is going to be changed. But the minister, simply by issuing a ministerial directive, can transfer that authority, that power to allocate huge tracts of standing merchantable timber either to hold it for themselves, when they can never hope to use more than a small degree of that timber, or to say they can dole out a few hundred cords here or a few hundred cords there. I think that the minister is really abdicating his responsibility when he allows people who are operating a plywood mill or a sawmill to obtain that right, when he gives that right to this operator to allocate timber to other users or people who have needs of those species. The minister has not adequately explained to me and to other people who are badly in need of timber why he has not reserved this right to himself and to his department, to allocate licensed areas or areas under volume agreement based on the needs of certain entrepreneurs in the area rather than allow somebody else, as I say, to play God on 15,000 square miles or huge tracts of land in our boreal forest.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a little misconception to what this Act says here. Section 2 refers to timber produced from time to time by the licensee. This does not deal with the third-party situation, so I believe a lot of the discussion, as far as this bill is concerned, is irrelevant.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, on section 2, may direct the licensee to offer to new operators the first opportunity to purchase timber products produced by the licensee. A number of mill operators have been unable to secure supplies of timber for their mill operations directly from the Crown because the Crown timber in the area is already under licence to timber operators.

Mr. Stokes: That is the whole point. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. Jackson: That is the third party agreement.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Under this new provision, Mr. Speaker, the minister will be able to assist these mill operators to continue their operations. This will assist in maintaining operations in communities that are threatened with unemployment and will result in greater integration of operations between timber licensees and mill operators and better utilization of different classes of timber.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this does not refer to third party licences. This is wood cut by the original licensee. The member for Timiskaming referred to penalties. He, if I understood him correctly, said that he would do away with the penalties and cancel the licences.

Mr. Jackson: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would be advisable. I do believe that sometimes a penalty reminds the licensee and we have the authority now—there is authority now in the Act—to cancel the licence at any time. We do believe that a penalty as outlined in the Act here—

Mr. Stokes: Why does the minister not use it then?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —will be very helpful, just to strengthen the Act.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay mentioned also about a possible mill that could be built in the Sioux Lookout area. It is quite true. I would like to say to the hon. member that at the present time, various government departments, including my own and others, have been giving this serious consideration. We have a task force that has been established and we hope, sometime in the near future, to be able to give the results of the work of this task force. There is considerable work under way involving various matters to try to make our forest operations more economical.

Again, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this bill, this bill deals only with wood, as mentioned in the Act, that is produced by the licensee on new species that could be used by existing mills in the area.

Mr. Stokes: Could I ask a question of clarification?

Mr. Speaker: If it is specifically clarification, yes.

Mr. Stokes: The minister says that this is for the purpose of allocating timber on the basis of need. Is the minister going to stop issuing the directives that he is issuing now and vesting this authority in the hands of other people other than his own department? The minister has been issuing directives.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This directive—the authority will be under our department.

Mr. Stokes: It will?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Jackson: Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister agree with Committee of the Whole?

Agreed.

INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 45, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: A one-line amendment—10 words—is the basis for the largest, single source of revenue for the Province of Ontario, our share of the income tax collected by agreement with the government of Canada. The growth in the value of this particular item, as outlined in the Treasurer's statement which goes back just to centennial year, 1967, is phenomenal.

In that year, on the basis of our share of the income tax, we received about $550 million and this statute, it is predicted, will accrue $1.5 billion to our provincial revenues. This amendment simply says that our share will be 28 per cent in respect of the 1972 taxation year.

It is interesting, in doing some simple division, that in 1967 a percentage point was worth about $20 million. The value of each percentage point has almost doubled. Each one, it is projected this year, will be worth just under $38 million.

There has been a continuing argument between the provincial governments—not just this one—and the government of Canada over the fair apportionment of what is agreed is in fact a shared responsibility to collect income tax.

Most people agree—and I would think almost every member of the government would be in that group—that we should not have a separate means of collecting income tax in this province if, in fact it can be avoided.

It is not my intention to argue the pros and cons, because this statute certainly intends to continue the sharing of not only the revenues, but the continuation of the agreement on the basis of the collection of income tax so that we do not have a proliferation of authority, that it is made as simple and as painless as such a heavy tax can be, and certainly we approve of this.

I think, however, it is often easy to forget that by the approval of this statute we in fact impose a tax on the citizens of this province, the revenue from which amounts to more than $1 billion—by far our largest single source of income.

And, as far as I am concerned, it cannot be reiterated too often by an opposition politician or a government politician that this is in fact a provincial tax and would not be levied if it were not for the decision taken by this government. And in every case so far has been supported by the Legislature because it is

the fairest possible tax. It is related to the ability to pay, and I think that it should be generally accepted as the fairest possible tax.

The clouds in the understanding of just what are the powers in this statute are generally related to charges that have come, I would say, from misinformed people, some of them in the highest levels of government, that somehow or other we do not have the power to increase the income from this source or in fact decrease it if we so decide as members of this Legislature.

There have been propositions put by the Treasurer himself and others, that the time has come to reduce taxation. The level of taxation, as far as we are concerned, has not changed very much. But the income from the unchanging base has doubled since centennial year, 1967. I have heard it said—and frankly I believe in it wholeheartedly—that one of the basic powers of democracy is that the government which spends the money should have the political responsibility to raise it by taxation.

Would it not be marvellous if in fact every municipal government had the responsibility, through taxation, to raise all the money it spends? And would it not be simple if the Province of Ontario, through direct taxation, had access to a tax base and tax fields which would finance all of our programmes? But we know, I think, as modern politicians—people who are perhaps not expert in these areas but at least have become inured to the arguments on both sides—that we will never return to the position where each government has direct and unoverlapping responsibilities for its own tax policies.

The municipalities complain about the attitudes of the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales). The provinces complain about the attitudes of the government of Canada and particularly the Minister of Finance. This sort of contention I suppose, has got to be inborn in an arrangement where there has to be the sharing of these responsibilities. There are complaints levelled by this government and other provincial governments against the policies of the Government of Canada about too much centralization, not enough consultation in the adjustment of tax base and not enough of block grants in transfer of public moneys without strings attached. Precisely the same complaints are levelled at this administration, and in fact at this Legislature, by those who have these responsibilities at the municipal level.

For that reason, I think that this particular statute ought to be a basis of a good deal of continuing education among ourselves as politicians but, more importantly, among the taxpayers. They tend to think that when they send off a cheque in response to the law which requires them to pay income tax, or they look at the deduction week by week or month by month from their paycheque, that it is the government of Canada that has this primary responsibility and it is often overlooked—even in this House, as well as in the electorate and the taxpaying public at large—that the power for the collection of these taxes in this province and our share of it, amounting to more than $1 billion, is in the 10 words in the operative part of the amendment that we are discussing this afternoon.

Now, I am aware of the problems that would be experienced in reducing the percentage involved in this amendment. Obviously we would have a lower income, and that is of course obvious, but the Minister of Revenue has said, and his predecessor has said on many occasions, that except insofar as they are part of the cabinet council, they do not make policy on this and they are simply a collection office. That must be a very simple task, the collection of this amount of money, since it is simply a transference from the Treasury of Canada to the consolidated revenue fund of this province—a very simple project indeed.

And this is why we support the collection agreement, because not only is it simple for the Minister of Revenue but it is simple for the taxpayers and surely the costs of collection are kept at a minimum because of this. And basically it is why we, in this party, object so strongly to any suggestions that have been coming frequently, and more and more frequently, from the government, that we may have to resort to the previous status in a separate collection system in the province.

Now, we look at this bill, which is an amendment to The Income Tax Act 1961-1962, and an examination of that statute shows that it is fully worked out as a provincial responsibility with the responsibilities vested in the Treasurer, not the Minister of Revenue, but the Treasurer of Ontario to enforce the collection and to make agreements on behalf of this province. As we look at the amendments since, they have all been basically changes in the percentage share of what used to be called the abatement. But since the statement of the Minister of Finance, now many months ago—the taxation white

paper—we do not use the word abatement, it is simply our share based on the collection agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the amendment and its wording here, I would challenge anybody to fathom the meaning of the various clauses and phrases as you trace it back through the amendments to the original statute in 1961. It is just a completely meaningless mishmash of words. And we, having confidence in the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler), are prepared to say that I suppose it is effective and that somebody will send us our cheque for $1,050 billion. And he, in turn, has confidence in somebody sitting under the gallery that this strange collection of phrases and references, back year by year to the original statute, is the best and most effective and most meaningful way to indicate to the public who might want to know on what basis they have to pay these huge sums for what the basis in law, in fact, is.

Well, I suppose there is no problem with it. As I say, there are 10 words of some meaning, and those are "the 28 per cent of the taxes collected will rebate"—not abate, but rebate—to the Province of Ontario.

I want to make it clear that the government opposite, and the opposition, as far as we have powers to move amendments to reduce taxation, at least can reduce taxation in this province on the basis of our income tax at least changing this statute or amending it. It is not going to be changed. It has not been changed for some time because its revenue grows at an extremely rapid rate without adjusting the percentages or the rate of taxation at all. It is just as true that if, in the future, or even at present, the income of this province is needed to support programmes for the development of the community of Ontario, and if the revenues should, in the judgement of the government, be increased, that this is the measure upon which the increase in revenue can be achieved.

The Minister of Revenue is well aware that other provinces have used this machinery to increase their own revenues on their own responsibility. The flaw in the argument is that all we can control here, if we continue with the agreement, is simply the rate which is rebated to the province, and therefore the total tax taken out of the province over which we have jurisdiction. But so far we have no control over the tax base whatsoever, other than through negotiation.

We can talk about negotiation. I suppose this is the crux of what the taxation collection agreement is all about and I am sure that this government has found out over the last few years that bluster and bombast and political confrontation will achieve nothing in improving the right that this province should have to negotiate with the government of Canada in the tax base as it is changed. I feel that the government of Ontario has performed a substantial disservice, not only to the taxpayers in this province, but in other provinces, in the political method that it has chosen to attempt to change the federal tax base.

It is not an occasion, I think, for any great homilies about how one deals with other governments. You have heard me on this on other occasions, but I would simply continue to recommend to the Minister of Revenue, in case he ever gets to talk to the Treasurer, who is the leading proponent of the present policies in negotiation, that much more can be accomplished, not with sweetness and honey, that sort of thing, but with a business-like approach to negotiation—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: —with the absence of the kind of political confrontation which more and more has been the earmark of this government's policy in dealing with its sister provinces and with the government of Canada.

I would say that the approaches of this government will accomplish nothing but simply further hiding of the responsibilities that lie with this government in the setting of tax rates as well as in the expenditure of funds for public purposes.

If the government opposite decides that the income tax in this province should be reduced, as they have said on many occasions, then this is the statute which empowers us to reduce the tax. It is true the reduction would not take effect tomorrow, but that is what agreements are all about, and by agreement, there is a certain sequence of events which would end in the reduction of income tax payable by the wage earners, the citizens of this province in due course.

On the other hand, if the government opposite feels that it requires more funds to finance its programmes, this is the fairest and best way to achieve that increase in revenue. But it carries with it the political responsibility to announce that it favours tax increases and to pass a statute which will require it, through the machinery of the agreement, to increase our revenues. All the rest of it is really political falderal; we do have within our own grasp our own fiscal destiny, and if there are obvious complaints with the

agreement, which is another issue entirely, the agreement can be improved. And the agreement will be improved, I trust, as long as other provinces as well as Ontario are negotiating with the government of Canada and are approaching it on a more reasonable businesslike, rational, basis. We do not intend to—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It would help if we were met by a more reasonable approach.

Mr. Nixon: Right. I would simply suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if there is fault it does not lie entirely on one side.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You are so right; so right!

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): This is the side we have got to complain to.

Mr. Nixon: So, Mr. Speaker, the statute, as I say 10 words—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Do not subside into submission.

Mr. Nixon: The statute, Mr. Speaker, is the most powerful statute on our books as far as the funding of government programmes is concerned. That if the government does not believe that it can accomplish the kind of taxation agreement in the future which it needs to fund its programmes, then, of course, it will have to revert to a separate collection agency which is within its undoubted power. We, on this side, reject that as a reasonable alternative. It is always there as a last resort for any government. But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government has not fulfilled its proper responsibilities in these negotiations. That for all of its complaints it still stands pat at the 28 per cent figure, not having the courage of its convictions when it says taxes should be lowered, in fact, to lower them, or on the other hand to say that as we need more money in the province to fund our programme, to increase the rate.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): What is the Leader of the Opposition's policy?

Mr. Nixon: So, Mr. Speaker, we are not opposing the bill in principle. I wanted to put these views before you simply to draw attention to the importance of this statute and the fact that the government has not been able to come to grips with the use of this statute as an instrument of its own policy.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Do not push it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken, I will not say, too trenchantly, but certainly well, on the issue of this bill. He has touched the bases as he came in for his slide, and has not been tagged out as yet, as far as I can see. I congratulate him for ranging widely on this particular issue and bringing in that background material, constitutional and otherwise, which so mesmerizes, it seems, the government of this province vis-à-vis the federal government.

May I suggest, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that were it not for the hon. Leader of the Opposition's intervention in these debates his party would be totally derelict apparently with respect to them. He comes in as the great bailer-outer, and on occasion after occasion watches performances during the afternoon. So, I think his tenure in office as the leader will be extended for quite a long time. Nobody else could even get close to him or take his place.

Hon. Mr. White: A couple of long faces over there when they hear that remark.

An hon. member: Is the member for Huron-Bruce after it?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): No, I am not.

Mr. Jackson: The member for Huron-Bruce is playing the deck.

Mr. Gaunt: That is why I am stalling.

Mr. Lawlor: There are two headings of importance in this particular regard. One lies as a threat on the part of the Treasurer of the province to move into the income tax field on their own should they not be conceded the various proposals made under his taxation scheme. And as it has been said previously in this House, some of the things you have proposed to the federal government in terms of qualifications and revamping the proposed Benson legislation are altogether meritorious and commendable, and Benson should bow. The tax credit concept as worked into that legislation—not the tax credit concept as you abuse it, by going off unilaterally into isolated areas to impose it—but within the overall scheme of an income tax Act it certainly has validity.

I think we will all agree that within the next few days we will have finally come to a climacteric with respect to almost a decade of hullabaloo over the whole restructuring or redistribution of taxes in this country. We wait batedly upon the minister in Ottawa, the bringing down of his budget in the near future and what form the revamping will take with respect to our total position. Whatever form that may take, I think that your thrust to the government that you will set up your own scheme should be highly scouted to say the least. The truncations that are taking place in this country at the present time can only be rendered irreversible and, for the purposes of the continued unity and life of this country, totally destructive if you proceed on that course with an overwhelming reason.

I do not know whether Benson will bring in the integration proposals or not. I know we are thoroughly opposed to them, but I say to you that even if we find them unpalatable, we over here do not find integration in its second sense—namely, the integration of capital gains taxation into the income tax field—in any way questionable. Our only question is with this government. They want to cut it back so severely as to make it relatively negligible and their contention in this always is that it is more just than what exists at the present time. That is simply because nothing exists at the present time.

To make a kind of minatory, very narrow appeal to the electorate that this government is moving ahead when it is not and when it has the opportunity and can grasp the possibility of making the thing wholly fair, it strikes us, is simply a dereliction of responsibitity and a preservation of the old order which sinks this government down to the ground. They have to give away something but they give away just as little as possible in this context. We will never get a just society or anywhere approaching it with that particular kind of attitude and with the psychology that is involved in our total position vis-à-vis the federal government.

Sitting on this side of the House one detects this engrossing hostility. They are in some emulation but they feel they have some kind of big shoulders that they want to throw around. They are not going to be talked to. They are not going to be in any way taken from your own course. They are the big brother of Confederation and they are going to rule the roost. There is this invidious, ongoing feeling in Ontario, bred by the Tories over a long time, which causes a despoliation, an introduction of dirty oil into otherwise clean waters. The federal government is not on its side, but we are concerned with our approaches here.

Somebody has to show some measure of equanimity, some measure of give-and-take, and I say that this should proceed from this House and from the government in power if we are to reach any stability or position at all.

The second thing, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, is that over the years the taxpayers' share of the percentage that is set forth today, being 28 per cent of the collections, has risen from the 1957-1962 period when it was only 10 per cent. In 1962 it went to 16 per cent with qualifications which we will not go into; then it went up one percentage point in 1963, another percentage point in 1964 and three more percentage points in 1965. This is the gradual moving in of the provincial government by way of tax points and taking over various kinds of responsibility which under that hoary old statute, for no reason at all sofar as I can see, happens to fall within the demesne of the provincial government.

In 1966 it went up three more points to 24, and from 1967 to 1971 the figure stood as it stands today—and this is the reason we will not take issue with this legislation —at 28 points. The threat—and it is a horrendous threat—again emanating, not from this minister but from the Treasurer, is that they intend to move into the point system as Quebec has done, to a position of in excess of 50 per cent of the total revenue coming from this source being returnable to the province and taking over all kinds of fields in compensation for that. That upsets the fiscal and dynamic balance of the whole country.

If that happens, then FLQs will become quite nugatory, quite second. We will have to invoke something far more than the war measures Act to keep the country together under those circumstances. Then up to the point where the determining aspects of fiscal policy affects the monetary policy of this country, your business of Keynesian financing, your cycling the economy, where the dynamics go, where you are going to have your growth each year—these will all come to devolve upon the head of the provinces, and this particular province, which is *primus inter pares* of the other provinces in terms of leadership and just in terms of influx of money, in such a way as to disrupt the whole financial condition.

You will remember 30 years ago that our generative engines with which to fight the Depression were thoroughly gummed up by the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, precisely on the basis of the federal government not having established enough power to control the fiscal destinies of this country.

So here we are, decades later, returning to the same—I call them empty threats—because if the threats are carried out this country will become an empty entity. It may well go off into the American orbit at that point, and it can be just as devastating in terms of hard cash as it can in terms of ideologies, however wierd, over here.

A lot of people do not realize that is what you are moving toward at the present time in sphere after sphere. In terms of what you are apparently anticipating doing with respect to this income tax and the taking over of 51 or 52 percentage points within the foreseeable future at least is not much perhaps a determination to do so, but certainly a threat to the federal government that this is what you will do in order to have your way.

I ask you to guard against both of these fallacies and both of these moves which will be the ruination of our country. We have tried to prevail previously under this particular head. I think this minister in cabinet could take a strong stand against that particular move, realizing the consequences and possibilities that will flow therefrom.

I would ask him to do so and ask for the restraining bit in the mouth of the young terrier over there. Wiser heads than his should certainly prevail. This neophyte knows very little about treasury matters. We will determine that very shortly in the course of the estimates in that particular area.

But that truculence which is so characteristic now can very well lead us astray, and the sense of frustration that you must often feel in dealing with your counterparts in Ottawa can become a kind of personal stirring to take rash actions without proper perspective and regard for the interests of the country as a whole. That being the basic matter I want to touch upon with respect to the introduction of this particular legislation in this year, I will simply state of course we do not intend to oppose the legislation. We do feel that this is the fairest form of taxation that we have; it is still very far from being anywhere equitable. And that does not say much for the rest of our taxation, does it, with our sales tax creeping up year by year very close to the levels achieved by the personal income tax.

If I make take a moment on one aspect of this government's dealings with Ottawa under this, every time it takes a percentage point in what is an expansive or elastic tax such as this the most elastic of all taxes, it takes it in turn for the financing of some programme which it feels is peculiarly an Ontario responsibility, let us say in the field of worker training of one kind or another. There are limitations upon what may be foreseeably spent in that particular area, and whereas when we take the tax point probably every cent is spent in this particular regard, within a few years because the percentage point has expanded, it quite overreaches what was necessary to provide for that particular service, and places surplus funds in your hands which again were not being spent for the specifically provincial objective that they were initially set up for.

Because of these surplus funds, of course, you can find some other place to spend them—it is no problem. But nevertheless it redounds upon your head the cyclical fiscal determinance of the whole economy, which may run counter to the best interests of the country as a whole. Only Ottawa, in all justice, in consultation true, only Ottawa has the perspective and the range and the height to envisage the whole situation.

It may run counter to the best interests of another province next door or British Columbia, so that we have got two fiscal policies running counter to one another, conflicting and sometimes simply neutralizing one another; but where the more powerful prevails, giving the tone to the whole economy. And this is really a bad tail wagging a sausage dog, if there ever was one, and is something we must be extremely careful not to bring about.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members wishing to speak before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I want to thank both the speakers from the other two parties for their contributions, in as much as neither intend to oppose. It then does not become something of controversy that we will have to deal with at great length.

I, too, must say, Mr. Speaker, that in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, although as he knows it is not my responsibility to discuss policy at great length, I think we have set the stage for our particular stance on what happens on the federal scene in regard to what we have done in succession duties. Indeed, I do not think there is any

desire on the part of this government at any time to impose taxation if indeed that is not necessary.

Relating some of these words to the member for Lakeshore, I think that the leadership that has been shown by the Province of Ontario in Confederation generally speaking would preclude Ontario from making any of the rash moves that the hon. member made some brief reference to. Indeed, I think Ontario has borne its fair share of equalization payments in the Dominion of Canada or in this great Confederation—to keep it together—and I do not think you will find very much argument against that particular position in the Province of Ontrio. Therefore I do not think that the member is—

Mr. Lawlor: Sometimes the minister is gracious about it when he wants and sometimes he is exceedingly ungracious.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, I should imagine that could apply across the floor in many instances as well. I am not only particularly thinking of money matters, but in some other things.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the position of the Province of Ontario at this particular time is a very fair one. I do not think that if we could enumerate—and I regret that I do not have the statistics before me—the exact amount of money that flows from the Province of Ontario to the federal government and then is disposed of by them. I do not think the member would for one moment suggest that we are not making our contribution to the future, and I regret that he made any reference to what the future might hold in regard to the society in Ontario if, in fact, Ontario were to take a few more points of taxation. I do not think Ontario will ever take that position, no matter who the government may be. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with these very few words I would merely like to say that the continuation—

Mr. Lawlor: Can we quote the minister on future occasions?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean he is not going to ask for the right to opt out?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I did not say that. Examine my words, I did not say that.

Mr. Lewis: There are a few opting out as well. It means 30 points more.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I did not say that and I do not want the member putting any words in my mouth.

At this particular time it is simply a continuation for the next taxing calendar year, and I can assure the members of the House if the lack of certain action by other levels of government is not that required for further stimulation of the economy. I think we can bring forth an amendment at a future date.

Mr. Nixon: They will certainly will have to do it by law next year.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification if you will permit: Has the minister examined the wording of section 1, and is he satisfied that this is the clearest possible way to put forward this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, for clarification, that from the institution of the statute initially there is a continuation through the years with the amendment right up until the present date and that is why we arrive at that very short subsection today.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is sure he read the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: To third reading?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you gentlemen.

USED CAR DEALERS ACT, 1968-1969

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend The Used Car Dealers Act, 1968-1969.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a word on this bill. It does extend control over car dealers as far as the used car dealers are concerned, but I think the Act could go further. The name of the Act should perhaps be changed to The Dealers' Act.

The whole point with this particular legislation is you read certain words and you will simply substitute other words. You know, it is a nice, succinct, neat way of doing it. I have seen it in previous legislation before this House and I think it is the way to do it. Otherwise, you start going through them individually or you start using mutatis mutandis language all the way through and

there is no point in doing that at all. So the legislative draftsmen, in other words, are improving enormously and they are to be given a little accolade.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Does the hon. minister wish to comment?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain to the House—I thought perhaps someone might raise it—in the consumer protection legislation it touches on the cooling-off period on the sale of a used car, and that cooling-off period would apply to that used car or used vehicle. We are having a regulation—I believe we have now passed it in The Consumer Protection Act—to make clear that that does not apply, that cooling-off, on a new car, a new motor vehicle. I think you can see how ridiculous that would be, for someone to take out a new car, drive it around for a couple of days and take it back and say, "I have not made the contract." All the provisions of The Consumer Protection Act apply except that cooling-off, and that is the only one.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: To third reading?

Agreed.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 47, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have only commendation, really, I feel that we have heard—

Mr. Lawlor: What the devil has happened to that legal staff of the ministers?

Mr. Nixon: They are out issuing press releases.

Mr. Lewis: Should the member not be in Brant?

Mr. Nixon: Things are pretty well fixed up out there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They know my legislation is in order.

Mr. Nixon: I recall, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions, having heard private members put before the Attorney General of the day—I think it was even before there was a Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs—the many cases where the sale of an item having been completed, the responsibility to pay, or the agreement connected with it, had been sold at a discount to another organization which then was able to come in and extract payment even though the article, or sometimes the service, had not measured up to any reasonable standard based on the original sale.

Many members have recommended that such legislation be brought forward and I can recall in the past, perhaps not this minister but some others associated with this matter, giving elaborate reasons why it was practically a legal impossibility to undertake this. Well, it has finally been undertaken and as far as I can see it should be a workable safeguard as far as the people in this province are concerned. I do not think we are breaking much new ground. I think other jurisdictions have similar legislation now. We have needed this for a good long time.

I recall most of the cases were based on knitting machines. The minister may recall that there were a great many of those sold, particularly to ladies who felt they were going to improve their income. Often they were very hardworking people indeed who did not, perhaps, understand the language, the English language, and were prepared to undertake almost a cottage enterprise in support of the financial position of their families. They found that the machines at $500 and $600 were practically inoperable and they had no recourse to the salesman or the company he represented because he had conveniently disappeared with the boodle. Some other company, usually a finance company, held the paper with the signature of the purchaser and they were not prepared to listen for one moment to any complaint about the quality of the item being sold or how it had been represented.

Certainly we support that section of this amendment. While I am not prepared to say it is too little in this regard, it obviously is too late.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder before—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think it should be pointed out that this follows legislation by the federal government, The Bills of Exchange Act, and it is my understanding that while that is federal legislation, I think the provinces will have difficulty in tacking on to a

promissory note, which is a bill of exchange, a condition which is not permitted by the government which has jurisdiction with respect to bills of exchange.

Mr. Nixon: The federal legislation is now about 18 months old.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, we have only been in session here for—at least I have only been this minister for a month.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes; the minister is part of the new wave.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have only been here in this department a very brief time. We have followed very quickly the opportunity which was given us by that open door.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Progress comes slowly!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It comes quickly here.

Mr. Lawlor: I am full of cornucopia this afternoon, of congratulations. This is good legislation, no question about it.

One of those things I could never understand at law school is that when somebody bought a chattel or an article from somebody else and owed money on it, and the person who sold it assigned his paper to some third party over here, this third party had no liability with respect to the defects that were found in that article subsequently. It was the grossest kind of nonsense written into the law, that that should be so, and here we are this afternoon changing it and it has been a long time coming.

It is one of the most ancient parts of our law. It was originally designed under Lord Mansfield in the mercantile law of the 18th century when it first took formulation, in order to make negotiable paper fluid and readily negotiable so that it would not bear what are called the equities between the parties.

Now the equities are going to foul the Act, and this is precisely what contemporary minds have come to—namely that the consumer has the right to be protected. Under Lord Mansfield's dictum, this is caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—let him take his chances. He had no redress. He could sue the person who sold him the defective goods, but he had to pay the shot to the fellow who held the paper.

Very often the fellow who had sold him the goods said "vamoose" and had taken off for other parts. What was he to do against the finance company? How many cases has one seen? I, as a member of this House whom people have consulted—much less as a practicing solicitor—have seen people coming and wringing their hands; they were out $3,000, $4,000, $5,000 or more. They have to pay it. The goods that they had were worthless and they have been hung up. This is equitable and highly beneficial legislation.

I find subclause 2 rather titivating and would ask—we can probably do it in Committee of the Whole House—but would ask that we go into it a little deeper as to precisely what it means. There are two separate principles here. The first part has to do with the knocking out of this doctrine of the equities between the parties.

The second part is rather narrow in this regard because something is set up. As things presently stand under the statute, section 29 which is being added to, simply says: "This Act applies notwithstanding any agreement or waiver to the contrary."

It is zeroing in on business of people doing something called contracting out. In other words, you have the protection of a statute passed by this assembly or by any other assembly, which is the law of the land. Then, in the face of that, you have the contracting parties in the old days and in the old laissez-faire notion, being more important than what the law of the country happens to be, setting up, so to speak, their own laws themselves and saying, "We seek a waiver of the power of this statute. We want out. We want to opt out of the statute."

They have done it in pieces of legislation after legislation throughout the 19th century, so the legislation may very well never have been passed. It was probably better that it was not passed because at least it would have actively turned their attention to what it was they wanted to get away from. So they used it as a foil.

So, in area after area, throughout this century we have been forced to move in and say, "No, the private parties to these private instruments do not stand in a superior position, that private persons to the communal legislation—" In The Mechanics' Lien Act, for instance, they would not permit a workman to make a deal with an employer to get out of the implications and effects and consequences of the legislation.

In other words, we are paternalistic. We protect the workman against himself and we protect him against the coercive forces of the market in which he has no equality. We have come to a grudging and slow recognition that in terms of contractal relationships, one party normally is infinitely more powerful in hard economic terms, than the other; and the other fellow, for all the pretext of freedom and self-determination had not really any ability whatsoever to stand up against him.

This is a permeating feature of our law. The Tory party in Ontario has come to some kind of glimmering recognition that this is the trend of events. Why there should be resistance, why people should fight that, except in the name of some abstract, asinine principle which they read from some political philosopher back 200 years ago, I cannot imagine, because it certainly does not make common sense in the context of today's society, even in terms of the benefits to be conferred on both parties involved in the transaction.

So, in this particular area, the business of implied conditions and warranties which, as I looked up, were section 13, 14, 15 and 16, of The Sale of Goods Act having to do with various forms of warranties in contracts—warranties saying, that if the goods delivered did not measure up to certain qualities, by way of description coinciding with the actuality, or the quality by way of the sample, or by way of various kinds of qualities written into the goods prior to their sale not coming to fact. All these warranties of the goods are such and such mentioned in these statutes, which are called implied warranties. They do not have to be set out in the statutes, they are there, and judges are saying here now, that they stay there—that a seller on the market cannot, dealing with an ultimate purchaser—not with a purchaser who acts as a middle man or a retailer but an ultimate purchaser, which the minister calls a consumer sale in his new definition—that that purchaser is protected irrespective, and he may not opt out of these particular warranties.

I do find—again I think—we will take it up in the Committee of the Whole House—the second part of that subsection 2, involved and, to say the least, tricky and almost unmeaning and in so far as I can read it, a piece of verbiage. But no doubt the new minister will bring the light of his mind onto this grammatical construction and show that it has some sense. We will work it over later on. Again, before I sit down let me say that saying the contracting out with respect to that particular kind of sale, seeking to negative or vary any of the such implied conditions and warranties is void.

Just to be on the record with respect to warranties, of course, the distinction between it and the condition of the contract is you have written a condition into a contract. The Act itself says the condition may often be construed as a warranty by the courts, and vice versa; the thing that is supposed to be the warranty is very often the condition. But a condition voids the contract—the condition can repudiate the contract—that causes the contract to be void ab initio. Whereas with a warranty the contract remains; the goods stay in the hands of the purchaser. All he can do under those circumstances is sue for the losses that he has suffered as a result of the imperfect article, and it is quite a different thing.

But you say in this particular legislation that both the conditions and the warranties are caught up, retained and imbedded in it. Again, for a lawyer it is a commendable and substantial, really substantial, move forward in our law.

The reforming ardour of the former Attorney General—his mantle was removed from him in favour of what appears to be a very retrograde and passive new minister, introducing nothing whatsoever so far as I can see of any consequence, or of no consequence at all; just nothing whatsoever. The minister has stepped into the shoes, into a new department, which was formerly encapsulated within the Attorney Generalship and has subsequently gone out, and has begun to move again in the direction of the new Jerusalem, which is not, I think, right around the corner, but because of legislation like this grows somewhat closer.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak on this? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am grateful for the very complimentary remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lakeshore, and I think this is good legislation. As I have pointed out in a few previous remarks, we have had to wait for the road to be opened under The Bills of Exchange Act, and we have now acted and I am happy to bring this legislation forward.

I think, as the member for Lakeshore suggests that this goes to the Committee of the Whole House. I will accept that suggestion and I will not, therefore, try to explain subsection 2 today, but I will do in the Committee of the Whole House.

I would like to say this; that in the considerations that went into the drafting of this legislation, there were some arguments went forward which perhaps had some—I will not say merit—but certainly some reason to be considered. It was pointed out, for instance, that if the man paid cash for the article, he would get the article. It was defective; it did not work. He could look only to the vendor, the seller, for service or for redress, or for damages.

If the seller went bankrupt, he only had the bankrupt estate to look to. If the seller went out of business—he had left the country or dropped the line and had gone—he had to give him redress.

You were giving, in effect, to the purchaser on credit who, when the paper was discontinued at the finance company or the bank, had not only the seller but had a third party—the financier, the finance company, the discount corporation—to look to.

He could refuse payment and he could demand that persons discounting the paper meet the liabilities, accept the obligations and the duties of the seller. I do not think that is a very strong argument, but it pointed up a little distinction, that you were perhaps giving the purchaser on credit some rights which the man who came in and paid cash did not have. I do not see any great cogency to that argument, but I do put it forward so that the House may think about it.

And the other thing I would like to say is that, again, while I think this is good legislation, I think it is important to make a distinction between the negotiable instrument, which goes out not just into the hands of the one discounter but it may go further. It is something like currency in a way. It has some of those characteristics. It may go into the hands of someone who really has nothing to do with the original transaction and did not expect to be burdened with obligations and duties and liabilities and service commitments and so on.

The argument put forward to me was this will increase the price of goods to the consumer eventually because the discounter will raise his interest rates. He will give less money when he discounts the paper and the merchant will be hurt because he will have to pay more when he discounts the note. He is going to have to pass that on in the cost of his operation to his customers, to the consumers. I do not accept that argument either.

Mr. Lawlor: It is very small is it not—a small percentage?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not accept that argument.

Mr. Lawlor: The loss is only about 1.7 per cent is it not? In millions and billions of dollars?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes. I could see that a shrewd finance company would say: "Yesterday when you did not have this obligation—before this legislation—we could take your paper, we know that you will pay. You are back of this note and we look to the purchaser.

"But now he may come in tomorrow and say, the machine is not operating and that you are not ready to take care of him or that you are going out of business. We are going to have to service that equipment and get the part that is defective or we cannot collect the money. He can say, No, I do not pay, because you have the obligation as the seller. And therefore, instead of giving you $95 for the $100 note, it will be $90 or $94—some lesser amount." In other words, they will be discounting at a heavier rate.

I do not accept that, however, because I think if it should have that effect what would happen would be the fly-by-night, the hand-to-mouth dealer—the one who is trying to take advantage of the consumer—he may find it very difficult to get his type of discount and eventually he will go out of business. I say that this will raise the whole tenor of business if you have the good people who are prepared to meet their obligations and carry out their liabilities—

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. minister is a secret socialist.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have always been away ahead of the socialists. I am a radical Conservative.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that what it is?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): "Red Tory" I think is the term, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am glad the member is beginning to follow my philosophy.

Mr. Lawlor: They call you people "red Tories."

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): He is a great guy. We all love him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not accept that argument. I felt I should acquaint the House with some of the arguments which were put forward as we brought this bill into being. I think I will leave the rest for the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill go before the Committee of the Whole House?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the Chair.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED,

That an income tax shall be paid by every individual who was resident in or had income earned in Ontario, being 28 per cent of the tax payable under the Income Tax Act (Canada) in respect of the 1972 taxation year, as provided in Bill 45, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Resolution concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one resolution concurred in, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 29, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Bill 30, An Act to amend The Forestry Act.

Bill 31, An Act to amend The Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 32, An Act to amend The Fish Inspection Act.

Bill 42, An Act to amend The Used Car Dealers Act, 1968-1969.

Bill 45, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

(*continued*)

On vote 2601:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose last the member for Lakeshore was in the middle of a dissertation.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I was in the throes of giving some kind of articulation to a vision of mine, not just purely visionary, but what I was saying Tuesday night was that, as a certain text says, "Without vision the people perish" and there is a perishing process going on presently in education in Ontario. It is internally at loggerheads with itself. It is going off in all directions. It really is in a state of chaos and state of inability to decipher its own intentions, what its goals and objectives are.

And among that vast, mountainous pile of literature that pours out from the subcommittees of the presidents and from every presidential office of the universities of Ontario—and surely, I think the minister will agree, the amount of material is overbearing—

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): That is the only thing we agree on.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, the only thing we agree on, that is right. Simply to try to get through the reports is a herculean task. But they all start and in the course of their enunciations they say, "What are we doing? Where are we going? What is it all about?" It seems to me in reading them all that nobody has given any focus or definition or direction to what might be a valid goal.

I thought I would take a stab at it in a kind of an arrogant way since others have fallen so badly down. If you are already on your knees, you do not have far to fall. In this particular regard, I was saying in fact that not the traditional notion of a liberal education—not that, although I quote Newman and will do so again—but an updated revamped notion, a democratic notion of humanistic education, ought to be and must be—if education is to have validity in the future—the whole education system, particularly at the levels of higher education.

I mean the whole must be permeated by the spirit of a liberal education. That merging with the multiversity in our society and always as the undertow to it—since the middle of the nineteenth century with the coming of utilitarianism, where everything for use, that is immediate, concrete, detectable, measurable use—ever since that time there has been a strong undertow in our civilization which has been devitalizing on one side of the fence, and which has been rendering us more barbarous instead of more civilized, more sensitive, more wide ranging, with wider intellectual powers and others.

Now you get the counter movement sweeping in, coming in from the young. They are saying that this impersonal, mechanistic alienated civilization—where you do everything in order to make a buck and where your whole life and the whole educational process is arrogated around parades, around earning a living, even at the highest levels—that particular sort of thing has not any appeal to them. They know that fundamentally it is betrayal; it always has been.

It is excusable. It was excusable at the end of the nineteenth century, because livings had to be made, so to speak. Populations were expanding, the industrial revolution was on its onward path. The penury conditions of earlier times had to be superseded; in other words a certain capital buildup had to take place.

I am speaking like a good Marxist at the moment, but this—you know that Marx had more in favour of capitalism than you could possibly imagine, he said it was necessary, it was a stage in human development. And that particular period, while what it brought about in terms of morality, in terms of the lighting of human lives is inexcusable, at the same time, in terms of pure economic development it was a kind of stage that the human race probably had to go through.

Therefore, we have reached a plateau. We talk about zero population growth, we talk about zero production rates, or some kind of a balance induced into this economy, and therefore a slowing down in productivity as and end-all and be-all in terms of job security. What is happening?

I was listening to the radio this morning as I came down. You know, they have a group in Toronto, headed by a woman, called Those Over Forty—this is the executive class. She says in the last few years that it used to be that a man 60 years of age, who was an executive, got tossed out of his job, had the greatest kind of difficulties because of his obituation and training to find a location elsewhere. It came down to 50. Now it is down to 40.

So at the one end of the scale, people who were considered soothers of this earth —the blessed ones who always had the good things, and who felt that, because of their cleverness, because of their ability to manipulate, because of their grasp of certain processes of production, that they were indispensable—find themselves in the gravest sort of jeopardy, and it percolates right through to the executive class. I do not suppose they can go down much lower than 40 and still have them experienced enough to begin to cope with the complexities of the system.

On the other side of the fence—and this is something this minister has said in this House, and he says he does not subscribe to—on the other side you have the expanding spectrum of education acting as a custodial function to keep people off the labour force. And if that is one of the prime determinants of the educational system, particularly University Affairs, as I personally believe it is, then Lord help us forget what I am saying. It will have no consequence or effect, except perhaps in some vague, shadowy, peripheral ways of visitation of the divine of what education really means—the stimulation of the mind, the sense of wonder and curiosity, the fact that life becomes meaningful, and whole, and we spend our whole time investigating, arguing, if you will, in dialogue, exploring the secret of things. Perhaps that could just be, by some form of blandishment, induced upon their heads.

But if they are there, kept in custody, the whole mentality is awry, they are not open to that particular form of approach. So, you get embroilment, you get boredom, you get terrible states of perplexity and frustration induced in the student body by simply harbouring the particular vice and lengthening out the year.

If that is the way that this government intends to deal with the problems of unemployment in a society, in this particular society, then let them pay the shot. Because whether through the instrumentality of The Unemployment Insurance Act, or by way of the dole, or in any other way, you are going to have to supply the citizens whom you cannot find within your power to employ. You are not sufficiently with it, in terms of contemporary economic theory and what can be done with respect to government stimulation of industry and the growth of jobs.

That is what I think your basic position is. You have too many hang-ups with the past. You are too given to your hands-off ideology, typified by the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), for instance, to enter in and to take that form of direct action and participation. Not a take-over, but simply invigoration, a high degree of partnership and a high degree of direction, if you will.

The present investment portfolios of the major companies are not necessarily, by any means, directed towards optimum employment possibilities. On the contrary, they are directed towards optimum profit margins and that runs counter. So you are forced into accepting the society that you do, bowing your head before it and to allow the universities to become the harbouring grounds, seedbeds of discontent of young people who, generally speaking, ought not to be there, a lot of them, and who are simply kept in this kind of thraldom as a new form of servitude. And what do they say? This is precisely what they say: They say the university is a master-slave relationship in which the faculty particularly and the administrative body exercises such oppression, and domination and control over their lives that they are kept in a state of adolescence almost into middle age. That is exactly what is happening.

At both ends of the scale you are running down, running into the sand. And there seems to be no hope or faith in you in this particular regard, and you are using the educational system as an instrument to try to blunt the full impact of your economic policies.

Hon. Mr. White: Whose economic policies?

Mr. Lawlor: The minister's. It is under this minister that it is taking place. He tries to slough it off to the federal government but surely he could see it coming. He had the instruments in his hands, he knew it was on his doorstep and yet he did not forfend.

I was talking then in the same vein about the role of the methodology of the sciences and how sciences, if taken in the wrong way, not in the plenitude of science with its curiosity, its wide-ranging research and its non-exclusion of other ways in which to approach the real, but in the reduction of sense, which is so endemic among sciences generally, of saying that a thing that cannot be tested by empirical methods or is not subject to the test tube or the mensurating table, that it is not real, it does not exist. Therefore, all the important things in human life—all the value functions—have somehow become mythological, unreal, not very important; as having no real reference.

That particular mentality has permeated the universities and it is part of the multiversity. And one of its aspects is the division of the sciences. One of the factors of the contemporary scientific method—right from the time of Bacon—has been a proliferation; scientists always disperse themselves and go into wider and wider areas. You permit this to happen at the universities so the specialization becomes the full mode and function. Specialization is a curse, at least for the beginning years of university. It is a seducing of the mind.

Whitehead, probably the greatest philosopher of science that we have had, has written brilliantly in his books on the aim of education. This is the curse: the technological aspects and the dwelling upon them, the exclusive insistence upon technology, technology being a question of means, of how you manipulate, a question usually of bringing out of a theoretical context a particular product into existence and then placing the whole emphasis upon the means whereby that is done also permeates because of this scientism, the whole aspects and life of the university as it presently stands.

This is the thing that those new Manichees of the modern world, the George Grants at McMaster and the Jacques Elieus in Paris, have written about, so that they have become Luddities in the process: destroy the machines, the nisus shirt of technology binds us so closely that free men cannot breathe and educated minds cannot come out of that morass. It is a winding sheet for them.

I disagree with the philosophy of the new Manichees. The old Manichees are those who said that everything material, everything of the flesh was evil and only things of the spirit were good. These men say that only the spirit is good and that all machinery, all technology, the various methods of manipulation through the media and so on are permeated by the devil, or something like that, if they speak in theological terms, which they normally do. I think it is nonsense.

I take a far more forthright approach and more balanced vision of life—not so dour, not so dark, not so jaundiced as we reach in these men. If you listen to George Grant you would weep after half an hour: The pessimism just rolls off him. It is tangible in the air; you could cut it. There is no point.

There are the good things of life, and I say that the last chapter of Bergson's, "Two Sources of Morality and Religion" speaks, in the balanced sense, of just how technology may be fitted into and rendered fruitful, not futile, may be rendered beneficial to the whole human race, but it has not to take the preponderance, primacy and the role that it has presently achieved in the minds of practically everybody connected with the educational establishment, and in Ontario it is simply a reflection of the mess that exists elsewhere without any thrust or forthrightness or innovation or sense of purpose of what it is all about.

This new minister is a man not lacking in considerable culture, a man who has read and thought and travelled and known ways and things. And I am hoping to stimulate him, to arrogate the functions of his office and in his constant colloquies with the commission that is so close to his heart. As a matter of fact, it is almost more of the man than the man himself, as we have come to see. This commission will be able to shape the policy. I think that the spirit of which I speak—and we will mention it again in a moment to see if I can drive it home—must permeate and pervade the whole of the educational establishment particularly, because it is with this kind of mind and the breeding.

And how do you do it? I suppose you do it partially through books, you can do it just as well in conversation. Last Tuesday night I was perhaps too insistent upon the pure intellectuality of the thing. The contemporary youth, the oncoming wave, you know, are far more concerned with the emotional, with the whole man, with the effective side of life and I quite agree with that. I always distinguish between the intellectual and the rational. The rational is narrow, repressive and concerned with the things of the mind alone, but to be intelligent, to be intellectual means to foster them all, to foster the whole life of man, his bodily functions, his emotional life, his artistic visions, along with a toughness of the mind that I have previously spoken of.

Newman says: "That only is true enlargement of mind which is the power of viewing many things at once as one whole". How can you envisage many things at once as one whole if you only know one or two?

Dr. Wright, you know, made a funny—well, I do not know how funny it is—statement in one of his speeches, that he was an engineer, and that people mistake what an engineer really is. They think that it is not because he knows anything about engineering, it is that he does not know anything about anything else. That was the point in so denominating himself.

It is the narrowness that what I am advocating will offset. It is only true enlargement of mind that has the power of viewing many things at once, as one whole, referring them severally to their true place in the universal system, understanding their respective values and determining their mutual dependence. It is that form of universal knowledge of which I have, on a former occasion, spoken; the setup in the individual intellect, constituting its perfection.

Possessed of this real elimination, the mind never views any part of the extended subject matter of knowledge without recollecting that it is but a part, or without the associations which spring from this recollection. It makes everything, in some sort, lead to everything else. It would communicate the image of the world, every separate portion, until the whole becomes in imagination like a spirit, everywhere pervading and penetrating its component parts, and giving them one definite meaning.

Those are the areas and the sort of life of the mind that your universities must bring about, or it will be very little worth. I cannot really imagine personally, a man emerging from a cultural milieu, or an intellectual university milieu, without having at least a smattering of ignorance about Sophocles—just to know that he existed. Of having read, not the tough dialogues of Plato, which really teach you how to think, like the Theaetetus, but the thing like The Apologia, where Socrates simply tells why he is willing to die rather than walk away from Athens, as they are begging him to do. "Please leave, Socrates, we do not want to kill you, but . . ." And he says: "No, I shall stay in this milieu. I shall not walk away, because my principle is at stake." The profoundest and the greatest teacher that ever lived and perhaps the profoundest message that has permeated our civilization. It comes from that story.

You see you cannot tie it down to individual speakers, but certainly among all the hodge-podge, and the gallimaufry, there ought to be an engineering student who would be aware of Kafka, and of the secrets that Kafka was—the terrible sense of insecurity, the doors closing and opening for no reason, the meaninglessness that Kafka—an insurance lawyer in Vienna, going to his office, in his dowdy way from day to day, and dreaming wild dreams as he went.

You could mention any number of people, but these would be the basis for the deepening, for the full growth of the individual of which my colleague speaks in his brief to the committee on secondary education.

Well all right, I mentioned the causes of rebellion on our campus and the feeling of disillusionment that is fairly widespread among youth, in the particularly suffocating atmosphere of the university. If the minister read the briefs of the faculty's associations, while more latterly they have become more sauve and more, perhaps, indulgent, even gracious, until a fairly short time ago, they did take a very lofty attitude, looking down their very long noses at the student body as a whole. They were what they call a community of scholars; the others were apprentices in the system.

I think they are beginning to come to some accommodation now. I think they should, in terms of the politic, and in terms of the moral, come to the recognition that students have a stake, a definite and vital stake in their future lives and in the determination of all aspects of the university life. I place myself on their side over against the Hilda Neatbys of this world, who say "We are the authorities on the subject and we are self-determining." You know how difficult they are to deal with as a self-determining community vis-à-vis the business of educational costs.

If by heredity you come into a position of almost personal autonomy with respect to your courses, determining what those courses will be, who up to a point will take them, the hours that you will allocate to them, the times and places—which have been the prerogatives of the professor for a very long time—then, of course, they cannot but resent the impact of the citizenry and of ministries of education which are paying the shot. I say the better spirits among them, as I see it, have grown amenable. It is not a question of bowing their heads. It is a question of seeing the light, and they have increasingly done that. Therefore, I give them a certain amount of commendation on that particular.

The other document that I wanted to make reference to, in continuity with what I had to say the other night, is this brochure, "Toward Community and University Government," which I take the liberty of calling the Lynch report after an old teacher of mine who 20 years ago introduced me to Bridgia. In other words, I see the hand at least of Larry Lynch in the writing of this document particularly. It is a very searching, very illuminating piece of writing. The sections on ideology—as to what the opposing camps in contemporary education are—and in this particular regard—apropos of what I had to say a moment ago about Socrates, they say at 26 that this is something of the traditional view where they give a résumé which is, I suggest to you, a very good rundown of the various positions and states of mind that apply to the radical position from one side of the fence and traditional position on this particular one. On the whole I cannot help but say that I favour the radical position. I think I have indicated in what ways I disagree, and will no doubt do so more before I am finished here today.

Just on that one head, this is under part 5, "the course followed by the university in its development must be determined"—this is a nostrum of the traditional position—"only by the members of the community." And Sir Eric Ashby has defined it in this way, that the idea that scholars in universities ought ot be free to teach and learn what and how they wish goes back to the Middle Ages, but the custom of guaranteeing this privilege by popular consent dates only from the nineteenth century.

Then he goes into what was formulated in Germany and it devolves into this newfound faculty feeling that they have sovereign, natural and sole right to determine the internal affairs of the university, which I take very grave issue with and think is a peculiarly pernicious doctrine. One could spend some time with it. I wanted to quote, perhaps more to the point, this paragraph on the radical view:

> It radicalized the growth in power of the academic guild and the results of specialism and professionalism of academic work are other features of the modern multiversity. The curriculum in many of the humanities and social sciences is often a reflection of the stultifying goals of the professional, academic and the market society. Criticism and questioning should go to the roots of disciplines with the growing inability of curricula to look at important questions as a result of the self-encloaked academic guild. Specialization feeds a burgeoning graduate school.

Those are very pregnant words. It is true. "Specialization feeds a burgeoning graduate school." The scanning of the faculties reveals a barren vision. They depoliticize the political economy department; economists are mere garage mechanics to capitalism. Literary studies feed on technical analysis.

To pause here for a moment. Look into what the money is spent on in this so-called region of research—particularly under the Americans; I think particularly under the Americans—in both MA studies and PhD studies and see for instance the proliferation of works on Scott Fitzgerald. Whether Scott Fitzgerald used the pronoun "ante" on page 17, the picayune nit-picking business of reading Chaucer for the umpteenth time to extrapolate out of it some conundrum, some anagram, some use of words, all of which goes by the way of research and by the way of higher education and the sovereign work of the mind.

Can anything be more ludicrous than what goes on, by and large, in the area of these postgraduate studies and the type of research that they do? This is not confined by any means, incidentally, as we come to OISE and find what those boys have been doing down through the years. It is a predilection of the academic mind which is self-stultifying generally. It loses perspective on all human affairs, has very little report with the community, feeding upon itself it grows vast like Pantagruel and bursts at the seams.

It is a terrifying sight to see the academic community go off to seed in this particular way, but that is exactly what happens when it becomes too specialized; when it arrogates to itself the plenary states of learning. It must be closer in accord with the community.

When an engineering faculty fails to question goals as it teaches techniques—I suppose one of the main faults, and one of the main and more devastating criticisms directed against the universities by the so-called young radicals and some by us older radicals too, I trust—is the self-imposed byzantine nature of the traditional university. It did not recognize the direct responsibility to the common weal and to the extent that the multiversity is breaking that down, making the university more responsible to the community, working in very great conjunction with the community, recognizing that it is not, that the scholarship does not flourish in insulated and isolated surroundings that there is a debt to be paid, that there is an invigoration to be gained from its interleaving.

To that extent the multiversity has virtue over against the traditional self-imposed monastic regimen, and so forth, where again that conservative mentality said there was nothing new under the sun. What is the point of going out and looking into a community participating as if it all happened before? It is all repetitive. But I shall live in the sovereign's delight of my intellectual feast, all by myself and a deep grade in selfishness and a sense of almost arrogant retreat being supported by the whole population. And Aristotle—this is where your contemplation comes from. It comes from the static Greek notion of life. For the Greeks and the Greek theories which continue to permeate the universities, that which was more perfect stood still longer. In other words, perfection was static. That is so in their paintings; that is why they were such great sculptors. They could hold it for illimitable centuries. And in philosophy the things called essences, those things which were permanent, were closer, more perfect. And any change was kind of an expression, a kind of a crawling disease on the face of reality because the change was something inferior.

For us it is just the opposite. For us there is nothing that is permanent in this sense and if there are no essences, then the fixity is not something to be sought after and commended and the very criteria of the real, the really real: the change and various forms and types and degrees of change. And so we have not got the sense of security that they have—the sense of indebtedness, the sense that nothing changes, therefore why worry. The sense of passivity, therefore the stoic intelligence that says, "We can suffer anything because it has all happened before."

We have not got that. We have a deep sense of adventure. We are pioneering intelligences. We are full of risks. We love risks. We are Faustian men. We will wedge into the future. We hurry our own adventures—our adventures of the mind and in the material realm. A completely different kind of intelligence.

And this, embodied in the university, has not yet really permeated. There are too many old fogies around sticking to these ancient norms of which I speak. The spirit of adventure and trial and error of which I am speaking, which is endemic to the liberal mentality in this regard, is the thing that will rejuvenate and preserve and make universities vital and interesting places in which people will want to go, particularly people who desire to be interesting—not so much interesting, but vital. People who want to know, who want to learn.

I did want to say a word about research and the role that it plays. The lopsided role. I will not spend a great deal of time on it because it has been said a great many times by other people rather better than I can hope to. But the problem, as the minister

probably knows, is that, particularly in the graduate schools and throughout the life of the universities, they are allocating prerequisites to themselves.

The faculty, for numbers of years now, have ceased being, by and large, a teaching body and have become a research body. They say that research breathes a life into the university which would not otherwise exist.

And I say, on the other side, that we have to watch our expenditures on research and the moneys that go into research at universities. Not only because of the nebulous and picayune nature of a great deal of it—as I mentioned before, in the works from Scott Fitzgerald and the Icelandic sagas, you know. There is nothing wrong with the Icelandic sagas, but to spend a plenitude of tomes and huge amounts of publication money upon them seems to me to be pushing it pretty hard, in terms of artificial and pretensive scholarship.

There are researches and researches. I have not seen anything in my reading that has indicated the kind of winnowing-out of the various kinds—the big division as between pure research on one side of the fence and applied research. And I do think that by and large massive or rather widespread efforts at pure research ought not basically to be done in the universities at all but in research centres.

It has been put forward and there have been some documents that this might be a very valuable idea. Because if the time and most of the effort of the university professor is taken up in his particular prelection, in a particular area which is always very narrow, he siphons all of his graduate students and as many other students as he can get his hands on into this particular area. True, coming through from the federal government will be sufficient sums of money and some payment will be made to these graduate students whereby they can take their education and this is part of the argument for research as a way of pay off within the university structure itself.

Nevertheless it is a derelection of responsibility. The chief task, obviously, and the emphasis overwhelmingly must be placed upon teaching functions. That is what they are there for. They are there to teach the student. The student is not there as a utilization for some research projects of some professor. And the business of granting eminence, granting extra salaries, granting tenure and prerogatives to a professor simply on the basis of his having established some kind of international reputation in research in a particular field is probably the most purblind thing that can possibly be done. If this man wishes to operate in a biological or chemical laboratory on a particular area, then I think we should find him the facilities—but somewhere else. He is depriving his students by and large of the wide swath of knowledge of garnered wisdom that this man has stored up in himself.

And it is you know a form of grotesque self-indulgence. I can see why you do it because one does the things one likes to do, and if you are subsidized in the process, you do it all the more. But is a real vision, is a real care taken to call this man to a halt to look at precisely what he is involved in doing as to the impact he has upon his fellows within the faculty and to the students whom he is supposed to be serving. After all, universities as I say the whole education process exists for one purpose the student, not the teacher but it has all been reversed. And the reversal costs incomensurate sums of money to feed them in these particular forms of self-indulgence. To pour the money to direct it to research is a heavy, heavy burden upon the person.

Hon. Mr. White: The member is really a Tory at heart?

Mr. Lawlor: Secondly, the deviation of the graduate student from his proper task—in other words, in picking up his PhD on the narrow area—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): New socialists.

Mr. Lawlor: —because of the moneys being provided for research—is a despoliation of his educational process too. Instead of widening and deepening, he becomes narrow and shallow, and that is the danger I have been ranting here against for a considerable time.

In this particular regard I would like to quote—I suppose I would say my favourite writer on education, a man I knew; he is still alive in France—Jacques Maritain. I disagree with Maritain on practically everything I ever agreed upon with him 10 years ago but not on these kinds of things. I will take the opportunity to purchase a copy of "Education at the Crossroads" and send it across to the minister so that in his long nights next winter he may get himself a bit of education in the process of reading it. Maritain says many things about liberal education along the lines that I am

speaking on and is very aware—having done considerable work in biological studies in France, in laboratory work and whatnot, he is not unacquainted with the sciences, particularly with the social sciences, sociology and whatnot, using of course as a philosopher ought to, extreme amplitude in his sources of knowledge. He is talking about institutes of advanced research:

> We may furthermore observe that the work of universities must find its complement in the work of institutes of advanced research. It is no doubt normal that any instruction given in the university will result in some original work and the advancement of knowledge especially in science. Yet this is in a way an overflow of the teaching scholarship.

I would not say, would you, that a professor who refreshes his mind—who goes and reads a book which is the newest book in his subject which has some kind of mark of credibility—the fellow is not completely obtuse or ignorant about the nature of the discipline. Keeping up to date in the current work of his field is research. Although sometimes you would think from the way they talk, that they demean that research. I would think that that is remaining viable as a professor, not becoming outdated and—

Hon. Mr. White: Scholarship is the word.

Mr. Lawlor: —Lord knows if you listen to a lot of them, they lecture from their mothballed notes that they come to and read from year after year. There is no more talk about occupational diseases, the one that infiltrates the teaching profession, particularly at university level—there are all kinds of stirrings down below but up there is a kind of senescence. I know many professors who have said that; they come in, stand there and they have done these notes 15 years ago.

This is the new outpouring. There is no outpouring involved. They do not even change the tone in their voices. It goes on for an hour usually, in a straight monotone, giving out the wisdom of the ages having been all written down there. This is a betrayal. At least, he could modulate his tone to the effect that he thought there was some excitement in the process, but he will not in his Germanic way. You know, the German professor was the loftiest of them all.

For a student to even think of approaching the great man as he came down the walk for his constitutional was a kind of slap in the face. The professor simply did not, in Germany, consort with the student body, even the highest levels of the student body. They reigned in lonely eminence like eagles from their perch. Some of them deserved it. Kant was of that mind because he was doing something up there. There were things that were going on in his head, in his lonely eyrie and eminence.

I do not think there is all that much going on in most university professors' heads I have run into recently. With that in mind, why should we spoil them? Why should we feed them with goodies at an enormous cost again to the taxpayer?

So many times it is said "Yet this is, in a way, an overflow of the teaching scholarship." That is right—this research business is part of their job and they ought not to consider it having priority, it being something distinct from their job, or something that they seek for in order to escape from teaching, which apparently is the direction of things these days.

The object of the universities is the teaching of youth and not producing books and articles and endless contributions, or making some scientific, philosophical or artistic discovery. It is right. It is not the job. Although every book you read on the thing says it is the exploration of new fields of knowledge.

Well, to the extent that it means staying up to date with what is happening in the general field, I think that within the university community, at least, of the undergraduate level, that is the confinement. I do not think that that should be considered a Procrustean bed, by any means, just to stay up to date. I know, to do so in law, it is almost an overwhelming task, and just to stay up to the university president's reports would take a lifetime of induced reading.

So here is a wise man saying that he spent his whole life at university, the Sorbonne, the Institute of Medieval Studies over here in Queen's Park; during the war, when he was out of his country, at Harvard and at Yale, and the Institute of Advanced Studies there, precisely framed and dedicated to the works of research.

Man's education by means of courses, seminars and laboratory training on the one hand, and advancement of knowledge through original inquiry which implies full concentration and the beautiful risks of which Plato spoke—are two quite different things. We professors know this all too well, especially in Darwin, organized in the Darwin Institute of Research, delving into the sciences of

nature and of man, have outstanding importance for the progress of civilization. They in the universities should help one another, but they should remain, for their mutual advantage, clearly distinct.

You want to save some money? Think about it. It is funny how these liberal fellows are the ones who are the greatest savers of money after all. What you need, as Chesterton said, in this civilization, is not practical men, but impractical ones. It is part of the theory that if a thing is worth doing at all, it is worth doing badly, and that if a man is to get some real good advice on a particular subject, it is better to have a theoretical man take a look at the situation. His mind will range a little wider over the issues. And that is the kind of person that I think universities should try to create.

Well, there are many other areas which we will get to.

I want to speak, as we get into the estimates about the radio problem at the universities, about the use of TV which, reading the Toronto report, I think in the short run raises the cost of education. But surely, in the long run and with the predictions of the number of professors at 8,000 a day that you are going to need by 1975 on any prediction. Surely the use of the Television media and a centre, a concrete centre, perhaps even along the lines that Trotter in the fifth chapter of his theme talks about, the open university concept, borrowed from Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman: Would this be a convenient spot for the hon. member to break his remarks?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, any time is convenient. I shall adjourn the debate.

It being six o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 27, 1971

Federal-provincial co-operation re low-income housing, statement by Mr. Grossman 1991

Conference on economic and cultural nationalism, statement by Mr. Davis 1996

General welfare assistance, statement by Mr. Wells 1997

Millhaven penitentiary guards, statement by Mr. A. F. Lawrence 1998

Further charges laid in connection with Kingston riots, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Shulman 1999

Cabinet decision delay on OMB appeal on Spadina hearing, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1999

Committee of review of agenda for federal-provincial conference in Victoria, questions Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 1999

Report on alleged layoff of workers in Ford plant in Windsor, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Nixon, Mr. B. Newman 2000

Participants at committee for an independent Canada, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Trotter 2000

Attendance figures at Ontario Place, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent 2002

Policy change re having public housing tenants on OHC board, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peacock, Mr. T. Reid 2003

Duplate labour dispute in Oshawa, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis 2004

Investigating announced increases by Stelco and Dofasco for consumer steel, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 2004

Putting people in jail for non-payment of parking tickets, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sargent 2004

Lack of adequate interpretation from French to English in Timmins courts, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Lewis 2004

Purchase of Pêche Island, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Paterson 2005

Representation to prevent massive increase in car prices, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Young 2006

Public housing starts running at lower rate than last year, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 2006

OHSIP subsidy for recipients of social and family benefits, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Gisborn 2006

Policy re clerks in bookstores arrested for selling allegedly obscene literature, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter 2007

Lands and Forests employees informed of pay cuts, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Jackson 2007

Use of deep wells for disposal of industrial toxic waste, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. MacDonald 2007

Vote of Toronto council re use of Mercer Reformatory property by youth, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Shulman 2008

Ensuring adequate facilities for travelling young people this summer, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. T. Reid 2009

Applicability of labour laws to persons hired in Ontario to work here for American firms, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Shulman 2009

Arrangement with Kennel Properties to build in Wingham for Lands and Forests, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Gaunt 2009

"Assessment of home" by municipal welfare official in determining allowance, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Jackson 2009

Situation at Malvern project, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Trotter 2010

Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 2011

Resolution re Department of Health by standing human resources committee, Mr. Villeneuve 2011

Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 2011

Provincial Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2011

Forestry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2012

Fish Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2012

Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2015

Crown Timber Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle second reading 2015

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading 2018

Used Car Dealers Act, 1968-1969, bill to amend Mr. Wishart, second reading 2024

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2025

Third readings 2029

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, continued 2029

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2037

No. 49

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 27, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: When we rose the hon. member for Lakeshore had the floor. The minister (Mr. White) is here.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Having been prune-fed and burgeoning, and I trust had a bottle of wine during his dinner, he has arrived back in to receive the inundations of one's wit.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is there a more ruddy face in the House than that of the minister?

Mr. Lawlor: During the recess, Mr. Chairman, I have been told that I have spoken long enough on this theme and that even so calcified, even so armadillo-like a government as that which sits over there, that some penetration certainly must have been made or despair it will ever be, the message will never get across.

So I desist; except to say that in summary of what I was saying previously, and coming back to what Socrates said, the whole business really is one in which the educational system is to achieve one effect, one product, one aim, and that is to know thyself, to really know yourself.

How can they with a technological education come to know anything about themselves? They know how to operate machinery. They know how to make certain gears turn over or engines work. Is not the dereliction of our civilization throughout the very fact that people do not know themselves, do not even want to know themselves, are rather terrified at the prospect of knowing very much about ourselves?

And you get guys like R. D. Lang and numerous psychopathologists and psychotherapists talking about the schizophrenia that exists and pervades, that just thickens the civilization, because people are terrified of the prospect of meeting themselves head on.

An educational system that does not take that as being the central focus of what it is seeking to do is one that is on the verge of destruction. The whole panoply and all the magnificent works and all the dazzling neon signs will all blink out sometime in the darkness. Universal darkness will descend and we will be known as the cacodemons of the modern world without a stone upon a stone at the end of the day, because we have not suffered. We do not know how. The educational teachers' system does not begin to teach us that which is most fundamental, which is what education is all about, namely, the processes of a deeper self-knowledge.

I would like to make reference before quitting this theme to a recent writing of a friend of mine. I want to refer to a book by Greg Baum. Gregory Baum is a Jewish boy, raised in Germany by his parents, who teaches theology over here at St. Michael's College and who has been doing pioneer, original, innovated theological work.

As you know, the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) mentioned the other day that some professor was being discriminated against, some philosophy professor down at Windsor University. He wanted to get on the staff and he wanted to write a book on the history of Canadian philosophy. I could not help but think—and I do not think this is self flagellation, you know, the usual Canadian instinct of masochism, of turning it against ourselves that we are an inferior people—really in that particular field the book would be fairly thin, about half a dozen pages at the most.

Who in the blazes would they mention in this particular area that had made any original or any profound contribution to the human race out of this country, in this area? Fackenheim probably, who is living in Toronto at the moment, is one of the best we have ever had and internationally known, and George Grant maybe in his own perverse way. George, at least as an individual, stands on his own feet as a thinker and deservedly has something of an international reputation. Who else? Maybe one or two men whom I have come across from Le Barre, but mostly

Thomists you know, working out of that particular tradition—and nothing wrong with that—but I do not think they are world-shattering figures. Then, we begin to go downhill. I think I have named all that can be named and we have come to the end of the road. The first paragraph is written and the book is closed.

What a commentary that is—just to say that—upon the hundreds of millions of dollars that you spend in the system. Is there no equation whatsoever between money spent and product produced in this particular area? Is the incommensurability between original creative talent, the ability to think originally and vast sums of money expended, so great as all that? If it is so, then again we should resurvey the whole purposes of our education.

The member for Scarborough East and I had dinner together tonight and we were talking about "The Greening of America," which I shall quote in a few moments, and about the young people as they come into the universities and the effect of the impact of the new mentality and conscienceness-free as it is called and the way they look at themselves and the way they refurbish the world.

What a transmogrification of values is taking place! It is a completely new ball game. I would ask the University Affairs Minister, to read that book, just to glean an understanding of what is taking place, because we can like it or lump it, but it is there and, on the whole, the appealing qualities outweigh those which disaffect one. But one of the things that disaffected one was the strong emphasis in contemporary youth upon oneself—egotistically I am what I am and that is all I am kind of thing. I do not take second place to any other person. I rejoice in my uniqueness. I do not seek to change myself very much. You take me as I am or you do not take me at all. The refusal among young people to criticize each other, or hold themselves up for assessment, to hold competitive ethos, is disappearing, it is going up in smoke. And thank God for that, because it bred far more alienation and hatred and disenchantment, making them totally miserable because they were reaching out to goals beyond their capabilities all the time. That was our civilization. And for what? To garner in some kind of external possessions in order to be able to show off to your neighbours. The business of conspicuous consumption. All that ethos, that thing which we and our fathers held so dear, which made us the great men we are and made this civilization the thing that we are all so proud of, is all disappearing like a wraith. And that is very fine; I think it is excellent, because, more humane values have superseded them. They are no longer under the same impress. They do not see the same affliction of insecurity that we felt. It is a different world.

But the one fault with this whole thing, was the egotism, the selfishness, the refusal to—to affirm oneself at the expense of all others. It seems to me that the contemporary movement was a return to a sort of defiling selfishness—the old individualism repeated all over again. Socialism at least has brought in some sense of community, some sense of human beings hanging together.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Hanging together is right! Well-chosen phrase! Or hang separately!

Mr. Lawlor: Or if they do not hang together, they will hang individually. And that is the way you prefer to hang, in your own closet, upside down. And the hanging is going to be.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): John was here.

Mr. Lawlor: The position is that they were all interleaves, our lives are all dependent, there are no "self mades." It is all a myth. A damn lot of nonsense. We had to put up with it for several centuries and it has come to an end, and it has come to an end with youth. And irrespective of what ideological complexions they may be, of what political party, they still permeate, they still give off the same vibrations in this particular area.

They repudiate the values of their fathers because the values are profundamentally and unquestionably, to our own minds, if we look at it, hypocritical. All the brotherliness, all the charity, all the caritas, all the pretensions of Christianity, all the things that we hold out and do not practise, and say it is impossible to practise, really. Chesterton used to say: "Christianity has not been tried and found wanting. It was found difficult and never tried." And that is the end of the road. It is perfectly right, difficult. Or is it selfishness?

Reading "The Greening of America", I find him quite wrong, in his recognition of the true doctrine—which you Conservatives can hold along with us, you just do not happen to, that is all. It has happened with conservatism and it has adopted all the liberal tenets of the

nineteenth century. You have turned to Liberals. I do not know what the Liberals have turned into. Some kind of anarchists, I suppose. But you have all become fundamentally what the Liberals were in the nineteenth century against the Tories of that time because then the Tories were deeply rooted in a concept of community.

My friend Greg Baum enunciates what I consider to be the true position on this. He says:

> Related to dialogue is the other dimension of the process by which men come to be, which we have called communion. This dimension also reveals the unfinished character of man, and his dependence on others. Man is in need of the community to become himself.

A fundamental doctrine. They previously thought that they could become themselves outside and against the community.

It was the doctrine down to this time. It is the doctrine of laissez faire. It is the doctrine that you fundamentally continue to adopt. But you are just old hat. You are completely out of date, fatuous, backward. And it has enormous implications for the educational system. Man is in need of the community just to become himself.

In the twentieth century various intellectual and political trends have made us abandon the individualism inherited from a former age. We are on the whole no longer tempted to think that a man achieves self possession by concentrating on himself and by affirming himself over against his human environment, and by resisting the demands which the community makes on him. We have come to realize that it is precisely through his relation to others, to the community, that a man comes to be himself. Others participate in a man's self making. We see one aspect of this when we look at the dialogue which constitutes the history of man. To wind up this portion, which is the substantial portion of what I want to say in these introductory remarks I will read you a page or two from Charles Reich's book—he is a young professor of law at Harvard University—who is sufficiently diagnostic and sufficiently vatic to pick up the veins of the time and to put it into print.

Various trends began to coalesce and come together about two years ago and he has picked them out and he has been able to articulate them. Now, there are all kinds of faults in the book and I have seen them criticized severely. He tends to anarchism. It reminds me of Turgenev's "Fathers and Sons" of 75 years ago with the same theme which was repeated in that novel of the Russian. This is indeed anarchism.

He hates what he calls the corporate state, the government, the big, big thing. He wants to break it down into decentralized very small autonomous units. I think he runs against the grain. I do not think he takes a sufficient weighing of contemporary factors. I think he is not wise.

But he is a young man and his time is coming. On the other hand he is infected by the Marcuse virus, the virus of Utopianism. In other words, that perfection lies immediately at hand and that it can be achieved. I think we have learned by bitter experience and what part of experience of life and, somewhat, disillusion that things must be taken by slow gradations; that what we achieve either in our own lives personally and our relations to others or in society at large are not done overnight.

We do not expect the apocalypse. We expect small gains such as we gained in some legislation that came through this afternoon. A minute step, inches up the face of the precipice. The long, slow, hard, enduring climb which they do not want to face. That is the weakness in the position. But apart from a couple of factors like that, which are fairly impressive, he says enormously important and very penetrating things.

On the second page he says:

> There is a revolution coming. It will not be like the revolutions of the past. It will originate with the individual and with culture and it will change the political structure only as its final act.

It seems to me that quotation is profoundly true. We feel somehow that we are irrelevant here. That things pass us by, that we are making important decisions which seem to have no external impact. Nothing seems to count, but the important things are somehow out there and they are moving in a sphere that we are not really with or understand. They are a little beyond us. That is what he says and I think it is true.

The change in the political structure, unlike all the revolutions of the past—the French and the Russian, and the revolutions that occurred under the Gracchi in Rome—a real changeover of society, were all political. Political in their inspiration, political in their inception and political in their solution. But not this revolution, the revolution that is going on all around us. It will not require violence

to succeed and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. I would ask some of the Tory cabinet ministers to take that last phrase into cognizance.

Mr. Lewis: Like the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman).

Hon. Mr. White: Shame on you. You are the violent types.

Mr. Lewis: No, you are the violent people. The Minister of Trade and Development is the agent provocateur.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: How many of you Tories—come off it—how many of you think that by using the weapons of power and suppression you can sit on people? That you can put things down?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Come, come! Let the member for Scarborough West get his violin out.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The law and order fanatics of the Legislature.

Mr. Randall: I will play that one to music.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Lakeshore should not get violent now.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Lakeshore is a gentleman juxtaposed to you; a very gentle man!

An hon. member: There is a resemblance!

Mr. Lawlor: It cannot be successfully resisted by violence. It is now spreading with amazing rapidity and already our laws, institutions and social structure are changing in consequence. It promises a higher reason, a more human community and a new and liberated individual. Its ultimate creation will be a newer and enduring wholeness in beauty. A renewed relationship of man to himself, to other men, to society and to nature and to the land. This is the revolution of the new generation.

Their protest and rebellion, their culture, clothes, music, drugs, ways of thought and liberated life style, are not a passing fad or a form of dissent and refusal, nor are they in any sense irrational. The whole emerging pattern, from ideals to campus demonstrations, from beads and bell bottoms to the Woodstock Festival, make sense and is part of a consistent philosophy. It is both necessary and inevitable and in time it will include not only youth but all the people in America.

Mr. Lewis: Except three or four whom one could name.

Mr. Lawlor: There are always people who are left out, you know.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. There are about four or five of them opposite, fairly identifiable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to say a word on three or four concrete problems before sitting down. One is the problem of the role of government as it affects the universities, the business of your formula grants and your imposed cutoffs.

On the whole, I think we will say about the formula financing system that we agree with it. Its insensitivities will have to be narrowed down and perhaps more factors worked into the overall formula than presently exists. In other words, you tried to make it as simple as possible and in that you have succeeded at the cost of not committing much diversity or much innovation within the system. It is mechanistic and narrow and hard-run.

You are going to have to introduce a greater flair, if you will, or a greater number of components into the equation in order to permit a greater flexibility to the universities than presently exists. I think they do feel themselves in some kind of procrustean situation and complain to you about it bitterly as the reports are always indicating, as they come in from year to year.

But I do think this: that when the faculty or any other individual say that they want to have the determining role inside universities, and we keep our cotton-picking hands off their vaunted intellectual freedom and their autonomy, that to paraphrase something said: was it not by Napoleon or somebody?—that the universities are altogether too important in this society to be allowed to be run by the university people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lawlor: It is extremely important that we in the Legislature should have a greater community and closeness to that university community.

I think that the committee of the Legislature, human resources, should be more exposed, and the university communities, the

faculty associations, students' associations, committee of presidents, ought to consider on occasion—Dr. Wright himself should perhaps on occasion consider—coming before the committee in an informal and amicable way in order to discuss these things among ourselves. This happens rarely.

I will never forget the time that Dennis came before the committee—the Hall-Dennis lad—and that was one of the most vital and informative sessions that we had. This man, as you know, has remarkable gifts, particularly in terms of speech, and he carries enormous conviction, he believes what he says, and I remember that morning was extremely valuable to us.

I do not think there is enough rapport, give and take, between the government and the universities as things presently stand, and I would ask that greater thought be given to setting up lines of communication over and above what presently exists.

As to the role of the committee of university affairs, it is my considered judgement that they are altogether too cozy with you; that all you fellows are all climbing into the same bed. There are no arms-linked transactions, there is no independence of judgement. Come off it.

Hon. Mr. White: What committee?

Mr. Lawlor: The presidents of the university formed their little cabal or faction, they have their second-in-commands and they have their echelons of committees. Their echelons of committees—the men that they have set up there—are seconded into the subcommittees, or into working together with the subcommittees of the committee of university affairs. Who forms the secretariat for this committee but the hon. minister's department? He gives them the underlying facilities, his deputy minister is sitting there, and all work together hand in glove. How in blazes can there be any determination in objective terms when all these fellows have such a cozy clublike, genial, fraternal—almost like a university faculty association—meeting? And you are dealing with hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. I say they should be put out at arm's length. They should have a greater measure of independence than they presently enjoy.

Hon. Mr. White: Who is "they"?

Mr. Lawlor: That university affairs committee should act as a liaison committee out there, and it should have neutrality, it should have its own staff.

Mr. Lewis: Both of them! You are the water boy for the committee.

Mr. Lawlor: The presidents who are representing the vested interests of the universities will then be able to meet.

Mr. Randall: Sounds like a union setup to me.

Mr. Lawlor: Somebody in the middle there who is independent, instead of being your page-boys.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. White: You do not know how it works.

Mr. Lawlor: I am surprised that they—

Mr. Lewis: You have a little crest on your jacket saying, "John White, at your service". A votre service, right!

An hon. member: Recommend what you want recommended.

Mr. Lewis: Who would have thought you would be a chattel for the university presidents? You, John White, a man of integrity in times past.

Mr. Randall: The hon. member will not get an honorary doctorate if he keeps that up.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): That is another problem altogether. What you have—

Mr. Lewis: We will make the member for Don Mills chairman of Ontario Place. Just hold your breath.

Hon. Mr. White: I think your Freudian inclinations are revealing themselves.

Mr. Randall: Let us deal with reality, not with—

Mr. Lawlor: You would not know what reality is. In your psychedelic dreams you have never met reality for three minutes.

Ontario Place is down there, it is a piece of fatuity to prove it. It is your baby, and your baby is a half-born creature, vermilion in colour. A queer infant, you know!

Mr. Randall: Do not knock success.

Mr. Lewis: For you, reality is a drive-in hamburger stand. That is your total perspective.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: This is unfair, Mr. Chairman, We are all very fond of the former minister, but it is not because of his sense of reality. Not at all. When he was minister of housing he had very little sense of reality.

It is because of your pixie-like dreams that we love you, and for nothing else. So do not give me that stuff.

Mr. Lewis: For nothing else.

Mr. Lawlor: Alice in Wonderland all over again, only in male dress.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, my God, look who is talking about Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. Randall: The member for Lakeshore must be blind. Have you seen Sheridan Park, all the housing and—

Mr. Lewis: No, but he has seen Alice.

Mr. Lawlor: In order to be the super salesman that you are, you do have to have a certain self-generated charm, do you not?

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, let it go at that. Let us not talk about reality.

Mr. Lewis: Only the cabinet does not appreciate it. The rest of us do!

Mr. Randall: Do you want me to be your next campaign manager.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to mention for a few moments the business of the attack by this minister as his first act of office—within seven days—upon the graduate facilities in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: Attack is not the word.

Mr. Pitman: A rehash!

Mr. Lawlor: It was an ill considered, purblind move on his part, taken out of context, a body blow to the future teaching profession—

Hon. Mr. White: The member cannot talk about taxpayers at 5:30 and about this subject at 8:30.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He will anyway.

Mr. Lawlor: —to the professorate of this province. May I just take time to remind the hon. minister, reading the remarks of Hon. William G. Davis, for his estimates of the year 1970-1971, at page 13 he says:

> Certainly, we must be extremely cautious about ideas of curtailing sharply enrolment within university graduate schools on the premise that a surplus of such students already exists.

Just a year ago. This is last year, before the minister's ascendancy—

Mr. Pitman: Only last year.

Mr. Lawlor: —before the minister's peculiar vision, and great depth of insight, acquired over about two and a half weeks, came into full play, so that he could make a bumptious bump upon the newspapers of the province.

Mr. Lewis: That is what he is, a bump.

Mr. Lawlor: You want to leave your mark. You want it to be known that you were there. You are not going to be held under swaddling clothes. Not White.

He was going to trumpet, but the walls of Jericho may fall down. Listen to Davis. Listen to your mentor; listen carefully; pay attention.

Given the length of time it takes to prepare a docile student—in other words, like the type I have objected to somewhat strenuously—given the length of time it takes to prepare people at this level, such short-sighted reaction—do you hear that—

An hon. member: Careful how you say that. The ladies are present.

Mr. Lawlor: —could easily leave us in a position three or four years hence where we have great demand for highly educated personnel and no supply to meet them.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): It is called "hog cycle."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Who said that?

Mr. Lawlor: Grenville.

Mr. Stokes: Grenville?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Hon. Grenville Davis. The minister's fault here is in not seeking—

Hon. Mr. White: Not in my stars?

Mr. Lawlor: —to move in to some extent, but because of the ham-handed, hatchet manner in which he does these things—

Mr. Lewis: He is a ham.

Mr. Lawlor: Certainly he can use a little more sophistication, a little more suavity. In

other words, he could use a little more selectivity in his process, because precisely there are schools and there are kinds of graduates coming out of universities who ought to be supported, who ought to be given a premium, to be left, for instance, in the social sciences. The minister knows that. There is a plethora of graduates in other areas which possibly should be scouted severely and cut down, but cannot the minister manipulate a little better than he does with respect to the areas which he seeks to promote and the areas which he seeks to restrict?

To bear this out, I would like to have him look at what his predecessor had to say in the same estimates about the same problem. For example, he is talking about the Americanization problem basically, but he is saying:

> "The percentage of faculty of given national backgrounds also varies, of course, within the major disciplinary groupings. For example, within the faculties of business administration and commerce, 81.3 per cent are Canadian, while at the opposite end of the scale, 53.6 per cent of those teaching social sciences, where we have had a dearth of graduates from our own universities in recent years, are from our own country.

If the business colleges and the schools of business are well staffed by Canadians, and we have an adequacy and a projected abundance of graduate personnel coming out of those faculties, then fine. But what about these social sciences? I do not know if one cares that much as to whether one is an American or whether one is Hindustani teaching in the schools of business administration. There are techniques and ways of organizing business offices, and so forth, which I think have fairly universal validity. There is a way of doing these things, which can be taught in any country. But in the social sciences, the very area which is the most sensitive, Canadianism does seem to me, without going overboard, on the patriotic bit, to have a good deal to be said for it. The social sciences require those who have a feeling for, and some deep relationship to, the peculiar socio-economic context in this country, the racial hereditary and other mixtures that we have. People coming from the United States, from Kentucky, from Texas, have hardly acquired that particular understanding, whereas we have it bred in our bones.

I think we understand those very subtle, almost intangible relationships between the Scots and the Irish, you know, or between the Irish and the English in the Ottawa Valley. I do not think you have to know much to understand that. These things are all peculiar to a country; this is the internal equipoise that binds us together or separates us.

And you have these strangers coming in, 53.6 per cent, teaching social sciences, only that. So these schools are played down. Now, why do you not operate selectively and use your grants in such a way as to rectify that disparity as it presently stands?

Well, there are dozens of other areas, we will get to them, particularly I would think in vote 3. I would just abjure and if I may be presumptive enough, turning directly to the minister, ask him not to be a force in the direction of the technocrat, not to preen himself on the technocratic aspects in his administration. I think he has some disposition to do that, to be some kind of paladin in favour of efficiency, thinking that this has a primary role to play.

He has the responsibility to spend the public money well, but in the field of education it is kind of a different thing than in the normal department. There is the human factor, the developmental factor, the factor of play is far more preponderant here than elsewhere.

Mr. Lewis: . . . against the philistinism of more scholar for your dollar.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the kind of thing. I am afraid that kind of phrase does ring false and hollow in one's ears. It is a dangerous doctrine, you know, which does tend to the utilitarian.

Mr. Lewis: Technocrat.

Mr. Lawlor: My whole speech therefore was directed against you on the basis of being directed against the whole utilitarian ethos and against that sort of thing which permeates our present institutions and this society and keeps us the pigmies we are, with the half page of philosophers that we have ever produced.

Mr. Lewis: Sort of bush league Harvards, you might say.

Mr. Lawlor: Bush league Harvards!

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that kind of stuff.

Mr. Lawlor: And so do take the thoughts and the feelings of George Grant when he talks about the technocrats and do pay some attention to the role in American government

of those who plume themselves upon this particular gift.

Mr. Stokes: Ecoutez bien.

Mr. Lawlor: The bright young men, the slick young men, the clever professional young men we pour out from our schools without a vestige of education in the proper sense of the term. Do not become concordant with them, they are the enemy, on the make, you see them on Bay Street every day, they infest the courts, they degrade the country.

They are all well dressed, extremely well kept and very bright, but God help us if they take over. Do not be one of them. Resist them and give your whole impact to the human aspects of the wider vision in education and you will have something for this province.

Mr. Stokes: That is a pretty tough act to follow.

Mr. Lewis: As my colleague the member for Peterborough says, that is casting pearls before swine.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I would not say that of him!

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I very much enjoyed listening to my friend from Lakeshore on Tuesday evening and again today. He and I share hopes for this society; pixie-like hopes, I suppose we could say. We envisage a society in which there is more love and less hate, more egalitarianism and—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Sentimentalists. Over there? They do not know the meaning of sentiment.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should go back to signing his mail and all his proclamations.

Mr. Stokes: Go back to leaving your fingerprints on the boutiques at Ontario Place.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The man has a rock here, not a heart.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Hold your ground, just hold your ground.

Mr. Lewis: Just purse your lips and sign your name.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sorry, I apologize to the Minister of University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore and I not only envisage but anticipate a much better world, starting here in Ontario funnily enough. A world in which there is more egalitarianism, more opportunity for everyone, greater freedom for the individual, a much more rewarding fulfilment for each human being—that is to say, intellectually and spiritually and morally and physically.

I think we are optimistic about the outcome, in part because of the incredible way in which we have been able to move forward in the society in the last few years.

I want to deal with that at greater length in a moment or two, but I have a responsibility, initially, which I had not anticipated.

It is to make a further comment, by way of postscript, on certain of the remarks of the member for Scarborough East on Tuesday. Members who were here will recall he spent a very long time detailing the proportions of foreign professors to Canadian professors in half a dozen universities.

I met that point in a general way when I stood up after his remarks and I will not repeat those general comments. Nor will I repeat, I think, the policy of this government. That has been clearly enunciated and our concern has been very deliberately and emphatically expressed. I feel obliged to bring the subject up, however, because without invitation from me or any of my staff, two submissions have come to me—one from the dean of law at the University of Windsor and one from the University of Laurentian—and I would like to read the two of them into the record. This is the bulk of a letter from the dean of law at the University of Windsor, Dean W. S. Tarnopolsky.

Mr. Lewis: A former noted Liberal.

Hon. Mr. White: He writes:

> I would like to express my willingness to meet with you or any members of the Legislature or the cabinet, in committee or on television, to answer the so-called charges—

by which he means the accusations made concerning the American professors in his law school.

> In the meantime, I would respectfully bring the following facts and arguments to your attention.
>
> There is no question but that one could show this law school has a number of Americans in its most senior ranks. What I am suggesting is that a reference to these facts, without explanation and without referring to other facts, is not fair. For example, although it is true that four of the six tenured members of this faculty

are Americans, and the two senate members elected by the faculty are American, and that the Americans on this faculty are concentrated in the upper ranks, it is unfair and a distortion of the law school today if you do not also acknowledge that since I arrived in 1968, only one further American has been hired.

It is a distortion of facts if one does not also point out to the audience which does not know about universities, that the people who are at a university the longest are the ones who will get tenure first. It is also a distortion of facts if, in similar circumstances, to a similar audience, one does not point out that elections to senates are usually for several years, and that therefore our senate members are quite naturally American because they were here first and longest.

When I inherited this school we had a faculty of five—three Americans and two Canadians; only one of them was from Ontario. By my third month in office, the one Ontarian was appointed by the federal government to the county court bench. Since I took office we have appointed—although some have since left and been replaced—12 from Canada, two from the United Kingdom, one from the United States, one from Ceylon and one from New Zealand.

I would like to point out further that no other discipline in Ontario universities has less Americans than the law schools. In fact, a number of Canadian law teachers have felt that by the late nineteen sixties Canadian legal education had become far too parochial and, to the extent that it was not too parochial, far too British.

I say as an aside that this may be a consequence of the hon. member's Rhodes scholarship.

Presently I feel strongly that I would not like to be associated with a law faculty which is purely Canadian. If there is an opportunity to hire at least a few capable, interesting people from other countries, as widely varied as possible, this would be for the mutual benefit of the faculty members themselves as well as for the greater benefit of the students.

And then he reiterates his willingness to appear before a legislative committee or any other group.

This information was taken on the telephone from the acting president of Laurention University in Sudbury. The total number of full-time staff at Laurentian is 185. Ninety-eight or 53 per cent of these are Canadian and Canadian citizens. Twenty-one or 11.4 per cent are British citizens. Fourteen or 7.5 per cent are American citizens. Eleven or six per cent are Indian citizens yet to obtain Canadian citizenship. The remaining 32 or 17 per cent are from 19 other ethnic groups.

In this respect Laurentian reflects the local population of Sudbury, which has some 33 different ethnic groups. Nine or five per cent are French.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Do not scorn it. Do not scorn it.

Mr. Lewis: He is a minister. He should not act like a clown, the buffoon of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Do not scorn it! Do not scorn me and do not scorn this.

Mr. Lewis: Sit still and sign your letters.

Mr. J. R. Simonett (Frontenac-Addington): You should talk.

Hon. Mr. White: Nine or five per cent are French. The Americans are in the majority in no department at the university. It is pointed out that one has to be careful in dealing with percentages when applying those percentages to small numbers because, for instance, in geography, out of seven faculty members, there is no American and, therefore, the percentage is zero, while in the classics department, which has two members, it so happens that one is American and, therefore, the percentage of Americans is 50 per cent. If the member for Scarborough East wishes to evaluate in terms of percentages, it is pointed out to me that this is a completely false approach.

Another point which could be of interest to the members of the Legislature is the fact that in their professional school which includes six faculties—engineering, nursing, physical and health education, social work, commerce administration, translators and interpreters—there is not a single American professor as of this date.

So as I say, Mr. Chairman, I have not intended to bring that up because I could tell from the interjections from the NDP and the reaction from my colleagues, and indeed the despair evidenced on the faces of the Liberals that they held no brief for that particular cheap form of populist politics. My expectation is that in the weeks to come my hon.

friend will regret having attempted to make that an issue. We are living in a very interesting and challenging world and I am curious to read observations and the prognostications of the prophets of our age. Let me deal for a moment or two with what they have said and how this might affect education at every stage, and most particularly at the post-secondary level.

I had lunch not long ago with Mrs. James Jacobs and the question was put to her, "What do you anticipate happening in this decade of the Seventies?" And she said, "I see a far greater decentralization, a far deeper and broader form of democracy taking place, with power flowing from a centralized system, whether that be Ottawa or Queen's Park or City Hall, down into a wide variety of organizations, neighbourhood associations, individuals, and so on." And she said, "I think this is going to characterize this decade."

One reads in Lewis Mumford's recent book —and an astonishing document it is—it was only about 1600 when Galileo and Copernicus discovered the universe was heliocentric that the idea crept into the mind of man that a perfect society was pyramidal in form. Funnily enough, the invention of the geared timepiece accompanied those particular discoveries. This gave some support to the notion that in a perfect human society men would fit into a particular groove in the same way that heavenly bodies travel around the sun in predictable and preordained orbit and in the same way that the gears in a clock go around in a perfect way.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and that Conservative ideology was essentially circular.

Hon. Mr. White: At the same time Descartes and other philosophers expressed the idea that a society will be best served when every individual in it has his appointed place, his appointed orbit, so to speak. I am curious in hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Lakeshore who sees himself, as I do often, as a modern-minded man, being entrapped by that Cartesian philosophy. I am going to attempt to prove, before I sit down, that without his knowing it himself, he has constrained himself by the Cartesian outlook and perhaps by certain Jesuit inclinations or experience—I am not sure about that —which, of course, puts into its most rigorous form this particular notion of the human society.

We observe that McLuhan, another of our prophets, situ in Toronto and a product to some extent of the Ontario society—and I am going to deal later with the rather derogatory reflection on our scholars, because I think it was not entirely fair, not at all fair, in fact a manifestation perhaps of our alleged lack of confidence—here is McLuhan telling us the effects of instantaneous communication, visual and audio, and how that is going to very greatly alter the structure of society, making it very much looser, very much more participatory and such like. I am not wise enough or learned enough in that particular field to expand on his theory. Then one learns about Ivan Illich's theory, in which he sees the present highly structured and centralized educational system changing—"deschooling" in his phrase. Funnily enough, we see this notion given support by the most conservative elements within the university community. I have had three examples in recent weeks where this is happening, or about to happen, and I hope I will get an opportunity to describe that when we get into the detail of these estimates.

Mr. Pitman: Illich calls those the "Bourbons." They are not true Illich followers.

Hon. Mr. White: Since the member does not know what I am referring to, I think his observation may be premature.

Mr. Lewis: They are neo-Illichs, as it were.

Mr. Lawlor: He does call them Bourbons.

Hon. Mr. White: We observe a common thread in the notions which the prophets are bringing to these various aspects of life in 1971. I thought a week or so ago that these interesting thinkers are not unlike the five blind men who described an elephant. One felt his leg and said an elephant is like a tree; another felt his tail and said an elephant is like a rope, and so on. It seems to me that these wise and articulate people coming to the problem of this overall change in society, attempting to define and give direction to the changing nature of our culture, of necessity come to it from a particular vantage point, because while, as the hon. member for Lakeshore said, it is a highly specialized age, among the generalists must be counted the politicians.

I observe a common thread running through these various prophecies, and I wish I were able to articulate this commonality more lucidly than I can. I think we are going to have here in Ontario, and no doubt elsewhere, a society in which there is more egalitarianism, in which there is more equal-

ity. If we were to enumerate the changes, many of them legislative, many of them flowing from this government in the last five years, I think we would be astonished at that list, whether one is talking about legal aid or Medicare or the POSAP awards. There are dozens and dozens of accomplishments, legislative and financial, which have made this jurisdiction of ours one of the jewels of the world since time began. And if you quarrel with that, we will have a debate on that subject.

Mr. Lewis: No. We we do not quarrel with that. All the ideas came from here.

Mr. Pitman: That has been the role of this party for the last 20 years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Not only do we see the societies becoming much more egalitarian, but as a by-product of affluence we see a shift from materialism; a shift, let me say, from the quantity aspect of life to the quality of life. I am so interested in hearing my hon. friend denigrate the productivity of our forefathers, as if this, in fact, were not the fountainhead of our new appreciation of these qualitative aspects of life—

Mr. T. Reid: Smell it every day driving to work.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you not go back to the bush?

Hon. Mr. White: —which have, of necessity, eluded previous generations.

By the way, when I was in Ireland a month ago they were not worrying a lot about pollution on the west coast near Galway, I can tell you. So we see this enormous productivity, the enormous return on foregone consumption, of all of our forefathers since Australopithecus Africanus picked up the first thigh bone—the first formation of capital —and slew his antelope. That is when capital originated and has been accumulating ever since.

Now we reach the stage at which the enormous production of goods and services makes it possible for us to reorientate our lives. When having cigarette lighter No. 7 no longer has any interest, or having car No. 3, or car No. 2—whatever it may be, bicycle No. 7 perhaps—no longer has any interest for us we are turning our attention to the quality of the nature of life, collectively and individually. This, I think, is going to be part and parcel of the 1970s here in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Better explain that to the public.

Hon. Mr. White: I think that we are going to see another signal of this decade, a much more heterogeneous world. Some people will have long hair, and some will have short hair. A recent conversion, as I point my finger to the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: Of what? Conversion of what?

Hon. Mr. White: From long hair to short hair. I was speaking figuratively.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wait until after the election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: People selling flowers on the street corner; people sculpturing; people making steel; people digging ditches. We are going to see the whole gamut of human activity here in this society called Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: That is possible, since there are a great many people active.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, it was not the case before when we were completely goal-oriented. If you do not understand that, you do not understand what I am trying to say.

Mr. Lewis: Well as a matter of fact, it is a very modest reply to the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. White: So the member for Lakeshore and I see these things happening and we welcome them. We see a more heterogeneous society. We see a more egalitarian society. We see a society in which power is deeper and broader.

I could go on, I think, but this will establish the general background as I lead now into some consideration—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister agrees that beauty will become more important?

Hon. Mr. White: If I lead now into some consideration of how—

Mr. Lewis: What about beauty?

Hon. Mr. White: —universities are to react and respond and interact with the community in the nineteen seventies, where the social transformations are happening very quickly. My hon. friend, from his Cartesian point of view, would have the Minister of University Affairs impose certain dicta on the university

presidents. I will be going into that detail later.

Mr. Lawlor: What has poor old me got to do with that?

Hon. Mr. White: As for this idea of applying decision-making from the top and having everything neat and tidy in its pyramidal form, let me ask him quite seriously if he would hold to this view if the member for Scarborough East were the Minister of University Affairs?

Mr. Lewis: The member for Scarborough East thinks he is, therefore he thinks, which is not self-evident.

Hon. Mr. White: Would he not agree with me that the best prospect for the universities increasing their quality in a variety of ways, and quantity too, lies not in imposing edicts from le ministre or the government or a committee of the government but rather in encouraging a heterogenity of innovation? Experimentation—boldly, I would hope—can take place without the enormous cost of a universal failure.

Mr. Lawlor: Talk about edicts. You need to be fed independent objective advice.

Hon. Mr. White: And would he not agree with me that the responsibility of the minister in this particular area ends with his encouraging this innovation, this bold experimentation, coupled with—

Mr. Lawlor: I sometimes wonder what your responsibilities are.

Hon. Mr. White: I listened to the member very quietly for some number of hours.

Let me finish. He can ask his questions later. Let me develop this theme.

Would he not agree with me that the Minister of University Affairs' responsibilities end—I am oversimplifying, of course—when he has done everything he can to encourage this kind of innovation, this kind of reaching for qualitative breakthroughs—I hope I have a chance to enlarge on that idea later—and when he has induced to the extent that seems wise to himself and his cabinet colleagues the economies which I see as the collateral condition to effective efficient teaching in our university system?

Mr. Lewis: Right, that was not an encouragement. That was an edict.

Hon. Mr. White: That was an inducement.

Mr. Lewis: An inducement? I see. What a euphemism that is? It was an order.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me run through some of these notes that I have made. Although they are not particularly orderly, they do follow chronologically at any rate the presentation of the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Typical university methods.

Mr. T. Reid: Will the minister abolish his own position?

Hon. Mr. White: I will be glad to deal with that later, too. Yes, I think it is possible that in a few years hence it may not be necessary.

Mr. Lewis: He will elevate Claude Bissell to the head of university affairs in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: Now the member expressed his dismay of the multiversity, so-called. This shorthand actually is distorting in and of itself; the very word has a pejorative sense almost always. When one uses that word, one obscures the point which the hon. member is no doubt trying to make.

Let us consider at some point in these estimates what constitutes the optimum size for a university. I put that question to some number of wise people and I have gotten some interesting responses. I think this is one of the many important questions with which we, as legislators, will have to come to grips in the next few years.

Mr. Lawlor: There are 12,323 questions that will have to be answered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, the member can make this question sound foolish, but it is not as foolish as that and he knows it.

Mr. Lawlor: I am serious.

Mr. Lewis: We have given it considerable analysis. Oh, excuse me. The former Minister of Public Works has much to say on this subject. There is a great illumination coming.

Hon. Mr. White: He said the professional schools were not scholarly, they were defective in all the things that matter. Those are his words: the professional schools are defective in all the things that matter. I think that is not quite fair to professional schools. There was a series of articles entitled "Annals of Legislation on Medicare" in the New Yorker magazine—and a very exhaustive series

it was—about 1962, in which it was stated, and I believe it is true, that nearly always a young man or woman aspiring to be a medical doctor expended virtually all his time, talents, energy and so on from the age of 19 to the age of 26, 27, 28 or 29 perhaps. And, in focusing on this particular specialty, he became the least informed person in the community. I know this is not always true, because I know a number of very cultured medical doctors and yet I know that this is very often the case.

This is a byproduct, I suppose, of a tremendously complicated profession, and I cannot say with the hon. member that they are defective in all of the things that matter, because one of the things that matters to us is the health of our youngsters and the health of our populace, mental health and physical health.

It is a sacrifice, I think, that those practitioners make. Most of them are dedicated. It is a sacrifice that they make; they forego musical concerts that you and I enjoy, and trips here and there, and reading good books and having good conversations and being a well-rounded man. That is one of the joys of being a politician, surely—that we sit down with informed people every day of our lives and discuss a wide variety of human activities.

Mr. Lewis: That is why the first heart transplant had to be from white to white. It is the sense of culture which the medical profession had.

Hon. Mr. White: Is that the member's concept of a logical interjection?

Mr. Lewis: It is a perfect example of the need for liberalism, which my colleague described, to infuse university education.

Hon. Mr. White: I hope the member is not comparing South Africa and this jurisdiction?

Mr. Pitman: They are taking two years off medical education in the United States.

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend dealt with the purposes of a university and his primary objection, of course, is to the vocational component. This is troublesome, no doubt, troublesome to all of us, I think; one of the things I myself wonder about from time to time.

Yet I observe as my four-year-old daughter learns to read and write—as she is doing at the present time—and as my four-year-old daughter learns to count and attempts for the first time some very elementary sums, that in acquiring these basic skills for intellectual development—which may expand who knows how far in the decades to come?—there is a very direct vocational application, whether she happens to sell lingerie in a department store, where she would have to reckon change, or whether she happens to write the most esoteric reports for nuclear physics. There is a vocational application there.

Mr. Lewis: Thanks to "Sesame Street," all of this is now possible.

Hon. Mr. White: Would my hon. friend from Lakeshore suggest that she should not be taught to read and write?

Mr. Lawlor: Come on! She has not been.

Hon. Mr. White: Would my hon. friend suggest that there be no vocational component in any of the faculties of any of our universities here in Ontario?

Mr. Lawlor: No, I want to suggest that there might be some other component once in a while, that is all.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we are going to observe a shift away, and in fact we have observed, a shift away from the job-oriented subjects. I would have been quite happy if there had never been a law school in a university. It is a vocational form of training which I feel is rather foreign to the primary purpose of a university, but the law schools are there. The lawyers, in the process of developing these particular vocational skills, have an opportunity to talk to economists like me and others who have a well-rounded education. In this respect, I suppose, it leavens the loaf to some extent.

Mr. Lewis: That is true.

Hon. Mr. White: As my hon. friend has proved to us in the last few days.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, the lawyers are somewhat better than the doctors.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not going to get a lot upset about the existing vocational component. I see this diminishing in importance as we enter into this very improved society, this very different culture.

Mr. Lawlor: It is getting worse.

Mr. T. Reid: The trends are having the opposite effect.

Hon. Mr. White: He made mention of the resistance of universities to social change. I think that is only partly true. I think in matters touching themselves directly they may be, as most people are and certainly as all institutions are, very jealous to safeguard their rights, their perquisites—

Mr. Lewis: Their authoritarian structures.

Hon. Mr. White: —their pay in money, their percentage of national income and such like. I observe that to be true—would you believe it—of members of the Legislature?

Mr. Lewis: That is true.

Hon. Mr. White: None of whom are more aggressive in this respect than the members of the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, reminding the minister of his actions around the University of Western Ontario, trying to introduce a sense of social change which did not quite come off.

Hon. Mr. White: What might that refer to?

Mr. Lewis: The election of a student to the board of governors.

Hon. Mr. White: Let us debate that separately too.

Mr. Lewis: Sure; talk about resistance to social change. The minister was on the side of the angels then. Now he is a minister and suddenly becomes protective of the rights of the university community.

Hon. Mr. White: I will be glad to debate that all over again and I will not have to change a word of it.

Mr. Lewis: No doubt the minister will, now that the Premier is where he is.

Hon. Mr. White: When I have certain other bills to bring in here, I will not have to apologize either, and one will see that there is a consistency throughout.

Mr. Lewis: That is fine. I am glad there has been progression.

Hon. Mr. White: Whether the numbers be one or 101.

Mr. Lewis: It was embarrassing then.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, yes?

Mr. Lewis: Indeed it was.

Hon. Mr. White: The university students did not seem to think so because I polled exactly the same proportion of votes on the campus as in my riding. I polled about six to one, when one considers the NDP candidate, thought at that time to be a very strong contender, the number one labour leader in the area.

Mr. Lawlor: That will never happen again.

Hon. Mr. White: But do not distract me now; we can argue these things point by point.

Mr. Lewis: I am just reminding the minister about social change in the universities.

Hon. Mr. White: I am now attempting to comment on certain points in the lengthy presentation of the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, the minister needs all his wits about him to answer that.

Hon. Mr. White: In expanding on this theme, the member said the utilitarianism that one observes is devitalizing, that the vocational element was excusable when livings had to be made. I want to reiterate something that I asserted or implied a few minutes ago.

Mr. Lawlor: And that specialization is evil.

Hon. Mr. White: Livings still have to be made and we still have to have skilled people to operate machines, to operate our law courts, to perform operations in hospitals, and so forth. One is, I think, not doing kindness to the cause to pretend that this vocational element can be terminated immediately.

Mr. Lawlor: No one says that.

Hon. Mr. White: The member certainly implied it if he did not say it.

Mr. Lawlor: I said just the opposite.

Hon. Mr. White: He said that retaining students in universities, which he averred was a deliberate policy to minimize unemployment, led to boredom and frustration. Now I ask the members of this House to accept my personal word of honour that at no time has this played any role in our policies so far as the expansion of the universities and the provision of funds is concerned.

Mr. Lawlor: Come off it. The minister deliberately—

Hon. Mr. White: It has been in no way a solution to unemployment—

Mr. Pitman: It is a backdrop. It is so pervasive that the minister does not even think of it any more.

Hon. Mr. White: —imposed on us. All right, I will pause here and deal with this in greater detail.

Mr. Lewis: That is the problem. It is all that you discuss in cabinet.

Hon. Mr. White: This government has been saying very emphatically since October 1969, and without any help from the opposition members, that the monetary and fiscal policies of the federal government, deliberately and overtly and explicitly designed to create unemployment, were the worst of all possible solutions to unemployment.

Mr. Pitman: Okay, we agree with that, but—

Hon. Mr. White: And we have since October—yes, hon. members opposite have agreed with it recently—

Mr. Lewis: Recently?

Hon. Mr. White: —when the numbers became so horrendous. You were silent for months and months after October, 1969.

Mr. Lawlor: Take a look at the federal Hansard.

Mr. Lewis: We have a had a fetish about it.

Hon. Mr. White: You never, in fact, put a whole-hearted effort before this government. Of course, one does not expect the Liberals to do so—

Mr. Lewis: No; right!

Hon. Mr. White: They apologize here almost every day of their lives for the despicable policies emanating from Ottawa.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is a man of some insight.

Hon. Mr. White: For instance, the NDP did not have much to say—

Mr. Lewis: No, on the contrary your leader takes his position from those we voiced.

Hon. Mr. White: They were afraid of supporting us as we opposed those policies. Your daddy may have, but you did not. And that is a fact.

Mr. Lewis: Do not visit the sins of the father on the son. Just be careful!

Hon. Mr. White: Can you imagine a government seeking the support of the electors, hoping and expecting to be re-elected, coping with unemployment by spending $4,000 per young man or woman for an eight-month period of time? Can you imagine rational men utilizing these enormous funds, hundreds of millions of dollars, to keep men and women in a university centre?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that is what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. White: It is not what we are doing.

Mr. Pitman: Can you give us one study that says 25 per cent of the population 18 to 21 should be in university?

Hon. Mr. White: I am really surprised that you would take this kind of a cheap, political, short-term approach.

Mr. Lewis: No, it is not cheap; and it is not political or destructive.

Hon. Mr. White: There are many things to be said.

Mr. Lewis: It is the policy you inherited from your predecessor.

Hon. Mr. White: There are many criticisms to be offered in this area of the universities, but this does not happen to be one of them. You know in your heart, my dear friend, that what I say is true.

Mr. Pitman: The universities have asked you.

Mr. Lewis: Do not try to seduce the member for Lakeshore. He is too bright for that.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore said that I was—or we, I guess, the government—were too given to a hands-off philosophy. I want to say to him, as I said to the member for Scarborough East, do you want me to select the faculty members?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. White: Do you want me to select the books for the university libraries?

Mr. Pitman: That over-simplifies the problem altogether.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. White: Do you want me to determine the course content?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. White: Do you want me to decide the standards of admission or graduation?

Mr. Lewis: Well, that is a thought.

Hon. Mr. White: My friend opposite takes a federal—

Mr. Lewis: We would like you to talk turkey to the university presidents. That is what we would like you to do. And speak to your committees in tough terms.

Hon. Mr. White: Where have you been for the last 11 weeks?

Mr. Lewis: You buckled under every time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why do you eggheads not go outside and have a talk to yourselves?

Hon. Mr. White: I am on to you fellows. You cozy up to Charlie Bigelow at OCUFA's meetings and say—

Mr. Lewis: Charlie Bigelow is the next member for London North, that is what he is. He is going to be in this House in six months. Be careful what you say about him.

Mr. Stokes: He will probably end up being the Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: You cannot even remember the Tory's name for London North. That is why you used Charlie Bigelow.

Hon. Mr. White: You cozy up to Bigelow, and the members of OCUFA, and say "Everything you are doing is swell." Then you come in here and criticize and hope they never see a Hansard, which they will not—

Mr. Lewis: What are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. White: —in all likelihood, while I have been spending the last three months going to the university presidents, in committee and individually—

Mr. T. Reid: You will send Hansard to them!

Mr. Lawlor: You will send it out to them.

Hon. Mr. White: —going to the student administrations—

Mr. Lewis: We have done that.

Hon. Mr. White: —going to the faculty associations—

Mr. Lewis: We have done that.

Hon. Mr. White: —going to the student awards officers, and saying to them: "You have got to use these funds very wisely."

Mr. Pitman: That is a brilliant remark.

Hon. Mr. White: "You have got to use them effectively."

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. White: "You have got to reveal fully—"

Mr. Simonett: You would not know.

Hon. Mr. White: "—thereby becoming completely accountable." Do not think for one minute this particular message has been music in the ears of the constituencies in the university communities across this country.

Mr. Lewis: But you watch the results in London next time around. You draw a lesson from Middlesex South, my friend. You watch the results in London North, Middlesex North and London South.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Lenny has been too tough.

Hon. Mr. White: We are spending, this year, on colleges and universities approximately $750 million and there are about seven and a half million people, so even my friend from Scarborough East can compute that is $100 per person, or one might say about $430 per family. The average family in this jurisdiction has an income of something like $6,500 or $7,000 a year, so $430 in foregone consumption of goods and services—a stove, a frig, a new car, or a trip to Muskoka—constitutes an enormous sacrifice, and I am not going to be deterred as I pursue this goal of having these enormous funds very well used—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, quit the gas!

Hon. Mr. White: —and I would be glad if the members of the opposition had the guts to stand up with me on behalf of this province—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —instead of muttering these small nothings in this chamber.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. White: No. The member can ask questions later.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister seen what we are wasting on plants in community colleges, on duplication? He is involved in so much waste it is inexcusable.

Hon. Mr. White: Instead of muttering these small nothings in this chamber and then going out to their allies on the various campuses and saying that everything they are doing is perfect.

Mr. Lewis: The minister makes these pretentious announcements—falderal, grandiose gesturing. What a posturer he is.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes? Well we will let the people decide where the integrity lies, where the truth lies, or where the worth in it lies.

Mr. Lewis: What a posturer the minister is.

Mr. Pitman: Pathetic!

Mr. Lewis: Come now. Back to the reality of philosophy.

Hon. Mr. White: Now my hon. friend said there are a lot of youngsters at universities who should not be there.

Mr. Lawlor: This government's danger is that it is factotum in its attitude.

Mr. Sargent: And less than three per cent of my people get to universities.

Hon. Mr. White: Right!

Mr. Sargent: And six per cent of the minister's do.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. White: Six per cent of mine?

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I do not know—

Mr. Sargent: How does the minister like those figures? Talk about them.

Hon. Mr. White: —what those numbers mean but I am going to deal with this now and I agree with you—

Mr. Sargent: A lot of hot air.

Hon. Mr. White: I agree with you and I disagree with the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He says it is a lot of hot air.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore said that there a lot of youngsters at the universities who should not be there, that some number of members of university hierarchies are just dying to economize—

Mr. Lawlor: And there are a lot who are not there who should be there. Balance it out.

Hon. Mr. White: —to bring their operations within the constraints of our more closely controlled financial resources by cutting out some number of kids. I have said not once, but at every meeting I have gone to, this is not an acceptable solution to our demand for economies in the universities.

Mr. Pitman: Because then they would be unemployed.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Then you would have them on the labour market.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, not because they will be unemployed! My friend for Lakeshore and I know that this opportunity should be made available to larger numbers of young men and women and older men and women too in a variety of ways.

Mr. Pitman: Exactly.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Hon. Mr. White: Right. That is the point. Now we all agree.

Mr. Lewis: Right. What is the minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. White: We are going to do plenty about it.

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. White: Most recently we changed the proportion for grant purposes from one-sixth to one-fifth, and there are a lot more things to come.

Mr. Lewis: That is a major change?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, that is a major change—

Mr. Lewis: I see, I see.

Mr. Pitman: We have been trying to get it for five years.

Hon. Mr. White: —and if the hon. member does not know it, it means that he is not informed.

Mr. Lewis: I was sufficiently informed to have hoped for much more.

Hon. Mr. White: And if the member does not know it, as indeed he does not—

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: —it means he is not informed.

Mr. Lewis: I was here when the minister made the announcement. But when he breaks down the class system of entrance to university, then we will be impressed.

Hon. Mr. White: All right.

Mr. Lewis: So that more than 25 per cent go from some other area.

Hon. Mr. White: All right. I do not disagree with that.

Mr. Pitman: And maybe fewer than 25 per cent from some other area.

Hon. Mr. White: Now it is clear to me. Yet, let us put the proposition into a clearer focus—

Mr. Simonett: I think you could double that and triple it.

Mr. Sargent: I never got there.

Mr. Simonett: I know that.

Hon. Mr. White: It must be acknowledged, in talking of the post-secondary institutions, that there is almost perfect correlation with socio-economic gradations.

Mr. Pitman: What?

Mr. Lewis: Well, that is not a treatise I would agree with.

Mr. T. Reid: Dr. Wright disagrees with that.

Mr. Pitman: That is not so with the figures I have.

Hon. Mr. White: There is a positive correlation between one's parents' income and wealth holdings and the probability of attending university; there is an inverse relationship when one considers the community colleges. Right? Right!

Mr. Pitman: In other words, what the minister is saying is that the poorer kids go to colleges of applied arts and technology. Well, that is known.

Hon. Mr. White: And when one adds the two things together then one gets an almost perfect correlation.

Mr. Lewis: The less economically advantaged go to the CAATs is what the minister is saying, which we have pointed out a thousand times. But what about your privileged university community? What about laying down a moat so mortals can enter your university community? This is what you have to do as minister.

Hon. Mr. White: That is what we are in the process of doing.

Mr. Lewis: All right. When you do that we will support you.

Mr. Pitman: That has not gone very far yet.

Hon. Mr. White: That is the point with which I am taking issue now, when the member for Lakeshore says to me that there are too many young men and women on the campuses who should not be there. In fact, this is not the case.

Mr. Lewis: And a great many that should be.

Hon. Mr. White: There are going to be a lot more in the years to come, and we are not going to let the universities become these exclusive islands of—

Mr. Lewis: Privilege!

Hon. Mr. White: —privilege.

Mr. Lewis: That is what they are now. They are all Tories. The government should lower the voting age. It would reap a harvest.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh come on.

Mr. Lewis: The minister does not realize that there is a member of the Edmund Burke Society under every bed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why you want us to lower it, eh, because we would reap a harvest?

Mr. Lewis: That is right, so that you could win a few extra seats.

Hon. Mr. White: Really, the ignorance of the leader of the NDP is just beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Lewis: Why? You do not think that the university community does not mirror the adult society?

Hon. Mr. White: These asinine interjections are completely off the point.

Mr. Lewis: What asinine interjections?

Mr. Sargent: He is hurting!

Mr. Lewis: They are all economically related to the society as a whole.

Hon. Mr. White: You are not on these points at all.

Mr. Lewis: Your middle class—

Hon. Mr. White: Your critic said that there were too many—

Mr. Lewis: And he is right.

Hon. Mr. White: —youngsters who should not be there.

Mr. Lewis: He also said that there were people who should be there and who are not there.

Hon. Mr. White: I am saying that there are a lot more youngsters from every class in the society who are going to be there. We observe now—

Mr. Lawlor: That is right, and they should be there.

Hon. Mr. White: —that the system is very much more egalitarian than it was some time ago, and it is going to be a lot more egalitarian in the future.

Mr. Lawlor: If the minister just does not know his own policy for the past 10 years of using universities as a custodial institution, then he should not be the minister.

Mr. Lewis: Exactly. Right! He was handed the mantle because he was safe. He would not violate William Davis's legacy.

Mr. Lawlor: That simple naive faith that he has about his own portfolio is something touching. If the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) were here, I would bleed a little

Hon. Mr. White: That faith is founded on performance any way—something that members of the opposition have not had an opportunity to do for themselves.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, he is a good minister and he should be Minister of Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. White: Now I would like to deal with the mix between—

Mr. Lawlor: If they were going to be decent to him, they would give him the Treasury of Ontario. At least he knows a little about it.

Hon. Mr. White: —the research and teaching functions of a university.

Mr. Lewis: They are fobbing him off on University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it would be a very beguiling idea that we remove all research from—

Mr. Lawlor: This portfolio is not worthy of him.

Hon. Mr. White: —the universities and put them into something new. What would we call them? Research institutes? This simplistic solution appeals to those simplistic souls—

Mr. Lawlor: It is many times simplistic, but he must be a cracker jack—

Hon. Mr. White: —who turn to simplistic organizations like the NDP. In point of fact—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, is this going to be a tirade?

Hon. Mr. White: The member does not have to stay.

Mr. Sargent: Get on with the vote.

Hon. Mr. White: We are not going to have a vote. The member does not have to stay. Go on. We promise not to vote until he gets back. Away you go.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the minister not grow up. We are getting to him and he is buying it.

Hon. Mr. White: Take the leader of the NDP with you and then we will get down to a sensible debate. Okay, it would be very nice if one were able to say from now on no more research. From now on, we will only spend half as much money, or whatever percentage it might be, on the universities. But it just cannot be done that way—

Mr. Lawlor: But professors cannot slough off their responsibility.

Hon. Mr. White: —for a number of reasons. The term research, starting about 1960, shortly after Sputnik became open sesame to public treasuries everywhere in the western

world. That word research came to be used for every manner of intellectual endeavour, or so it seems to me. So, as my friend pointed out, research is now the word applied to gentle scholarly pursuits of a non-rigorous nature, into the most esoteric realms, the study of a Sanskrit poem, or whatever.

Mr. Lewis: Here now! What a Philistine the minister is. There is nothing wrong with Sanskrit poetry.

Hon. Mr. White: This is part and parcel of a university's activities, and if this research, so-called to use modern term, were excluded, we would not have universities as we know them. I think I could agree with the member for Lakeshore if he were to urge that there be some conservative shift, some modest shift, of resources and emphasis from research to teaching.

Mr. Lawlor: Considerable.

Hon. Mr. White: And in fact we are inducing that right now. How are we doing it? In three ways. First of all, we are decreasing the increment of the BIU values year by year.

Mr. Sargent: What does that mean?

Mr. Pitman: It is a basic income unit. It means money.

Mr. Sargent: Talk so I can understand you.

Hon. Mr. White: I cannot talk so you can understand me. I lost that facility at the age of three.

Mr. Simonette: Write him a note.

Mr. Sargent: The minister sure hurts my feelings.

Mr. Stokes: He sure knows how to hurt a guy.

Mr. Lewis: It is the university equivalent of BTU?

Mr. T. Reid: The minister made more sense when he was three than he does now.

Hon. Mr. White: Secondly, we are encouraging the modernization of university governments in its every form, and most recently, I reiterated it again on Tuesday, how pleased I would be if the standing committee on human resources had before it some member of university administrators to explain why they had a high proportion of Americans.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister should tell his friend the chairman that.

Hon. Mr. White: The government is improving the information available so that the public and the representatives here can scrutinize these public funds. Most recently, as the House knows, a week ago, I tabled for the first time in the history of this province, the financial report for the 14 provincially-assisted universities. At the same time, I was able to amounce they had acceded to my request that these returns be put in uniform form.

Mr. Pitman: By when?

Hon. Mr. White: By early in 1972.

Mr. Sargent: A likely time.

Mr. Pitman: The minister's predecessor last September.

Hon. Mr. White: So in these several ways, we are redirecting the flow of these resources to some extent with some caution, no doubt in our Conservative fashion, from research, using the word broadly once again, to teaching.

Mr. Sargent: When is the minister's book coming back?

Hon. Mr. White: Because while it is true, as my hon. friend said, that the teacher is there to teach the student, that is not the exclusive responsibility. That is not the sole function of the university. I think my friend spoke too quickly.

Mr. Lawlor: Basic functions.

Hon. Mr. White: And I know he was speaking extemporaneously. They have a number of other functions. Research, scholarships, thoughtful ruminations—

Mr. Pitman: Over-cautious.

Hon. Mr. White: —that, in search for truth and beauty—

Mr. Lewis: Faculty tea parties, consoling words and cocktail lounges.

Hon. Mr. White: The objectivity which they can bring, given a high degree of autonomy, to social, political and economic questions. The university has many roles to play of which teaching is a most important, and perhaps the most important, but for my friend to imply, as he did, that it was their only role is not what he perhaps intended.

Mr. Lawlor: I said it was their basic role.

Mr. Lewis: The member said it was their basic role.

Hon. Mr. White: Probably an involuntary expression once again of his Cartesian thought which sees a master, preferably of the German model—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister does not understand me at all, does he?

Hon. Mr. White: —standing in front of a number of students with a ruler in his hand—

Mr. Lawlor: Is the minister sure that he has not got Maritain mixed up with Bismarck?

Hon. Mr. White: —pounding down.

Mr. Lawlor: They are different people, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Pitman: More like Hegel, is it not? The minister is a little confused.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister wants to save some money in the universities, set aside some of the cocktail lounges for the professors. They spend three hours a day in the cocktail lounge.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, all right!

Mr. Simonett: The member shares it with his colleague right behind him.

Mr. Sargent: I know.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): There speaks the expert on cocktail lounges.

An. hon. member: What votes does that come under, research?

Hon. Mr. White: The member made reference to the ethos of our forefathers disappearing because there was not the same feeling of insecurity. He averred that the younger people were abandoning the values of their fathers and then he said something that I felt was interesting and in contradiction to those remarks, notwithstanding their juxtaposition—namely, that things were not done overnight, but that progress was made in inches.

The values are changing and I think, as I mentioned earlier, that this shift from quantity to quality summarizes well enough for the purpose of this discussion the change that is taking place. It is coming about gradually, a byproduct of many things, not the least of which is high production.

I think this is in keeping with the approach which we on this side are taking towards these enormously complicated problems. We are making progress slowly and surely. We are making many changes which my hon. friend chooses to overlook and which will make the universities into a fountainhead of knowledge, truth and culture in a way that he and I both wish.

Mr. Lawlor: Has the minister ever observed the sideways motion of a crab? He talks about progress. He is going around in circles.

Mr. Sargent: You are very disorganized there, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore made reference to my keeping an arms-length relationship with the Council of Ontario Universities, which is the new name for the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: Not that committee, the committee on university affairs.

Hon. Mr. White: You said both, now I know what you mean.

There is no arms-length relationship needed with the minister's advisory council, whose function is to collect data, to consider it, discuss it, make conclusions based upon it and make advice available to the minister.

Mr. Lewis. Oh come on now!

Hon. Mr. White: That is their function.

Mr. Lewis: Come now!

Hon. Mr. White: The fact that they are able to express this advice publicly no doubt provides a form of objectivity to ministerial decisions and the government policy and the government expenditure programmes. And it provides, no doubt, a source of information for those who quite rightly are scrutinizing the activities of government. It is not sensible for one to suggest that the minister's advisory committee be in some way shoved away. That is just absolute nonsense.

This is the role of the Council of Ontario Universities and this is the role that they are playing, in fact. They stand in relationship to the universities as the committee on university affairs stands in relationship to this government and so we each have an independent source of information.

We each have resources of our own with which to turn up this data on which decisions are based and then, in the final analysis, when

confrontations take place, as confrontations must, it is between the minister and the department on the one hand and the presidents and their universities on the other hand.

For one to suggest that the minister's advisory committee, in some make-believe fashion, be moved a block away—

Mr. Lewis: Tell us of one of these inevitable confrontations! In recent memory what—

Hon. Mr. White: I will turn your attention to the articles in the newspapers on April 27, 1971, when some number of university presidents were highly critical of the increased resources made available in the Treasurer's budget of the day before, and were critical of the increased BIU values which were announced concurrently as applying to 1972-1973. Once again, the leader of the NDP, in jumping in thoughtlessly, has revealed his ignorance.

Mr. Lewis: What? That the university presidents criticized?

Hon. Mr. White: If you are not aware of the fact that the university presidents are very dissatisfied with recent changes, then you have been living in—

Mr. Lewis: That is a regular charade. It takes place every year. One expects them to react that way. It is prearranged.

Hon. Mr. White: You have been too busy in Ottawa You were in Ottawa at that time. No wonder you are out of touch.

Mr. Lewis: Do not be too virtuous about it. Just look around you at all your own members—all seven of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mention was made of the graduate schools and I know that the NDP flagellated themselves, hoping to pick up a few votes among the graduate schools. That was hypocritical! You will live to be ashamed of that. I want to read a letter that was sent to the—

An hon. member: He does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. White: I want to read a letter that was sent to the Ontario representative of the Canadian Union of Graduate Students by one of my advisers in response to a query of his having to do with the recommendation of the committee on university affairs considering—this is going to take quite a while without interruptions.

Mr. Lewis: And so you become the John Barrymore of the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. White: —and conveying as well a statement of the former position of CU of GS on the CUA recommendations. Now this is a fairly fulsome explanation but I think it will be helpful to those in the NDP who are not informed on this subject, including the leader, of course.

Mr. Lewis: Of course.

Mr. Lawlor: He is the first to know.

Mr. Lewis: Have you any other useful observations?

Hon. Mr. White: It reads:

Your letter suggests that the recommendations reflect provincial budgetary concerns or some more general concern about costs. This is not the case. The proposals reflect a concern for the proper development of public educational policy. The committee on university affairs is not less concerned than the Canadian Union of Graduate Students that there should continue to be an appropriate amount of graduate work at a high level of quality in universities in Ontario and for that matter, the rest of Canada.

Starting about three years ago, the committee on university affairs tried to base plans on a five-year time scale and Ontario, as in most other western jurisdictions, have accepted the notion of social demand as the primary basis for planning post-secondary educational opportunities.

Mr. T. Reid: There is no plan.

Hon. Mr. White: To continue:

At the undergraduate level, such a policy had presented no very great problems and as you may be aware, the province has endeavoured with some success in recent years to remove financial disincentives to undergraduate study. The situation is rather different at the graduate level however. Up to the present at least, most graduate students have been more or less fully funded on what amounts to a modest salary. The availability of such support stimulates or even creates the demands. Thus the two requirements of society are very much assured.

But the problem is even more complicated. In the five-year projections we have received from the universities, it has been evident that almost every department in

almost every university envisages a major role for itself in graduate study and research.

Mr. Pitman: Because of your formula financing system.

Hon. Mr. White: The letter goes on:

Ambitions for such development have indeed been so strong that in some cases resources have been kept for graduate work at the expense of the quality of undergraduate education and, most critically, departments wishing to expand their graduate enrolment rapidly have sought students from every possible source.

For instance, graduate studies translated into future projections of graduate enrolment have seemed in some subject areas to involve total intakes larger than the total of the baccalaureate graduations in the respective subjects from all Ontario universities.

Mr. Pitman: Exactly what you encouraged in that department.

Hon. Mr. White: It goes on:

Some studies developed over the past year or so have shown a large proportion of graduate enrolment in the Ontario universities has entered Canada from outside jurisdictions expressly for graduate study. It is undoubtedly difficult to interpret the situation precisely, but it seems clear that in most cases such patterns reflect in a very real sense the inducements of fairly generous teaching fellowships and the like. It is easy to see that under these circumstances the projections of very rapid rates of growth of graduate enrolment could be self-fulfilling prophecies.

All the above relates to questions of intake and total enrolment. When we turn to the question of output some even more critical concerns arise. In the first place it seems clear that, notwithstanding considerable urging, the nature of most PhD programmes is still of such a character as to prepare and acculturate people almost exclusively for a career in university teaching and research, producing more PhDs.

Some figures we obtained from the universities recently indicate that last year about twice as many new appointments were made to full-time faculty positions in the Ontario universities as the Ontario universities graduated PhDs. But as we know even during the past year not all of those graduating with doctorates from the Ontario universities were able to find appointments in our universities.

The most recent projections indicate that within three or four years the Ontario universities expect to be graduating annually twice as many PhDs as there will be new appointments made. That is, a four-to-one difference will have been created over quite a short time.

Mr. T. Reid: Exactly what I was saying.

Hon. Mr. White: To continue:

It was and is the opinion of the committee on university affairs that all of this represents a severe problem. As a result it became our opinion that something had to be done to reduce this rapid rate of increase of enrolment, and furthermore that something should be done to change the character of PhD programmes to prepare people for other than university work.

Our first idea was that the number of foreign students imported should be restricted to some reasonable proportion to the number of Canadians, including people who have been landed immigrants for some time. We felt that this would lead to some reasonable kind of self regulation analogous to the operation of social demand at the undergraduate level. For various reasons, particularly the unattractiveness of quota systems, this was not pursued.

Instead the proposals relating to levels of support were developed. It is, of course, impossible at this stage to predict precisely what will be the results. You can be assured, however, that the situation will be carefully monitored, but notwithstanding the suggestions in your letter it seems clear to us that action must be taken now.

Indeed it was, I say parenthetically.

Mr. Lewis: It is the result of your own follies. You are now correcting them.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I guess perhaps that sums it up.

Mr. Pitman: You created the situation.

Mr. Lewis: You created this nightmare.

Mr. Sargent: What was the reason for that exercise there?

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore has suggested that we use grants to alter the proportions of Canadians in the social sciences. Why would one do it in that covert, indirect, surreptitious, cowardly

fashion? I mean if one is going to control the number of Canadians in the Social sciences why not do it? I cannot see that you are on a stronger ethical foundation or have a better moral background.

To use grants to induce that particular result would have won just established quotas and now, I hark back to the version I tried to give to the hon. member earlier in my remarks, when I said that this is not the function of the Minister of University Affairs, in my view, with a heterogeneous, autonomous system of universities. Nor should it be in the world of Lewis Mumford and James Jacobs and Ivan Illich and Marshall McLuhan and Buckminster Fuller and all of the great prophets who see the thing moving in quite the other direction.

Mr. Lewis: Your predecessor sent a letter out to all the universities.

Hon. Mr. White: You do not even understand what I am talking about.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I understand you fully. You have exercised controls before. You have exercised controls before.That is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now you are getting violent.

Hon. Mr. White: The leader of the NDP made reference to my phrase "Bush league Harvards" and I want to conclude by offering this explanation to this House. I have described for some number of minutes in that press conference about March 8 that I thought the university could use these funds more effectively, more efficaciously, in part because these constraints force people to consider and reconsider how to use resources to better avail. And I said that I thought—no matter whether the reporters who were in that press conference understood this fully, as did the reporter from the Globe and Mail, who chose to take the phrase and use it in a completely different context, thereby giving it a completely opposite meaning—I said that I think that with the enormous resources that the Ontario people are putting into universities—

Mr. Lewis: All 16 as I recall.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, all 16.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Right!

Hon. Mr. White: Fourteen, plus two—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: —Waterloo Lutheran and RMC, which receive federal grants through our consolidated revenue fund. Fourteen and two is 16.

Mr. Pitman: Well, that is not quite accurate.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, that figures out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: However, that snide reference in that article did not upset me. It just amused me. I was not even upset by the misuse of this phrase: "Bush league Harvards."

Mr. T. Reid: At least Harvard has a Canadian studies programme.

Hon. Mr. White: Here is what I want to say: I think we can use the enormous financial resources available. One hundred dollars per person for the seven and a half million people in this jurisdiction, a total of $750 million this year for colleges and universities, coupled with the well-established human resources which we have here of every kind from every part of the world.

I think we can put these together in our university system if our universities will stretch their imaginations; try to put down the constraints of a conventional wisdom, not by copying the Sorbonne, not by copying Oxford, not by copying Harvard, because I do not think we need 16 bush league Harvards in Ontario. That is what I said and that is what I mean.

Mr. Pitman: What is the misquote?

Hon. Mr. White: Now I conclude with a quote from Goethe:

> Oh my dear friends, would you like to know why genius so rarely breaks its bonds? Why it so seldom bursts upon us like a raging torrent to shatter our astounded souls? My friends, it is because of the sober gentlemen who reside on either side of the river, whose precious little summerhouses, tulip beds and vegetable gardens would be ruined by it; and who know so well how to build dams and divert all such threatening danger in good time.

Mr. Lewis: Well, who was that?

Mr. Lawlor: Sounds like young Goethe.

Hon. Mr. White: Now I say to the members of the Legislature that this government

will not be deterred in its insistence that these enormous public funds be well used and that there be full accountability in the process.

Mr. Lewis: We have agreed with that.

Mr. Pitman: We have been talking about it for some time.

Mr. Lewis: We have talked about it for years and now you are finally cottoning to it.

Hon. Mr. White: And I express the belief, in concluding, that as we strive for these particular objectives, if the university community will enter into this undertaking with a spirit of goodwill and by using their wit, then we can have a university system in Ontario that will excite the comment and the wonder of educated people all over the world. That is what I believe.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, are we moving to vote 2601?

Mr. Lawlor: I have some—

Mr. Chairman: I am going to call the votes. I would like to just comment on the breakdown: the departmental classification, the standard accounts classification in vote 2601.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

If you look at—well my sheet shows at 339 there is a kind of departmental summary of the situation before the sheet with figures on it prior to getting into the votes; 2601 follows upon that, and the question or the remark I had to make has to do with the general overall situation, some remarks that this minister made during his reply, which I think he should be rallied on.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I believe the procedure has always been for the opposition critics to make their comments and the minister to reply to those comments. Then we go into the votes themselves and you can bring anything up under the specific vote that requires further discussion. This has been our procedure. Under vote 2601 I do not think we can separate the items. Let us take the vote in total.

On vote 2601.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, Mr. Chairman, under 2601—I have never seen another minister do this, Mr. Chairman. In introducing his estimates here and in replying to our contentions, he has had the effrontery to stand up and say how he has saved the people of Ontario the sum of $41 million. Did you ever see anything more blatant than what he did?

Hon. Mr. White: I said I could not call them savings, that is what I said.

Mr. Lawlor: He said that the presidents of the universities came forward with a certain basic income unit, but the Reverend White was not prepared to accede to these egregious and overwhelming demands. He was going to cut them down, and in the process of doing that—which is done every year by every minister in every conceivable circumstance—he saved us $41 million. Hail, a Daniel cometh!

Hon. Mr. White: I said no such thing.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that not marvellous? He goes through a whole series of things like that, Mr. Chairman, one after the other until he counts up to $41 million. It is like saying, you know, that the Treasury Board, hearing the various propositions and appeals made to the various ministers, saved us—what—let us say, $100 billion last year, because they did not accede to every request that was made to them.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, come on!

Mr. Lawlor: He has an enormous gall.

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend is misquoting me and misunderstanding the presentation and if he would like me to, I will explain it.

Mr. Lawlor: You had better.

Hon. Mr. White: There were a number of programmes in effect, the annual increases for which have been well established over an extended period of time.

Mr. Lawlor: No, no, no! That is wrong. Three or four years.

Hon. Mr. White: These figures when run forward would have totalled X plus $41.5 million. By making half-a-dozen or so changes in these various continuing programmes, we reduced the total amount to be expended to X. I made it very clear that they were tentative figures; that I did not claim them to be savings. Now I point out—

Mr. Lawlor: You should be ashamed to say it is so at all.

Hon. Mr. White: —that they cannot be considered, cannot be compared to a department going to Treasury Board and asking for,

say, $20 million and being given $10 million in comparison to, what, the eight they had before. They are two completely different considerations.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not agree. I think it is a completely comparable situation.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2601, the hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to—

Mr. Chairman: Was the hon. member for Lakeshore finished in the first vote?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a look at the information and public relations estimates and the research estimates under vote 2601. I think it is very interesting to see that the public relations expenditure is more, in fact, three times the amount of money in this budget allocated to research. I find that a very interesting statistic. But in regard to research I would like to use this opportunity—

Hon. Mr. White: Where is the hon. member? I am sorry I cannot find that.

Mr. T. Reid: I am on vote 2601; it is the minister's first vote.

Hon. Mr. White: Which item is the hon. member looking at?

Mr. Chairman: Research is under 2602, is it not?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I am on page 196. There is something called support services.

Hon. Mr. White: We are on page 340.

Mr. Meen: Try the same book.

Hon. Mr. White: Strike out.

Mr. T. Reid: Strike out is right.

Mr. Chairman: We are now on vote 2601.

Mr. T. Reid: Let me just take a second, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: It is the departmental administration programme.

Mr. T. Reid: I am trying to see what he has got here.

Mr. Chairman: We are taking the vote in total, not in items.

Mr. T. Reid: Support services—where the heck—

Mr. Sargent: You are speaking on all subjects, are you, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Anything under vote 2061? Administrative and support services for the operating programme.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough East has relinquished the floor. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: There are a couple of things under this vote I would like to know. First of all, exactly what was he talking about? Where is the research item that last year represented $61,000 being taken out of this particular area where it was located last year and placed in the next vote? Is that the same research we were speaking of in the previous year, or has that altered?

Hon. Mr. White: There are a number of provisions for research and I will attempt to recapitulate them for the hon. member. I think there is no item of research in vote 2601; am I correct?

Mr. Lawlor: No, there is not. That is what I am asking. Where has it gone?

Mr. Chairman: The only one I can find is in vote 2602, in the programme descriptions.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that the same research—

Mr. Chairman: I have no idea.

Mr. Lawlor: —that was previously caught up in that department?

Mr. T. Reid: My point of order here, if you like, is that—

Mr. Chairman: I have not heard one before. Was there a point of order?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, because I got up and said I wanted to talk about research.

Hon. Mr. White: Really, the research branch is under support services, which is vote 2602. It is part of a programme—

Mr. Chairman: All right. We will dispense with any reference to research under vote 2601.

Mr. T. Reid: Can I just ask for a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman? The vote last year had to do with research that was done by the department—in fact, I think a fellow by the name of Mr. Peebles headed it up. I want to know what has happened to the public relations and information aspect of the minister's department and the research aspect of the minister's department, which had separate estimates last year. I am not talking about research to the committee on university affairs, or research grants to the university. I want to know where the research is that this minister's department does?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister could straighten that point out.

Hon. Mr. White: Right. Under support services there is a small research branch, information—I do not know if we use the word public relations or not—library services—

Mr. T. Reid: It was used last year.

Hon. Mr. White: The administration of these various support services—perhaps I should offer a breakdown of that estimate.

Mr. T. Reid: Do I understand then that the minister does no research in his department?

Hon. Mr. White: We do some and we provide support services to the committee on university affairs which in effect has no staff at all. It places demands on the department for research of every type.

Here is a breakdown on that particular item. In 1970-1971 we provided $750,000 for department-initiated research projects, including projects which were undertaken by individual faculty members in various universities in this province.

In 1971-1972 this amount was reduced to $650,000, and at the same time $100,000 was established for directed research—that is to say, research initiated and directed by the department and, I suppose one could say, almost always on the request of the committee of university affairs.

The committee on university affairs contracts its research and as I think I mentioned, a sum of money has been established in vote 2601, item 2, for internal research. The $750,000 figure, incidentally, has remained the same for four years.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think I—

Mr. Chairman: There is some small amount of research then in item 2 of vote 2601?

Mr. T. Reid: This is the comparable figure to what I was talking about.

Mr. Chairman: All right! The hon. member for Scarborough East on vote 2601.

Mr. T. Reid: I am not really trying to make a minor point at all, Mr. Chairman. I really want to say something about the need for the minister to have his own independent research. The point is a very simple one. I have reiterated this a number of times; the member for Lakeshore has made the same point again, as has the member for Peterborough in the past.

Basically we do not accept that the Minister should be dependent on research on others for certain things—research that he himself personally directs. I am not questioning the integrity of the people involved in the committee of university affairs at all.

My point to the minister is, in light of the letter he read into the record of the House this evening from the dean of the faculty of law at the University of Windsor, I think it is very important that the minister, who is the trustee for the taxpayers and for the voters of this province, should be able to evaluate letters such as that to his own personal satisfaction. I think it is quite proper and right that the minister should put into the record of this House the letter from the dean of the law school. But I would like to reiterate to the minister that under "support services" he should have funds there, or he should be using the funds allocated there, to do research to investigate, for example, the statistics and facts that I put forward in this House and to investigate the statistics and facts which he received in the letter from a particular dean in a particular university concerning those facts.

Honestly, if I were in his place, I would certainly discount the views of an opposition critic to some extent, but I would not be willing to accept totally a letter which I had received from a president of a university, for example. I think the letter should have come from the president as opposed to the dean.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I would like to—because I think it is important to have it in the same Hansard—to state that here is an example, if you like, of the need for the minister to have this type of research which is directly under his direction, as opposed to being one or two steps removed. I would like

to point out by way of example, Mr. Chairman, that the letter from the dean which he read into the record did not refute in any serious way the statements which I put into the record of this House on Tuesday last.

I do not want to get into a picayune analysis of the differences, or into a personal confrontation with the dean of the law school, whom I know, or with the former dean, who is a close friend, or with the president of the University of Windsor. But I would like to point out the need for the minister to have his own research staff to look at these things.

I will just use two examples of differences in factual statements. I stated in the record of this House last Tuesday that there were five tenured professors—professors are people with professional appointments—in the law faculty of the University of Windsor. Four of these were citizens of the United States. The dean in his letter to the minister states that there are six tenured people with professorial appointments and he acknowledges that four of those are citizens of the United States. The important difference here is that the former dean of the law school—this is my understanding of the facts—does have tenures with the university, but he is on a full-time leave of absence because he is a member of Parliament in Ottawa.

These are the shades of difference. Perhaps I did not state it that clearly. My position was four out of the five key decision-makers now in that law faculty were Americans. The dean says there are six. He is right, I am right. The minister must be able to have his own independent evaluation of the significance of that.

The minister must have his own research—if it is not research it is at least investigation power or ability. I do not dispute that anything in the dean's letter is not a statement of fact; in the same way I do not believe anything I stated is not a statement of fact.

The dean does point out that he hired X number of Canadians—and I do not dispute that—since he became dean. The facts in a different light do not quite reflect that.

For example, if one talked about this current year, 1970-1971, you would find that there are nine full-time members of the faculty at the Windsor law school right now, plus the dean, plus the former dean who is now an MP on a full-time leave of absence. Of those nine, four are American citizens. What the dean has said, I believe quite correctly, is that for next year he has hired additional people, but they are not right on staff now. So again we are dealing with slightly different sets of facts. I could add—I did not want to go this far—to my knowledge two of the Canadians now on staff are resigning from the staff. If one looked at what is happening in that law faculty, you would find that next year the Americans are there with tenure—

Hon. Mr. White: Enough! Enough!

Mr. T. Reid: Okay? I am just saying I do not want to dispute what the dean says except it is a very complicated situation. It merits the minister being able to have a research ability, if you like, to delve into this type of thing—

Mr. Lawlor: Pretty ingenious how he worked these two things together.

Mr. T. Reid: It is very important.

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to say something on this point.

Mr. T. Reid: Just to conclude, I think the effect of my remarks—I hope it will be a positive one, Mr. Chairman—I would point out that part of the problem Dean Tarnopolsky has had—and you know I really appreciate this problem and I am guilty perhaps of not keeping him informed.

The press report of my statement in this place on Tuesday which appeared in the Windsor Star on Wednesday, was one of the worst reports I have ever seen written, summarizing a very carefully prepared press statement. If I were the Dean and read only that press report in the Windsor Star, I would be very upset because there are mis-statements of the fact, or mis-statements of what I said in that newspaper statement itself.

I would like to underline two points I did make in my prepared remarks. I do not want to respond to the type of remarks the dean made when he was under a great deal of pressure about my personal characteristics and motives in bringing this up. I made it quite clear that I did not want anyone demoted, fired or anything like that, but I did make it clear—and I think I established my point quite clearly, Mr. Chairman—that in terms of what is meant by domination of decision-making, such was the fact at that law school.

The dean has not disputed that at all. Really, if one reads his letter, he does not dispute it, but what he does say is that he is going to hire more people.

My quarrel with him—and were I the Minister of University Affairs I suppose I could not say these things because there would be the threat of government enforcement behind it—but what I did say is that he could solve that problem by bringing in Canadians or promoting Canadians within his faculty to the position of senior tenured members in his department. There would be a dilution, if you like, of the domination of citizens from other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make that reply to the dean's letter. I think the dean is one of the best civil libertarians I know in this country. I respect him immensely, but still, in my role as a politician, I believe that the present situation in that law school is one of American domination of decision-making. I believe I have an obligation to state that in public.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept the hon. member's apology, and I expect the dean will, too.

Mr. T. Reid: It is not an apology.

Hon. Mr. White: Nevertheless, I think I should point out that the dean is very anxious to appear before a legislative committee—

Mr. T. Reid: Talk to your chairman.

Hon. Mr. White: —or on television or in whatever other situation to present his side of the argument. I rather think that will be the solution, unless my hon. friend wishes to retract all of the remarks he made earlier.

Mr. T. Reid: Of course not. My remarks are totally correct.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Never retract them, never!

Mr. T. Reid: My remarks are totally correct.

Hon. Mr. White: Now I, too, welcome very much the hon. member for Scarborough East's urging that we expand these research funds for internal research purposes, because in the estimates before you we are quadrupling them from $25,000 to $100,000.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, just one point—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: It brings out an important but very small point, and I accept the minister's glee in being able to say that, but why in the bloody devil do you not put your estimates in such detail so that we can see that type of thing? If you want a rational debate give us the details.

Hon. Mr. White: Well we presented to Treasury in great detail and they present this presumably comprehensive summary, so if you do not like the way it is laid out then I would suggest you make your case when the Treasurer's estimates come up.

Mr. T. Reid: But you are the minister.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it is kind of unusual for a man who has never been to university to discuss in this august company such a high level as university affairs.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Normally you are not overwhelmed by anybody.

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that these people who have been to university talk down to us plebians, those of us who have never been that far along the line, that never had the money to get there in our station in life, never had a chance to get to university. So it concerns me as a taxpayer and representing a lot of working people in my area where only three per cent of my people get to go to university, as against six per cent across the province. The minister agreed with this.

I see in this vote where there are possibly 2,800 employees in The Department of Education and we are spending in this vote about $1,500,000 for salaries in your department, Mr. Minister. We are spending about $226,000 for co-ordination of supervision of departmental co-operation.

I want to say this, that yesterday I went to a graduation of my daughter in Centennial College. And for the record, representing a lot of people in this province who have kids that never get to university but can go to colleges, I sat there yesterday and there were over 500 graduates at Centennial College. I looked at the people, the mothers and fathers there, along with me, proud of our kids. The amazing fact was that the majority of the kids did not have a tie on. Their shoes were running shoes. There were torn clothes. But they had their robes on and they graduated and they were beautiful kids, just as nice as you see in any of these universities.

But the fact of life is that in this province there are two groups of people that get to

university. It is not the minister's fault; it is a part of the system that we have had here. Now you bring along community colleges. But the shocking thing to me, Mr. Minister, was that these kids in the last years blossomed; they received a great education at that college. The exciting thing they have done there in an old factory—and this university does not have all the ornate trappings you have in these colleges that these people and that you have gone to. I have never been inside them.

But they had across the back of the auditorium a sign that said "Centennial College" and it was written on a piece of paper, a silk-screened piece of paper on the wall. Have you been there? You did see it?

But the education was wonderful. The kids were so excited; it was a wonderful feeling to be there. But most of the fathers and mothers were working class people, you could tell it.

The shocking thing to me is that we in our affluent area here can have two types of people. It is galling to me that this can happen in this country. You are spending $400 million or $500 million on secondary education, university education. I think you should put that in your pipe and smoke it, because I was made to think that this can happen—that we can have two sets of systems in this province.

I am glad we are bringing our community colleges along, but there is where you should be putting your money and not in these class groups here. This is what brings along communism and the things that we are against. You have got to take a good look at that, Mr. Minister, and this is from one guy who is not very smart, never got to university. But I think we should start thinking about the people who make this country.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I would like to comment—

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to add a footnote to it. The young people wearing jeans and running shoes may have come from Forest Hill Village. In fact, he likely did come from—

Mr. Sargent: I am not saying that to be smart.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no. I am not saying—

Mr. Sargent: All I am saying—

Mr. MacDonald: I am not saying it to be smart either. All I am saying is that to draw any conclusion that the kid who had jeans and no tie and was wearing running shoes was necessarily of a lower class today. It is rather ironical, but we may find he came from Forest Hill Village. That is the lifestyle of the younger generation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or even that he is any poorer.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to go back to another point, and perhaps I can do it while I am on my feet.

The minister referred to the $100,000 increase in research appropriations within the department. I am curious to know what are the relationships regarding research between this department and OISE? I recall the day when we debated the need for research for the industry of education and the almost complete lack of research for education in spite of the fantastic amount of money that is being spent on education. I am going back no more than 10 years. This was the kind of situation that led us all to say that we needed a research institution, not only for Ontario but because Ontario was affluent, could build the institution, it could serve Canada. OISE was the result.

I am a little puzzled as to what extent there is a co-ordination and therefore why we need to have research budgets within either the Education department or the University Affairs department. Why would it not be more appropriate for it to be done in a co-ordinated way within OISE if that is the research institution for education? Since education today is a continuum from K-13 and, I would trust, beyond that through the community colleges and universities, theoretically OISE would be the research institution for this department as well as the education department.

So I am back to my basic point. What is the co-ordination between OISE and any research that this department may do? Or, specifically, if the minister has a research project, does he build his own empire within his own department? Or does he go to the empire that has been built over on Bloor Street and ask it to do the job?

Mr. T. Reid: Or ask the committee on university affairs?

Hon. Mr. White: I think I can explain that, although the hon. member for York South may not be completely satisfied with the existing policy. Each year, for four years, $750,000 has been established for grants in aid of research. On the recommendation of

the CUA we asked the advisory committee, concerning grants in aid of research, if they would expend $650,000 in grants to individual professors for individual projects as vetted by them and retain $100,000 for use on our direction. That was not acceptable to them, so we reduced the $750,000 for grants in aid of research to $650,000; and incidentally, this year they have dispensed $517,675 which may be all that they will grant, although they have full access to the $650,000 on approval of the minister.

We increased the $25,000 that was established in the previous estimate by $75,000, giving us a total for internal research this year of $100,000. I think the rationale is that posed by the member for Scarborough East, namely, that in certain circumstances it may not be wise to ask another body—OISE, the committee on university affairs or whoever—to delve into a particular matter. I do not like the illustration he used, namely, the racial or national component of the Windsor law school; yet it does provide an illustration anyway.

We provide no research funds at all to OISE. Perhaps we should. I would like to consider that as I learn more about this department. We do provide several million dollars—I do not know; about a third or a quarter of their total resources—by means of graduate school grants, based on the BIU values available to every one of the 14 provincially assisted universities, because they are educating, I think, 2,400 graduate students—some full-time, some part-time and many of them at the University of Toronto. They get a larger sum of money from The Department of Education, some of it for project-directed research, this was a change this year, and one that can be developed with the Minister of Education, and a smaller proportion, I think, for internally innovated research.

It may be that we should be utilizing OISE in some way. I am not in a position at the present time really to offer a comment myself on that. It is a suggestion that is worth considering.

Mr. Pitman: On the same topic, can the minister indicate what projects do come under that? Could he give us an example of what studies are being done by the research directly under his department, or being given out as grants in aid of research—

Hon. Mr. White: In my department?

Mr. Pitman: —where the grants are going and what research is being done?

Hon. Mr. White: Oh the grants for research at OISE?

Mr. Pitman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: That is not in my department.

Mr. Pitman: No, I meant what is in the minister's department. I thought you said that there were two different kinds.

Hon. Mr. White: There are grants in aid of research, which this year total $515,000.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, but that is on another vote. We are talking about the research in the minister's department, on this vote.

Hon. Mr. White: I will try to give the member some data on research undertaken inside our department. This includes primarily information collection, like the type of information the hon. member for Scarborough East has been asking for, about enrolment and related activities, material asked for by the Committee of University Presidents—

Mr. Pitman: Maybe the minister could have a little conflab there with his staff. I will leave that with him.

Mr. Sargent: He is moving his lips.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me send the member a paper describing how those funds are used.

Mr. Pitman: Are there any particular projects of importance that are going on which you feel are particularly relevant that you should do yourself, as opposed to what you—

Hon. Mr. White: I, myself, have not asked directly for any research as yet. In the last three months, I have done a number of things, but I have not, as yet, come to grips, with certain of the internal operations of the department. I thought it was important for me, in the early months of this responsibility, to accept as many invitations as I could to meet with a wide variety of people from universities from all parts of this province.

I have met them individually and in groups, large and small, and I have succeeded in making myself available, I think I can say, to every component within the university system in that length of time. I have not requested any research directly from this particular research facility for my department, although obviously some has turned up in the ordinary course of events. When a member

of the Legislature asks a question, for instance, the data is pulled out by this particular group.

Mr. Pitman: For example, in view of some of the announcements that the minister has made, for example, to come back to the new system of admissions. Is there any research that would indicate that this new system of admission is going to cut down the cost? Is it going to be appropriate to all these institutions in Ontario? Is it going to be of value having a common application form and a co-operative procedure for admitting students on the part of all the universities?

That is the kind of research I would like to know whether your department would do. Do you have any research, for example, on first year failure rates at various universities and the effect of this upon universities? Would that be the kind of—

Hon. Mr. White: This is the kind of thing we are trying to do. The explanation given me is we are establishing student flow models to determine where the students are coming from, and so on, for purposes of enrolment projections, trying to improve capability in this area.

Mr. Pitman: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting piece of research. I wonder if the minister could get a bit more information on that for tomorrow morning? I would like to ask him about that very area.

Hon. Mr. White: We will do that.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the member for Scarborough East was on his feet a moment ago. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the minister could provide us—some of us, if not all of us—with the more detailed breakdown available to him and his officials for his budget. I think it would save actually a lot of questions on our part.

For example, just take grants for research, Mr. Chairman, on the next vote. You know, it is over half a million dollars. I would like to have a list of the grants that are committed for the current financial year. I think if we could have these more detailed breakdowns, we could have a better discussion and perhaps even a shorter discussion.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I have no personal objection to that, although I think I will have to get advice on whether the publication of these internal documents would be in some way undesirable, for reasons I cannot now imagine. I have no personal objections to it and I will explore the possibility.

Mr. T. Reid: Perhaps some should remain confidential but I can certainly see that quite a few might have absolutely no reason to be out of the public purview.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: You got them in previous years, did you not?

Hon. Mr. White: I would be glad to look into that.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to read a paragraph to the minister and have him comment. There are two separate problems contained. I am referring to page 30 of the report of the Minister of University Affairs for 1969-1971. The paragraph reads as follows—it talks about the office of the deputy minister:

> Because university developments closely relate to the interests and activities of other government departments, The Department of University Affairs maintains a close relationship with such agencies as the senior co-ordinating committee for the health sciences, the Ontario universities capital aid corporation, the council of ministers of education, and particularly in such areas as teacher education and other branches of post-secondary education with The Ontario Department of Education.

Overnight, I would ask the minister to consider that paragraph and tell me just how close is his liaison there; how many meetings he has personally attended of these various interrelated groups. But what I would ask him to see if he could answer right now is the next sentence:

> In 1969 an interdepartmental committee was formed to examine government support of research. This committee, under the chairmanship of the Deputy Minister of University Affairs, is expected to recommend a series of guidelines to assist government departments in utilizing the research budgets in the most effective manner.

I would like to know whether or not those guidelines have been set up; if it is possible to obtain a copy of the recommendations made by the Deputy Minister of University Affairs in this respect; and whether, thirdly, this is part of your budget as set forth under this vote.

Hon. Mr. White: I would be glad to do that. It was mentioned to me during the supper hour that the deputy minister, who was a member of the senior co-ordinating committee, attends a meeting of that committee every week, which lasts for the better part of half a day.

Their function is to bring together The Department of Health—the chairman is the Deputy Minister of Health—The Department of University Affairs, and the head of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, and in this way to attempt a degree of co-ordination, on the part of these several departments which are directly involved either with the education of people for health services, or the provision of services.

Mr. Sargent: It now being six of the clock!

Hon. Mr. White: May I just make a quick response to the member for Grey-Bruce? I quite understand what the member is saying, and I have a very great deal of sympathy for him. There is at the present time a connection between the wealth of a kid's family and his prospect of going to university, and I do not like it.

Mr. T. Reid: The minister has just contradicted the Premier.

Hon. Mr. White: About all I can say in defence is that this has changed very greatly in the last five or ten years. Now one sees much larger numbers of kids from other than wealthy families going to university and we at the government level have gone almost as far as we can go because we make very generous grants and loans available to every youngster. I do not know that we will ever have the same ratio of university students from various economic groups, because one of the variables is the amount of encouragement that the kid gets in his home. There is not a lot that we can do here to alter that situation. I am in sympathy with my hon. friend, however, and I will do what I can do to loosen it up.

Mr. Pitman: Change your education system!

Mr. Sargent: Have I got time for one more question?

Mr. Chairman: Will there be further discussion on vote 2601?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, there will be. The minister has not answered the question yet.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to indicate that tomorrow we shall take the private bills which are on the order paper for third reading. I anticipate that the Lieutenant Governor will give assent to those which are ready for his assent. Then we will go to the first item on the order paper, the resumption of the budget debate.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, would the House leader know the order of the estimates? I asked our whip today and he said you probably would announce them tonight.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Correctional Services follows University Affairs in the House and the committee, I believe, is now engaged with Social and Family Services. I believe it is Labour that follows, but I cannot be certain from my memory.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Grey-Bruce should stay around anyway.

Mr. Sargent: I will get a whack at the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have got a long wait for that one.

Mr. Sargent: When is the minister on?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am on every day.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The minister is on every day just like "Laugh-In"; that is what he is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will certainly be able to inform the hon. member tomorrow of several other departments.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 27, 1971

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, continued 2043

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2075

No. 50

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, May 28, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we have many guests in our galleries again. In both galleries we have students from Don Mills Junior High School in Don Mills, and later today we will have students from St. Mary's Girls High School in Kitchener, from St. Joseph's Island Elementary School, St. Joseph's Island, from Shuniah Public School, Thunder Bay, and from Rainham Central School in Fisherville. In Mr. Speaker's gallery this morning we have Junior Miss Hamilton with the nine runners-up who were chosen at the 125th anniversary celebrations of the city of Hamilton. I am sure that we are glad to have these girls here with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): What is the matter? Has the Minister of Trade and Development not got a statement today?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): I am never short of statements.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Has the member read Andras's comments?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

FARM MARKETING LEGISLATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is not much of a target there but we are glad to see the Minister of Agriculture and Food back with us and apparently feeling well. Will he report to the House on the status of what was billed as a test case on the imposition of the powers of former Bill 10 in this House involving the seizure of broilers that were to be marketed from an outlet, I believe, in Hawkesbury?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition on my return to the House. It is good to be back. I find, though, the questions seem to cover the same subjects as when I left.

Mr. Nixon: Not much has changed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition's question, the broiler board inspectors did indeed visit the outlet and, I believe, placed a detention on the chickens. The gentleman in question made application to the broiler board for a permit to sell the chickens and to import further chickens, and I believe these permits have been granted. I think the matter has been satisfactorily resolved, as far as I know.

Mr. Nixon: It is not going to be used as a test case as far as the minister is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not to my knowledge.

FARM MACHINERY COSTS

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has he been made familiar with the final report of the Barber commission reporting, I believe, to the federal House of Commons on the farm machinery situation and farm costs? Does he have a group within his department which will be concerned with auditing these recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I found the report on my desk when I returned yesterday, and I have not had a chance to read even the recommendations. There are recommendations contained in each section. We will be going over the report, but I understand from word that I have had from Ottawa that the federal minister is reviewing the report as most of those recommendations pertain, I believe, to what could be described as federal action that might be taken concerning certain aspects of the farm machinery industry.

I think we all, as interested Ministers of Agriculture, will be reviewing those recommendations to see how best we can cope with what has been, and what promises to continue to be, a very difficult situation insofar as farmers are concerned in the agri-business section.

ONTARIO PLACE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY IN RECEIVERSHIP

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development. Is he now in a position to report to the House how much money it cost the taxpayers of Ontario in the unfortunate bankruptcy of Secant Construction during the construction of Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information, Mr. Speaker. My impression, if I recall it, is that it was very little, if any. I will find out.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary, does the minister recall giving me a similar answer when I asked that question about 10 days ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I do not.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Yes, the minister did.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will look up Hansard. Do not get excited. I do not recall. The hon. member will appreciate that I have been asked a lot of questions.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): And the minister has not answered any of them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If that is the case, I will find out why I have not had the answer put on my desk.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister can make a ministerial statement.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary question, is the minister not aware that certain cheques which were issued in the name of Secant, were returned labelled "not sufficient funds." and these cheques had to be honoured by The Department of Public Works, I believe, in the development and construction of Ontario Place? It was my impression that the money was not an insignificant amount.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I promised to get this information, there does not seem to be any point in discussing this on the basis of somebody's memory.

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS POWER

Mr. Nixon: If the minister knows nothing about it, there is no point in discussing it. He is rght.

Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Is he aware of any special negotiations between the former Premier of Ontario and the Premier of Newfoundland on the possibility of purchasing power from the surpluses that will be developed under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland in the future?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such negotiations.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister aware of a news report, I believe in yesterday's Globe and Mail, which was not put forward as just a speculative story but in fact indicated that the member for London North (Mr. Robarts), the former Premier, was in communication with the Newfoundland government about this matter? He is not aware of that, I take it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, when the member for London North was Prime Minister, there had been negotiations carried out with the Premier of Newfoundland—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That was just about a fishing trip.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —regarding hydro and certain resources within the boundary of Newfoundland, but I am not aware of this latest report.

Mr. Nixon: Can I ask another question, Mr. Speaker, of the same minister? Has Ontario Hydro been negotiating with any other province, particularly Quebec, based on their recent announcements for hydro-electric development in the James Bay area, for the possible purchase of some of this power by Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been preliminary negotiations between Quebec and Ontario regarding the James Bay development. Ontario, as the hon. member knows, now purchases a small quantity of power from Hydro-Quebec and we are looking to the possibility of a source of power in the James Bay area. As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, this particular project is in a very preliminary stage. There are only very preliminary discussions going on. There is no indication really of how much power will be generated in the James Bay area.

As the hon. member also knows, there have been surveys going on between Ontario and Quebec about the James Bay area and the whole area of northern Ontario and northern Quebec as to the possibility of the

generation of power. These studies have been going on, as the hon. member knows, since about 1967. Until those reports are completed and until there are more advanced engineering studies completed for the James Bay area, there can be no real agreement as to the purchase of power or the supply of power, vis-à-vis Ontario and Quebec.

ENRICHED URANIUM PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, or a new question if you prefer: Have there been negotiations between the minister's department or Ontario Hydro and the officials of any other province on the possibility of establishing a uranium enrichment programme, using the surplus power either from the Brinco development in Newfoundland or from Hydro-Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member mentions any other province—

Mr. Nixon: Or the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, there have been negotiations between Ontario and Newfoundland, for example, as far as the Brinco development in Labrador is concerned. That province—

Mr. Nixon: On enriched uranium?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, as far as power is concerned. As for the possibility of enriched uranium, this of course would involve the federal government and its federal agency in the whole policy and the whole programme of nuclear power.

In view of the fact that our programme at the present uses just natural uranium, there is always a possibility of using enriched uranium. In the event of any change in our policy, these negotiations sort of are a continuing thing without any real commitment or decisions being made.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: as the only purchaser of an atomic facility using the CANDU method in the world, surely the government of Ontario would expect to be consulted, if in fact this method is going to be amended or changed or improved in any way. Would that not be so?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, I might remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are not the only jurisdiction using this process. There is a plant in Quebec, but—

Mr. Nixon: The government is the only purchaser, though; Ontario Hydro is.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is true, but I would say that Quebec, whether you want to call it Hydro-Quebec or the Province of Quebec, is doing business with the Atomic Energy Commission of Canada.

GREAT LAKES BASIN POLLUTION CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: All right.

Mr. Speaker, another question of the same minister: Is there any new information on the possibility of continuing the Great Lakes basin pollution conference, or will the negotiations between Ottawa and Washington preclude any necessity to continue that conference begun here a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as the recent press releases have indicated, there is to be a meeting on June 10 in Washington between Canada and the United States. This meeting will be as a result of committee meetings and working group meetings that have been taking place during the past several months involving the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, Canadian federal people as well as people in the United States, with the idea of some sort of an agreement involving the International Joint Commission, in respect to water quality in the Great Lakes basin.

There is to be a conference, a second Great Lakes environmental conference in Michigan in August. This is a result of meetings of an ad hoc committee that was set up at the original conference and which now is making recommendations to the second conference in August.

I think really that the conference in August is essential. It will really tie down the stand and the submissions and the feeling of the various states. I think unless we have the commitment and agreement of the eight Great Lakes states as well as the three provinces, any federal conference that is conducted will not be successful.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The minister mentioned three provinces. Essentially there is one province concerned with the Great Lakes basin; there are two others on the periphery. Has Ontario made representation to the government of Canada on the development of the treaty which apparently will be signed in the immediate future? Will there be representation from this government or this minister's department at the final discussions leading up to the signing of the treaty?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was talking to Mr. Davis about an hour ago—

Mr. Nixon: This Mr. Davis or the other?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Hon. Jack Davis, the federal Minister of Fisheries.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): We are not related.

Mr. B. Newman: The better one.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and there will be a meeting, I anticipate, next week between our officials prior to an agreement being made between Ontario and Ottawa as far as Ottawa's commitment to assist in the installation of nutrient removal facilities at our various plants in the Great Lakes basin, is concerned.

There has been some preliminary commitment from the federal government. We are hoping to get a definite commitment as to the amount of money they are prepared to advance Ontario so that this work can be done at the various treatment plants in the Great Lakes basin and some of the plants on the tributaries.

That agreement will not be completed prior to the June 10 meeting in Washington. It is my hope that it will be completed before the August meeting in Michigan so that at that conference we can show the Great Lakes basin exactly what our position is, vis-à-vis Ontario and the federal government, as to the amount of work and money to be spent on the Great Lakes basin on the Canadian side.

Mr. Nixon: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister not agree that just as important as the commitment of money would be the commitment of powers to the IJC? Has he got cabinet agreement for the position that he expressed at last year's conference, that some powers presently exercised and held by the Province of Ontario will have to be turned over to the IJC with no strings attached if, in fact, the cleanup of the Great Lakes basin is going to go forward?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that any agreement that is made between Canada and the United States will, of course, touch on the question of sovereignty, of agreeing to give up certain jurisdictions in order that the International Joint Commission might have certain surveillance or enforcement powers. That really will be, I think, the basis of the agreement between the two national governments. I have not, of course, discussed this with cabinet at all and I think—

Mr. Nixon: They shot the minister down last time! They would not go along with him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think an awful lot, really, will depend on what happens at the meeting on June 10. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario has always indicated its willingness to go even further than any of the other Great Lakes States.

Mr. Nixon: That is not true, no! The former Premier did not.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate the amounts of money and the particulars of some of the projects involved in the negotiations with Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In our estimates, Mr. Speaker, to completely do the job as recommended by the International Joint Commission, covering all the Great Lakes states and updating the sewage treatment facilities and with nutrient removal facilities, the figure is somewhere between $30 and $40 million.

Mr. Lewis: Between $30 and $40 million?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, that is for Ontario as an investment?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, what is the minister expecting from our negotiations with Ottawa in terms of a subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are negotiating for all we can get, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: One hundred and ten per cent.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, we will settle for 110 per cent, but, really, if we can get 50 per cent—

Mr. Lewis: The government want a 50 per cent subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is the basis, but the federal minister, of course, is aware that the municipalities in the Great Lakes basin as well as the province have a substantial commitment now for our own programme.

The additional $30 million or $40 million, of course, is something that would be a new programme as a result of the IJC report. So, we are making our submissions to Ottawa based on these facts. Frankly, I feel that if we can get at least the 50 per cent commitment from the federal government we will be making headway.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the minister: Will there be discussions concerning the trans-boundary air pollution involved in this?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, this is all part of our proposed meetings. I might mention, as the newspaper reports have indicated, the meeting in June will be only the first meeting. I do not expect any really definite commitments, or hard and fast commitments, being made there. But there will be a second meeting, proposed for October, when the final decisions will be made and when, it is hoped, the final treaty will be signed between the two countries, which will be rather a historic occasion because the last one was signed, I believe, in 1909. But, certainly, any agreement involving the International Joint Commission recommendation will include air pollution.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition completed? The member for Scarborough West, a question?

ODOUR FROM ST. MARYS MINK FEED PROCESSING PLANT

Mr. Lewis: My questions, Mr. Speaker, were largely for the Premier. Perhaps I could ask the Minister of Energy and Resouces Management a rather less transcendental question this morning.

Has a solution yet been found for the extraordinary odour problem caused by the Finnie mink feed processing plant in St. Marys, Ontario, given the minister's encyclopaedic knowledge of his department?

Mr. Nixon: The minister would know all about that.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That is certainly not transcendental.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might start out by asking, Mr. Speaker, where is St. Marys?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald: (York South): Oh, do not do that. You have already lost the riding. You will clinch it.

An hon. member: Now; now.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am aware of the problem. I am not aware that a solution has been found. I know that the officials of the air management branch and waste management branch are looking into it.

Mr. Nixon: There is a shrine there, a Conservative shrine. The solution is clothespins for everybody's noses.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will have to get that information and report to the hon. member.

STATUS OF CENTURY CITY

Mr. Lewis: That is very good of the minister.

May I ask the Premier a question, Mr. Speaker? How close are we, or how close is the government, to a definitive statement on the status of Century City in the Toronto-centred region development?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government has been reviewing all the proposals related to the Toronto-centred region—the proposals and submissions from the municipalities and various ratepayers' groups. The process is well along, but there is a large number to consider and, of course, any decision relating to Century City will be part of the total analysis of the situation. Hopefully, we will have this done in the early part of the summer.

Mr. Nixon: Do not set those goals. The government may not get to it that soon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We may.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is the Premier not concerned that there is a great deal at stake for landowners, for those who have entered into mortgage arrangements for the entire life of the plan, as it were, if the delay is protracted much longer? Can he not give some kind of date in which an assurance will come?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the concern of the people involved with Century City. I would only say there is also concern in many other areas covered by the Toronto-centred region as to their plans for future growth.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): And while Century City obviously is a matter of priority, there are several others that all have to be fitted into the consideration.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the Premier aware that there are a number of farmers whose lands were bought by the developers of Century City who have not received payments for many months since the whole thing has been put on ice by the government's statements on the Toronto-centred region, and these people are caught in that kind of an economic bind waiting for the full review which may be completed some time in the early summer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of it. I am quite aware there are other situations not exactly comparable to Century City where, because of the consideration of the Toronto-centred region, certain developments have been held up.

Mr. Nixon: There is not one like this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I say not completely comparable, but there are other situations.

Mr. Nixon: Not even close to being comparable.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the minister not realize that the conflicting statements of his various cabinet ministers on whether or not the principles of the plan will apply to Century City and comparable areas have thrown that entire part of Ontario which is affected into considerable upheaval? How can he allow it to procrastinate at this length without indicating in specific projects where the government will stand?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, there have been no conflicting statements as to the development of the Toronto-centred region.

Mr. Lewis: Certainly there have.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The statement was made by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). I recall making some reference to it myself, not in this House, that the whole matter of the Toronto-centred region related to submissions we have been receiving from the various municipalities, the ratepayers groups—and obviously Century City is one of them —but it is only part of the total consideration.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, when the Treasurer says that the principle of the plan is now firm, as set out, how then can the government pretend that certain areas like Century City are not in direct conflict or violation of the principles of that plan and procrastinate this way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, when the Treasurer states that—and I forget the exact phraseology—obviously the concept or the basic principles of the plan that the government is adopting relate to the principles, not necessarily to the distribution—

Mr. Sargent: Where is the Treasurer? Is he on holidays?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of the population within the area. And one of the very real problems that the government is sorting out in conjunction with some of the municipalities is the distribution of the population within the given zones, and that does not contradict the general principle of the plan.

Mr. Lewis: Well it threatens to contradict.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well certainly everything threatens to contradict.

Mr. Lewis: It appears to contradict and will contradict if you take much longer.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Lewis: By way of another question, Mr. Speaker, how close is the Premier to giving the government's decision on the location of the new airport?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the leader of the New Democratic Party realized that such a decision is made by the federal jurisdiction—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —not by the province of Ontario. We do not make this decision. I have communicated, as has the Minister of Transport (Mr. MacNaughton), with the federal government regarding its policy, or a possible policy, as it relates to the infrastructure or the servicing of any new proposed airport facilities. And if memory serves me correctly, we have not yet had an indication from the federal government as to what their policy is going to be with respect to the servicing. The decision as

to the location of the new airport will be made by the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier not concerned at the potential violation of the Toronto-centred region plan unless the government of Ontario indicates precisely where it would choose the location to be from amongst those offered?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the federal government is quite aware of the principles and concepts of the Toronto-centred region plan.

Mr. Lewis: But not this government, I take it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The government is quite aware.

Mr. Lewis: But you are not saying anything.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the Premier give me his views on this statement? At the last meeting of the airport committee we had, there were some of his ministers there and we felt that this was an Ottawa decision and if we let this government into the act it would become political in view of the election coming up.

Mr. MacDonald: Ottawa never does anything political.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who said anything about an election?

Mr. Sargent: Could the Premier tell me how much control this government is going to have in the decision as to where it goes? What is his position, sir? Is he going to make a decision on the question or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I did not know anything about any political considerations or possibilities of elections. I certainly would know nothing about this. But I have to make it abundantly clear that the decision as to the location of the proposed new airport facility is a decision to be made by the federal authorities.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier agrees?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No question.

Mr. Lewis: Not in defiance of the provincial government? It will not work that way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh I am sure they would not.

Mr. Lewis: Do not play that game with us then. Just tell us where the government wants it.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions by the member for Scarborough West?

RESIDENTS RECEIVING $30 SUPPLEMENT

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: How many residents of Ontario will be covered in the $30 supplement announced yesterday by the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells)? How many people will that actually apply to?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only be guessing if I used the figure of some 4,700 and I do not want to be held to that. I will check it and get the actual information for the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Four thousand seven hundred?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is, but I am not sure, so I do not want to be held to it. I will find out.

Mr. Lewis: But the Premier does have a feeling it is in that range?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a feeling.

MERCHANDISING AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate the inordinate precision in the reply.

May I ask one final question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Trade and Development? Is it accurate, as recorded in that estimable journal, the Toronto Globe and Mail, that much of Ontario Place derived its inspiration from Disneyland, particularly in the sale of goods and articles at the provincial boutiques and other provincial agencies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have not read the article in the Globe and Mail, therefore I do not know what they have suggested as to where the inspiration was derived. All I can say is whatever the inspiration was it has turned out to be a hell of a good thing.

Mr. Nixon: There he goes again.

Mr. Pitman: Press the button and he goes on.

Mr. Lewis: There were 6,000 people yesterday as I understand. May I ask, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a pretty good crowd.

Mr. Lewis: That is an excellent crowd.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Disneyland is successful too. Has the member visited it?

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I have.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, then the member could tell his leader?

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister's officials visit other spectaculars beyond that of Disneyland?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure these questions do not come under the heading of urgent public importance. I can assure the hon. member that Ontario Place was planned over a great period of time. I am sure that many officials visited many places. How many visited and where they went I do not know and I do not intend to find out.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister concur that it has become a baroque folly in the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not concur in that at all, Mr. Speaker. All I know is that nobody seems to be happy with Ontario Place except all the people of Ontario.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Better not believe that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is why the members over there are so unhappy.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to two questions asked earlier this week.

Mr. MacDonald: That will kill the hour.

Interjections by hon. members.

OHC RENTAL ARREARS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the member for High Park asked some questions concerning arrears in Ontario Housing Corporation.

The first question was:

> Did the installation of a centralized computer accounting system last winter result in the Ontario Housing Corporation losing control of the situation in connection with rental collection, resulting in rental arrears of hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Then he asked a supplementary:

> The minister did not know he had a computer system. Did he know this computer system resulted in west Toronto alone having rental arrears of $240,000?

And a further supplementary to a question, incidentally, which I did not answer:

> Does the minister approve of the written instructions on this matter which were given out by his director of housing operations saying this matter must be kept confidential?

On the following day, the member asked the question:

> This morning a group of employees of OHC were threatened that charges would be laid against them under The Official Secrets Act if any further information was given to me or any other member of the opposition. Sir, I submit to you—

And he made some statement about the rights of the members getting information.

Mr. Speaker, I am not just too certain what the hon. member was driving at in posing these questions. I do not know whether he was complaining about the use of the computer and/or its alleged malfunction, or if he objects to the use of internal—

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the minister not make up his mind in an answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to find out what the question was.

Does he object to the use of internal confidential correspondence, or is he concerned, that we are allowing arrears and not evicting the tenants? I do not know which one it is. However, Mr. Speaker, I will try to give him as full and honest an answer as I possibly can, and I will try—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, yes!

Mr. Lewis: What does that imply about the minister's previous answers?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps I should have said a non-provocative answer. In answer to the first question, the use of a centralized computer accounting system created some rent collection problems for property management personnel, but the corporation at no time lost control of the situation, as he put it. Across the province—

Mr. Shulman: No, as your Mr. Davies put in his letter—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will tell you about Mr. Davies if the hon. member will just give me a chance. I will not get provocative. I will try hard not to.

An hon. member: Get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Across the province, our total arrears at any one time average about two per cent of total billing. In the private sector, which contains many luxury buildings, rental arrears usually run from 0.08 to 1.4 per cent. Since we are fulfilling the needs of very many low income groups, we consider the two per cent arrears as quite acceptable.

The confidential memorandum the member so gleefully distributed to the news media was written last November, when the property management staff were seeking ways of improving rental collection. At that time there were arrears of $240,000 in the west region where there were at that time 6,746 units under management. Today, with 7,419 dwellings under management in the same area, the arrears in the region have decreased to $163,000.

Sir, when one considers that OHC's rental collections in the west region amount to almost $7 million annually, this seems to be a reasonable record, particularly in light of the levels of—

Mr. Sargent: This is the minister's statement today, is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —incomes of tenants in public housing and the fact that the corporation bends over backwards to assist families who face rent problems.

In reply to the member's third question, I should point out that the memo on which he based his question was a confidential, interoffice document in which one of the corporation's officials, a new man in the department —on staff a few short weeks; somewhere between three and six if I recall—outlined an idea to stimulate members of the property management staff into improving rental collection.

The suggestion as to the write-off of arrears was not policy, nor has it become policy. It did, however, have the desired effect of stimulating ideas and discussion among the staff and this is reflected in the improved arrears picture.

The member for High Park must know that making public this confidential correspondence and the next day making charges that employees had been harassed—something no senior official of the corporation is aware of—has certainly not contributed to OHC staff morale. This charge, in fact, Mr. Speaker, has no foundation.

The hon. member's use of private correspondence in this matter, together with the publicity which resulted, has tended to cast a cloud over all public housing tenants since. Some 98 per cent of OHC tenants pay their rent on time—I want to make that perfectly clear—some 98 per cent of OHC tenants pay their rent on time and carry out their obligations like the good citizens they are.

It is most unfortunate to see headlines at the expense of these people and thereby present a distorted image of them to the public. It does not help us get the public to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of OHC tenants are good, law-abiding citizens. I say that most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, in answer to this question.

A great many citizens of this province have a low image, a low idea, of the kind of people who occupy public housing. Questions like this, which lead the public to believe that the tenants are allowed to go millions or hundreds of thousands of dollars into arrears and that some effort is not being made to collect the rent and they are getting away with a lot, is giving an image to the OHC tenants which does not help us get public acceptance of the kind of social housing we are providing and are expanding daily.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have another one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No, there must be an opportunity for supplementaries on that one.

Mr. Shulman: I have two or three supplementaries, Mr. Speaker: First of all, can the minister explain his statement that the Ontario Housing Corporation did not lose control of the situation? How does that compare with the statement from the director of the Ontario Housing Corporation that the housing management personnel lost control of the situation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a matter of opinion and a matter of terminology when one suggests "lost control of the situation." I suppose at that particular time they had lost control of the situation, if one wants to

suggest, to imply or even to state that, because of a breakdown or malfunction in the computer. Then, at that particular time, they lost control of the situation, I suppose you could argue. But using the term, "lost control of the situation," if that is the expression he used, which I do not agree with; I do not know if he used that then he should not have used it, but I think it is a term that can be used in many ways.

If I am going to collect some rents some place and I cannot find the tenant, or I have lost my records of that tenant for that day, one could argue that I lost control of the situation. But if we are able, because of the functioning again of the computer, to get this thing into line again in a very short while—and the member was talking about a memorandum which was issued in November, 1970—then, obviously it really was not a pertinent question of the situation as it exists.

Mr. Shulman: A second supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Are the rental arrears down markedly, as the minister suggests, because of a massive write-off of rent, which he did on December 31 last, and how much rent did he write off in this past year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there was a write-off; there always is a write-off of rent. I might as well give the hon. member these figures as I have them here as some backup material.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: One might think the minister had lost control of his department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am being accused constantly of making long statements, when I am trying to give as brief information as I can. I am trying to avoid that; I am trying to answer the question as it was asked.

Mr. Sargent: They are very unfair.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to avoid that, I am trying to answer the question as it was asked. If the member wants further material, if I have it available, I will give it. If I do not, I have to obtain it. Many questions are asked; I have to obtain a lot of information and take a lot of time to determine the answers.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister will now give the information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are the members not sorry for me?

Mr. Sargent: Getting dotey in your old age!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the total annual billings are $32,616,000. The total units under administration are 37,828. The total arrears—the last figure I have which includes accumulative arrears—as of May 1, I am advised, are $613,000, which makes it an average arrears percentage of 1.88 per cent. As far as the write-offs are concerned, in 1970 the corporation wrote off $160,000, representing 0.7 per cent of our rental revenue at that time. Of this total write-off, Ontario would pick up 42.5 per cent, Ottawa 50 per cent and the municipalities 7.5 per cent.
I suggest the hon. member—

Mr. Ruston: Do not apologize.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If you would just stop apologizing for Ottawa and help us in Ontario, you would do a lot more good over there. I will be going to Ottawa shortly to speak to the minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I would like to know that the Legislature is 100 per cent behind me in doing what I can for Ontario. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the average arrears percentage is not unduly high, which speaks well for OHC tenants and the OHC administrative staff. I get no credit for this at all.

Mr. Nixon: None at all?

Mr. Lewis: What would the government do without you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just take blame for things that go wrong. Poor Grossman. And I suggest that the write-offs are not unduly large either, because every corporation has to have write-offs and particularly landlords. That is one of the reasons I would like Mr. Andras to become the landlord. I hope that answers the hon. member's question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

An hon. member: Take him along with you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a feeling he already knows about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I answer another question?

Mr. Speaker: If I do not let the member for Grey-Bruce get in, I will not have a happy morning.

MODULAR HOUSING

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we want an answer, I will ask this question of the Premier, because what I am talking about is of public importance.

An hon. member: Everything the member asks is of public importance.

Mr. Sargent: If I may say so, this is a hard question to set up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has been working on it for over half an hour now under my eye.

Mr. Nixon: You are setting him up very well.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Not that Owen Sound subway! Not that subway again!

Mr. Sargent: Very seriously, if the minister is sincere about doing something about the unemployment situation and housing, I suggest to him, if he will listen to me for a moment, he can solve it by one shot. If he is aware, sir—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shoot, man!

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): That is right. Shoot all the people who need housing.

Mr. Sargent: —there is a modular housing programme now going on under the HUD operation in the USA. In Avon, New York, 175 miles from here, a modular programme is going on and I wish you would send a group down there to do a crash programme—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: All right. It has got to be someone who has some action in him. They are manufacturing housing down there, sir—

Mr. Lewis: What is the question?

Mr. Sargent: —for people under $5,000 income, of three-bedroom houses. You could make Toronto, sir, or Ontario, the housing capital of Canada, using rail transportation to bring in a modular housing system similar to what is going on in Avon, New York.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member would say, "Is the Prime Minister aware of this," he has a question.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Premier please answer me, sir? Would he send a group, if I can set up the appointment? I talked to them on the phone this morning.

An hon. member: They will fly them down.

Mr. Sargent: I told them there is a good chance the Premier might listen to this.

An hon. member: The government will have to buy the licence, though.

Mr. Randall: They are so small we would have to rent them to dwarfs.

Mr. Sargent: They ship them by rail, coast to coast, and it would solve our housing programme and put tens of thousands of men to work in Toronto immediately. Would the Premier go and have a look at it please?

Mr. Nixon: On his way to Disneyland.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Premier pay for the phone call this morning?

Interjections by hon. members.

LOCATION OF TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Minister. Did the Prime Minister receive a letter from a resident of Cloud Bay, offering land at whatever price the government was willing to pay, for a location for the Tourist Information Centre near the Pigeon River border? Is it a fact that the site that was chosen was purchased from an American millionaire and will require up to 65,000 yards to fill? Assuming both of those statements are correct, what is the difference in the cost to the government of the site chosen and the site that was offered at whatever the government was willing to pay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not operate on the basis of assumptions. I will find out the facts for the hon. member and have a reply for him early next week.

Mr. MacDonald: He has the facts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has his facts. I will find out.

Mr. Pitman: The member is embarrassing the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, we have come to the end of the question period.

Mr. MacDonald: What of the amount of fill required?

Mr. Randall: Wait until the tide goes out.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Lieutenant Governor is waiting to give assent to certain bills.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 24, An Act to amalgamate The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport.

Bill 25, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Bill 27, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill 29, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Bill 30, An Act to amend The Forestry Act.

Bill 31, An Act to amend The Gananoque Lands Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 32, An Act to amend The Fish Inspection Act.

Bill 37, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Bill 42, An Act to amend The Used Car Dealers Act, 1968-1969.

Bill 45, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the 1970 annual report of The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Public Records and Archives; and the 84th annual report of the Niagara Parks Commission.

Hon. Mr. Kerr presented a report in recommendation of the Littering Control Council of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, of the two departments named be referred to standing committee as follows:

The Department of Labour to legal administration committee.

The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs to natural and physical resources committee.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just one comment on that motion: Does the House leader, in the information behind this motion that is available to him, contemplate that this will be the last of the estimates that will be referred to committee, or will there be others beyond these two?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could not be absolutely definite, but in my contemplation I think these will be perhaps the last that will go to committee. I am not certain of that.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

Mr. Deans, in the absence of Mr. Makarchuk, moves second reading of Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PROTESTANT CHILDREN'S HOMES

Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Homes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THUNDER BAY FOUNDATION

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. Jessiman, moves second reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Thunder Bay Foundation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HUNTINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Nixon, in the absence of Mr. Sopha, moves second reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Huntington University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

RELIABLE PLASTERING LIMITED

Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Reliable Plastering Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BROCK UNIVERSITY

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. Morningstar, moves second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Brock University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SOCIETY OF INDUSTRIAL ACCOUNTANTS OF ONTARIO

Mr. Gilbertson, in the absence of Mr. J. Smith moves second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ZURICH LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF MISSISSAUGA

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Town of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HILLBROOK INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Mr. Deans moves second reading of Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Hillbrook Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ABBEY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. J. Smith, moves second reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

KEDAR MINES LIMITED

Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill Pr17, An Act respecting Kedar Mines Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. Boyer, in the absence of Mrs. Pritchard, moves second reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WOODSTOCK

Mr. Innes moves second reading of Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TRIANGLE SWINE ENTERPRISES LIMITED

Mr. Nixon, in the absence of Mr. Breithaupt, moves second reading of Bill Pr21,

An Act respecting Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TIMOTHY INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Mr. Gilbertson moves second reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting Timothy Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CADMUS ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Mr. G. E. Smith, in the absence of Mr. Morin, moves second reading of Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Cadmus Associates Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF SUDBURY

Mr. Nixon, in the absence of Mr. Sopha, moves second reading of Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the City of Sudbury.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF NORTH BAY

Mr. Innes, in the absence of Mr. R. S. Smith, moves second reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the City of North Bay.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF GUELPH

Mr. Worton moves second reading of Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF CORNWALL

Mr. Meen, in the absence of Mr. Villeneuve, moves second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Cornwall.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BARRIE

Mr. Boyer, in the absence of Mr. Evans, moves second reading of Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the City of Barrie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH

Mr. Boyer, in the absence of Mr. Evans, moves second reading of Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the Village of Wasaga Beach.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. Deans, in the absence of Mr. Pitman, moves second reading of Bill Pr39, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The third order; House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. R. J. Boyer in the chair.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 47, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966,

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of a question to the minister, did he not say last night that he intended to get certain approval from the Lieutenant Governor and take certain second or third readings? Did he mention committee?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, that is right. Yesterday this bill was given second reading and we agreed it would go into Committee of the Whole House. The bill was hailed with much acclaim by the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Lewis: Well, there were some plaudits from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and from the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) as I recall.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And I did undertake to deal particularly with subsection 2 of the first section. But I had hoped that the member for Lakeshore would be here.

Mr. Lewis: I know that one or two of the members would have liked to be here and

were under the impression that we would not be in committee this morning.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, there was no undertaking not to be in committee. I did indicate the general trend of the business of the House. Certainly I have no desire to take advantage of the—

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that. Would you mind standing it down one sitting? Could it be done next week?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is good legislation and I would like to get on with it.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that, but since you would not get royal assent today I—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The election will be over Monday and then they will all be back here.

Mr. Lewis: —thought maybe it could wait.

Mr. Chairman: Order: Are there any questions on section 1?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Really, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I do not think that the member for Lakeshore, when he reads my explanation in Hansard will take it amiss.

On section 1, Mr. Chairman, there was a question raised yesterday—particularly by the member for Lakeshore—when we were dealing with this legislation on second reading. He had a question as to subsection 2 of section 1. Now that subsection reads that subsection 1 applies to assignments made after this section comes into force. That may appear rather peculiar and I can understand the question that might be raised about it, particularly when you look, if I may look forward and refer members to section 3 which says this Act comes into force on the day to be named by the Lieutenant Governor on proclamation.

The question is, "Why, therefore, do you have to have this subsection 2 in the particular section?"

The reason, I think, is this—the reason is definitely this—the first part of section 1 that is indicated as 27, provides that the assignee of the rights of a lendor, and the lendor here really means the seller, the vendor, has no greater rights than, and is subject to the same obligations, liabilities and duties as the assignor. That is, the discounter of the paper —the conditional sale agreement, the promissory note—takes the obligations, the liabilities, the duties of the seller, and must meet the warranties, service undertakings, and so on.

Now unless you had subsection 2, when the Act came into force and was proclaimed, the interpretation would be that at that point, at that moment, every holder of a promissory note, of a negotiable conditional sale instrument, would be subject to these duties. In order to make it clear that this only affects those contracts that are made after this Act comes into force, it was necessary to insert a subsection, which is subsection 2. So for someone who had made a contract a month before or six months before and held a negotiable paper, if we did not have subsection 2 it could be said he is subject to those obligations, rights and liabilities which he had no knowledge he was going to be faced with.

So you insert subsection 2 to say this will be applicable, as the subsection reads, after this Act comes into force. So there is an awareness then that when a contract is made the assignee, the finance company, the bank, which discounts the paper, will then take those obligations but it will not apply to a transaction which took place prior of the coming into force of the Act.

That is clear and simple—perhaps not simple but it is a clear explanation, I trust, of the reasons for that subsection.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further comments on this bill?

Bill 47, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports one bill with one amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is good to have an opportunity so early in the session to speak in the budget debate. Quite often

one ends up speaking so late in the session that people have forgotten exactly what the budget was all about and all of the things that it contained.

Before I start to deal with the budget I want to talk about a number of other small matters that are of concern to me. One is that at the moment we find ourselves in the position where a committee is sitting; we found during the course of the session where committees were sitting concurrently with the House that it makes the business of the House extremely difficult. It makes it difficult for the members of the House to be as aware of the things that are happening that affect the people of the Province of Ontario as they were able to be up until this particular session started.

Having looked at the way in which the committee system operates within this House and having looked at the problems I personally have in keeping abreast of what is happening in the estimates committee and in other standing committees and in the House, it makes the job twice as difficult as it once was.

I am going to suggest—and this is a purely personal view—that we again sit together to discuss the appropriateness of the way in which we deal with the business of the House and to discuss whether or not it makes sense that matters of such vital importance as estimates should be dealt with in the committees at the same time as legislation is being dealt with in the Legislature.

The example I give to you is this: Yesterday I wanted to speak on bills that were coming before the House, but because of obligations in the committee and the desire to be there to present the point of view that I felt was required I could not be here. It is very true that it is hard to be in two places at once, and because of that I missed the opportunity to express some views which I felt were relevant to the business of the province.

Because of that I want to suggest that during the time that the Legislature is dealing with legislation, the committees not sit, because I feel it is important that the members of this House be here to do the business for which they were elected. At all other times—times of speech-making, replies to budget speeches, Throne speeches and private members' hours—in all of those times it seems appropriate that other business could be carried on. But I cannot help feeling, as I look at the way in which we now operate, that it is inappropriate that members are not able to be aware of what is happening in the Province of Ontario, by way of legislation because they are studying the estimates. So much for that.

It ties in, though, to some extent with what I want to say. I think at times we perhaps lose sight of the reason why we are here. I have come to the conclusion that on occasion we seem to feel that the purpose of our being here is purely political, and of course it is not. There are many people who rely on us to be present and express their views—and there still are people who have a very puritan view of the Legislature, that things that are said are indeed relevant. And we can, as individuals, influence the affairs of government.

I think it is important, in taking on a job like this, that first of all we recognize that the responsibility of the Legislature is to work to ensure that we leave at least as good a place and perhaps a better place for this generation and for future generations, when and if we finally depart from this place, and obviously we depart from this earth.

I want to say that as human beings we have an obligation to work continuously for the betterment of all of the people. We have got to try to get away from the notion that the profit motive is the motive worth considering and we have got to set our minds to determining that we are going to provide a better place in Ontario than there has ever been for the people who live here and the people who have yet to come.

Yesterday, as I walked into the committee dealing with the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services, I read the notice outside the door; it said: "Human Resources Committee." Now, I ask you, can you think of anything further from the truth, when dealing with the people of the province, than that the people of the government, honestly believing the problems of those on welfare, look at those on welfare and consider them as human resources?

It seems to me that the attitude toward people who are less privileged than ourselves, toward people—particularly at a time of high unemployment—toward the infirm, the aged, or those people who are required because of injury to receive payment from the government other than payment through the Workmen's Compensation Board—it is an inhuman attitude that we do not look upon those people as human resources.

We may look upon them as humans but we give little thought to the resources they have that they could put to good use to develop this province. We do very little, other than to hand out dollars to those people, in any way to try to assist them to become a useful part of this society. There is very little emphasis placed by government on the resource angle of the human body when it becomes less than perfect and when there is little for them to do in the normal sense of employment.

I think it is time that the government started to recognize the worth of the people of this province. Not everyone is capable of doing eight hours' work every day. Not everyone has highly technical skills that will enable him to go out into the marketplace and find employment. But there are any number of jobs for people who are presently unemployed, who are presently receiving welfare payments and who want to work. There are any number of jobs that could be created in this province that would provide adequate incomes within the meaning of the cost of living within this province. I am convinced that any government that set its mind to it, that honestly believed people were a resource, could very gratefully devise the kind of training programmes and the kind of mechanical aids necessary to bring great numbers of these people into the work place where they want to be.

The example I give to you is that we have a system within the welfare structure. We have a system that says to a young widow with five children: "She cannot go to work," because unless she is extremely well-skilled, the money that she will likely be able to earn will be considerably less than the money she can get from the public purse. And even although this person wants to work and can find part-time employment that will enable her to maintain her skills for a day when inevitably she will be alone, this government, by its actions, dictates that she cannot do that. I think this is drastically wrong. It is dreadfully wrong.

What happens is that this widow receives a set amount of money for her and her children. And during the period from day one when she first starts receiving it, when she was perhaps 25 years of age, until the day on which her children all have left to take up other residences and other responsibilities, her income is reduced time after time with the departure of each child until, at some point in her life, perhaps 20 years later, she finds she has no income at all because she no longer qualifies under the programme which at that particular point she was involved in. She is then forced to become a welfare case.

This government could spend its money much more wisely, it could make that money available to these persons and encourage them, even if it meant that in terms of total income they were receiving more than the welfare allowance would allow. They could be encouraged to do whatever it is they are capable of doing, knowing full well that there has been a floor level set below which their earnings cannot drop and, provided they earn at all, anything they get will be in excess of that.

I feel that in everyday life for families there is something that is looked forward to. During the time when families are small, people have a difficult time making ends meet. This is to be expected. But at least when the family is together and there is a unit working, the mother and the father look forward to a day when things will be paid off, children will be grown up and they will have a little more money to do some of the things that are more pleasurable in life.

But there is no such thing for the widow. She looks forward to the day when the children will be gone, her income will be reduced and she will be receiving considerably less than she was getting. She will have no skills to work. She will still have payments to make and she will be faced with poverty. And what a thing to have to look forward to.

I suggest that this government must take a very close look at its attitude toward the recipient in those instances. There must be more to look forward to than poverty. And at this time, in the programmes that are put forward by the department, all there is is the possibility of after 20 years of raising a family, she will be forced into destitution and I think that this is extremely bad.

I suggest to the minister in charge, and I will do so later again, that a complete revamping of the entire welfare and social assistance programme is required in order to provide some incentive; but also in order to recognize that within the total welfare package there are at least 50 per cent of the people who are in receipt at any given time, because there is no other way that they can earn a living.

There is no other way at all. They are incapable of earning a living due to age, due to physical disability, due to mental disability or perhaps, as in the case that I have just mentioned, due to obligation.

I think it is time that we separated those people from the mainstream of the welfare structure, and we added to that particular proportion the kind of dignity that goes with the receipt of Workmen's Compensation. No one ever looks down on the Workmen's Compensation recipient. Yet the person receiving family benefits, whose claims just as legitimate, whose injury perhaps did not occur in the workplace but who is injured nevertheless, who is ill or infirm, has to suffer all of the indignities heaped upon the welfare system by people who do not understand it.

I want to see this government make the move to separate the recipients of income maintenance into categories, in order that they can at least be recognized and in order that they can have the dignity that goes with the needs that they have.

There is yet another category. It is time that we came face to face with the problem of unemployment. There is no point in looking at a person who is receiving unemployment insurance benefits and saying that this is his right or her right. That they are entitled to this and it is not their fault; then turning around on the day after their unemployment insurance runs out and they are forced to receive welfare and saying that they are not trying; that they are not looking for work; that they are not doing their best.

How does this happen? How is it that on the last of one month an individual can be receiving unemployment benefits—and that is perfectly legitimate, that is perfectly acceptable—and on the next day of the following month he is receiving welfare benefits, and he becomes something less than acceptable in society.

Why is it that this has to occur? Why can we not take a more positive approach toward the human element in society? Why can we not look at people as resources? Why cannot the government sit down with the government in Ottawa and change the unemployment system in such a way that people will be able to qualify for unemployment because they are unemployed? Why is it that people should have to go to the welfare system and get the money from the public purse that they ought really to be receiving from the more general public purse? Why do we have to structure the system in such a way that the people who are receiving the benefits have also to put up with all of the indignities? As I say, the transition from being acceptable to being unacceptable can be a 24-hour period. I think that this is wrong.

The same thing applies to workmen's compensation. What about the workmen's compensation recipient who, during the period that he is unemployed due to his injury, is accepted by society? Every one of his neighbours thinks he is a great guy. He is receiving his income and there is no problem.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): In some cases.

Mr. Deans: In the majority of cases. All of a sudden we find that some doctor some place has decided that his disability can be regulated, or can be ascertained as being 15 per cent or 20 per cent or 25 per cent, and he is reduced in the amount that he receives from the compensation board. There is no employment for him. He cannot receive proper retraining. His former employer will not take him back. He is supposed to go to the welfare office for payment, and he becomes less than desirable on that day. Why do we tolerate such a system? Why can we not really start to deal with people as human beings, and why can we not structure it in such a way that people get in accordance with their needs? Why can we not recognize that the majority of people—and it is a known fact—do work; a majority of people would work and the majority of people want to work?

The policies of government, particularly in Ottawa at the moment, but also the policies of government here, are doing absolutely nothing to improve the work situation. How can you say to someone that he falls into the category of the welfare recipient with all of the abuse that is heaped on these people, when through no fault of his own, because of the actions of government, there is no opportunity for him to work?

I suggest to you that it is time that this government sat down and revised in total its welfare programme, and that it made it abundantly clear to the people of the province the rights and the obligations that they have. It is time that we sat down and recognized that every single individual in this province is a human resource, and that if we want to take the time we can quite readily find out for what they are suited, and we can quite readily then fit them in to what has become the mainstream of society.

I want to say that there has been much said in this House and in the media in the past while about the new government. I cannot help feeling in looking at it that it is not particularly new.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Right, and that is not a government.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It is a good one, though.

Mr. Deans: It obviously is not governing very well by its own pronouncements and back-tracking and there is little to justify the pronouncements of the newness from the government offices. In fact, I was given a book that I read at length with considerable interest. I want to say that I cannot help thinking that in some of the government offices this must have been applied in the determination of who would get the portfolio. The book is called The Peter Principle. It says that, given the opportunity, everyone will rise to his level of incompetence. I suspect, in looking at some of the cabinet, that some have reached that level. In fact, I think that some reached it some time ago. The transferring of them from one portfolio to another is not going to alter my opinion of their ability to handle the affairs of the public of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, the book was written about this cabinet.

Mr. Deans: In fact, I think it was written by some guy called Goldfarb.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): One thing is sure, we will never find out whether it will apply to any of your crowd or not.

Mr. Deans: That is the kind of comment that I like.

Mr. Lewis: Time will tell.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a bit of braggadocio.

Mr. Deans: That is a good word. I think it is pretty obvious from the floundering and the manoeuvring that has gone on since day one of this new government that it has not yet been able to come to grips with what is supposed to be new.

We have the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) in the early days of this session speaking about his housing programme, and it has disintegrated. We have ministers of the Crown one after the other making great public statements to the press about their intentions without introducing legislation to back it up.

How are the people of this province supposed to be able to assess the value of this government, if in actual fact the major problems that confront the people are being bypassed by this government? How are the people supposed to respond favourably to this new government, when unemployment has been left almost totally alone, although it is perhaps the major problem confronting the people in this province today?

Surely this government does not intend to have us believe that the tree-cutting operation is the answer to the unemployment situation in Ontario?

I can recall about a year ago, within two weeks of a year ago, raising with the then Premier (Mr. Robarts) the unemployment situation that at that time existed in the city of Hamilton. I can recall asking the Premier if he would meet with the executives of various corporations in the area to determine the problem and its origin and to decide on what course of action should be taken to try and meet the immediate problem of that area, using it perhaps as a test. It was rejected. In fact, at the time the Prime Minister said that there was really no problem.

Since that time unemployment has almost doubled and since that time absolutely nothing has been done to try and meet the difficulties that people are facing. The evidence of it is in the public welfare system and the additional costs that are being borne by the municipality.

It is time that the government recognized that it has an obligation to every citizen in this province, not to some elite few. It is time that this government recognized that its action or inaction can very well be the cause and support for the inflation or the anti-inflation measures and it is time that it recognized that these measures have caused and are continuing to cause unemployment. It is time we embarked on some meaningful programmes of development that will create a much brighter employment stimulus in this province.

What do we need? Let us begin with the housing programme. If it was the intent of the government to actually stimulate employment, a massive housing programme—even at the expense of borrowing—at this point would provide a greater stimulus for employment than any other single measure which could be undertaken.

Yet we get statements from the government about some mediocre effort that is

being undertaken—some mediocre effort in the building of houses, many of which were already determined to be built some months ago, in fact, years ago. It is a continuation of an existing programme that was inadequate when it started and is no more adequate now by the minor additions that have been made.

I just feel that the more positive approach is required. It is necessary for this government to set its mind to solving the problem and get away from all the nonsense and the jangles and jingles that come out. It is time that it set its mind to meeting what are the immediate needs of the people of this province and go about it. We might not agree with what it does—but the one thing we would agree with is that if the government had a positive programme and it could lay it out and it was obviously following it, then it must at least be given credit for trying. But at the moment the government cannot be given even that, because the effort it is making is so minimal.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Pathetic.

Mr. MacDonald: Picayune.

Mr. Deans: Picayune, when you take a look at the magnitude of the problem.

Nevertheless, it seems that the government is in the process of trying to sell, by a lack of action, some kind of stability. The government appears to be trying to promote a feeling of confidence. Confidence in what? What, in honest terms, has been done by the government in the last six months? What has been done by this government in the last six months that would promote confidence in any sense of the word?

What is there that gives the government the belief that the people of the Province of Ontario will be taken in by the grandiose statements that are lacking in substance? I want to deal with the budget itself, in a moment, but I want to talk about some local problems and the opportunity that the government had to do things in the area that I represent. We will see just what has been done.

In education, for example, we had a situation arise in the city of Hamilton where application was made—this shows how money can be misspent—where the local board of education expended some millions of dollars building a school for which there was no need, much of the money coming from the Province of Ontario.

To begin with, it is time that the province, in making available its moneys for building purposes, particularly in the field of education, determined first of all whether the request is legitimate, and in this instance, it obviously was not legitimate.

When it was brought to the government's attention that the board had, in fact, misspent the money, and that the school that had been built was going to sit empty or, if it did not sit empty, it was going to mean that a great number of other schools were going to be operating at less than capacity, simply because of the shuffling around, the minister said it was not his responsibility.

When he was asked whether the board had applied to The Department of Education for the grant that it received, and had it made the basis for the grant the building of an all-grade-13 institution, which is what happened, would the grant have been made, he said no.

So I asked him to look then at what changes are contemplated in the manner in which money is handed out by the Province of Ontario to assure that this kind of misdirection of public funds does not take place. There does not appear to be any. It seems that as long as the local board is prepared to go before its electorate and justify it, the government will make the money available.

There is no attempt made to determine whether or not the facility that is being built is a facility that is required. In this instance, it was not required. In this instance, the board acted improperly. In this instance, the board did not do with the money what it said it was going to do with it. I want to know what this government is going to do.

If there are to be no checks, then quite obviously anyone receiving money can do anything he wants with it and there will be absolutely nothing done about it. I do not just happen to believe that is how one should look after the public purse.

I want to refer to a second instance in The Department of Education. Up until a year ago, it was possible to get a permanent teaching certificate in one of two ways. A student could with a university degree obtain a letter of permission to teach for a maximum of two years, then attend the College of Education and receive a teaching certificate; or, he could with that same degree, go directly to the College of Education, be there for a year, and receive a teaching certificate.

Up until a year ago this operated quite well. I did not agree with it then. I do not agree that there should have been the addi-

tional avenue of a person leaving the academic field, going into the teaching profession and teaching, as it were, without any proper training, but, nevertheless, that way was there. A number of teachers chose that way. A number of people chose that way of entering the teaching profession. They got into it and they were half-way through the two-year period when the department decided to change the rules. It decided to add a simple little clause that said that, in addition to the two years, in addition to the degree, and in addition to the letter of permission, the individual has to be 26 years of age. How that magical number came out I have no idea.

But what we are faced with now is that there are a number of young people in the system who are not 26 years of age, who have complied, or did comply in the first instance, with these requirements, who are now not able to complete what was, if not guaranteed, at least referred to. I do not understand it. Now they are no longer able to complete what they started.

Surely that is not how one makes changes. I asked the minister is it not reasonable that the teacher who is already in the system, who got there under the existing rules, should be given the opportunity to continue until the end, that the teachers already in the system be given the chance to complete it, regardless of age as of whatever day you decide that there shall be no more?

The minister just ignored it. The minister obviously does not care. It is another human resource that the minister obviously does not care about. His attitude was, "Well, that is too bad. We did not promise them they would get teaching jobs. That is just too bad."

What kind of an attitude is that to take toward people? How is that to deal with the human resources of the Province of Ontario when, after setting ground rules and after having people comply with them, the minister suddenly changes them in the middle of the game and they find themselves without the opportunity to complete what they went into in good faith and what they reasonably believed was a right.

Is this the new government? It is the new minister. Is this the attitude of the new government toward the people of the Province of Ontario? Is this how you are going to deal with everyone? And once they get involved in the game you are going to change the rules. I say to the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) how would you like to be skating down the ice and have them suddenly decide they are going to move the blue line?

How would you like to have them suddenly, just as you are about to shoot the puck, move the goal? Well, that is what you are talking about. That is not the way the game is played. You set up the rules before you start to play and you maintain the rules throughout the game.

This is the new way. This is the way you deal with people in the Province of Ontario. There may not be many—perhaps you can do these sort of offhand things because you are talking about a rather few people isolated throughout the province. They are not in one riding or in one area. They are all over the place.

But it does not make much sense to me and it is not the way that I think that you should deal with people. And I suggest that if that is indicative of the new government, then perhaps the old one was better. Maybe we should recall the retired Prime Minister and place him back in his spot so that we can continue with what was there.

Or we have the now minister—well, he is still the Minister of Agriculture and he is here and I am pleased to see him back and I hope that he is feeling much better. But the minister and I—

Mr. Gilbertson: He will be here for a long time.

Mr. Deans: Oh, I would not bet on that. The minister and I have discussed a number of times the problems of the Niagara Peninsula, and I am not going into that. But I just want to say to him that I spoke, one week ago—no, last Sunday—with one of the major growers, long-term residents of the peninsula, people whom if I named them I am sure the minister would recognize readily, and they tell me that everything that I said in this House—and they are not New Democrats, never have been and not likely ever to be—they tell me that everything that I said in this House in regard to the problem of the peninsula is true, and that unless some action is taken to assist the farmers in the peninsula, we will find in a very short period of time that there will not be the kind of farming that we require to sustain the fruit industry.

Now the minister can slough it off if he likes, but it is true. He knows it is true and it is another indication of the callous attitude of this government toward the needs of the people of this province.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Please do not wake up the morning after it is all over.

Mr. Deans: The problem is that when it is over, we will be in power.

Mr. Lawlor: That is what they do all the time. They wake up three days afterwards.

Mr. Deans: We have the situation that has arisen again in my riding, in regard to the development of what was called in the first instance the satellite city and has now—God knows what you call it. It is a major housing development but it has not yet got off the ground. One week before the 1967 election the then minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) made a great statement that supposedly was going to salvage the bad fortunes of the Tory candidate, and he announced that there was going to be a massive housing development take place on the South Fleet Mountain the likes of which we have never seen. That is right, we have not seen it.

All that you have succeeded in doing is disrupting the lives of the people who presently live there. You have left them with question after question as to how they will be dealt with. They have no idea. The programme has been changed at least three times since the day it was announced. The decisions we thought were made some two years ago have now been rescinded. There are people who do not know whether they are going to receive services or not. You cannot tell which area is going to be developed first, if and when it will be developed. There has not been a shovel put in the ground. Three and a half years. I suspect that just immediately preceding the next election there will be a great statement made and the Minister of Trade and Development will trudge over to Hamilton. He will get on a great bulldozer, he will get his picture taken—a bulldozer is a good word for him—he will take up a great chunk of the earth, and saw "We are under way and let us elect the Tory candidate."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Housing by headlines.

Mr. Deans: I tell the minister that his programmes when we look at them are so phoney and transparent and this is the new government! Still no action and still people ask questions and still people have their whole lives disrupted and the future for them is uncertain and insecure because this government cannot make up its mind what it is going to do next.

In that housing development—I ask the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) does he know that in that housing development they are going to build the first houses around the outside of an existing quarry? They were still blasting every day. That is the kind of planning that is done. Did he know that they were going to build a school right next to the quarry? When I asked the minister if they were going to phase out the quarry, they had no plans to phase it out. It was a 20- or 25-year life expectancy and for 20 or 25 years, assuming they built the houses, those people would have to put up with the racket of the blasting every day.

This is the kind of planning that is done. The government paid three times what the land was worth in the first place. It bought land which was not suited for what it intended. It is developing it entirely the wrong way, and the ministers do not even have the decency to sit down with the people of the area and discuss with them their future.

Mr. Pitman: Boy, when the government goofs it really goofs, does it not?

Mr. Deans: I say to you this is the new government. This is how the government deals with the human resources of the province of Ontario. One cannot help wondering whether it might not be better if they all packed up and left and then—

Mr. Pitman: That is a great idea.

Mr. Deans: The government thinks those things are bad? Well one has to live in Hamilton to appreciate what really goes on.

About 18 months ago, in comes the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), charging into Hamilton in his inimitable fashion and he arrives at the major hotel. Let me tell you about him. He has unveiled the regional government study. A wonderful document and everyone involved in that study but Burlington said "Yes, we agree, we will go along with it." Burlington disagreed.

Who would have thought that the government could not have decided within a 16-month period whether or not the objections of Burlington were legitimate? Who would have thought that they were incapable of sitting down and listening to what may well have been legitimate objections and coming to sensible conclusions about them and then implementing a programme?

Mr. Deacon: Did the Minister of Energy and Resources Management sit down?

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes. They felt, perhaps correctly, that the minister who happens to represent that area was a mite vulnerable. I did not think he was vulnerable then. I happen to think he is now but at that point he did not appear to be too vulnerable.

The Minister of Pollution single-handedly —I give him credit—was able to stem the tide of regional government. He stopped it and we do not have regional government. In the period between then and now, because of the delays, because of the inaction, because of the government's lack of proper and well-thought-out leadership, we now have a very great problem in the Hamilton area.

Even if the government decides to implement it, the other municipalities who were, in the first instance, quite prepared to go along with it, are now saying, "Well, wait a minute, we want to think it out again." My guess is that there cannot now be regional government in that area because there is considerable discontent and that discontent was brought about by an action of this government.

Would it not have been more reasonable if the government and its Department of Municipal Affairs had said:

"These are the boundaries that we have decided will be set up since after all there was a major study and since after all there has been continuous consultation. We want to give the municipalities in the region the knowledge that we are going to set this up in a year or in two years—you can choose whenever it is you want—but these are the physical boundaries. You can now start to work together to put together the organizations and to amalagamate and to provide the services for the entire region in whatever way it can be most economically done because you can rest assured that this is the way it will be." Then, having determined how the taxing policies would be worked, how the province was going to finance the regional governments in the Province of Ontario—I tell you, there is a lot of determination to be made there.

Mr. Haggerty: The member has changed his tune.

Mr. Deans: I was the first one, by the way, who said that there is a lot of determination yet to be made in terms of the financing of regional government. But having made that determination, using all of the skills of the civil servants, surely then you could have implemented it in its entirety. It would have eliminated problems of battling for industrial development. It would have enabled the region to come together in planning of housing and major developments. It would have enabled the region to set up the structure as to how most of the services were going to be implemented well in advance of the actual implementation, knowing full well exactly what the regional boundaries were and knowing that there was going to be adequate financing made available.

I suggest to you that it will be extremely difficult for this government to implement regional government in the Hamilton area now because it has procrastinated so long, and I think it is time the minister who is now in charge sat down with all of the councils in the area and discussed in total the whole of the area as it was envisaged by the Steel commission and try to determine now whether it can be saved.

I suspect it is a monumental task and I think that it may be—

Mr. Haggerty: Do not go down Bay Street.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry?

Mr. Haggerty: Keep away from Bay Street.

Mr. Deans: I suspect that it may well be that the present minister might not be able to do that, but he should try. It has to be done, and he has got to make the move.

Nothing can be gained by delay. The government will win no more seats. It will lose no more seats, perhaps. So, for goodness' sake, forget the political aspects of this and go on with what it knows is right.

Dealing with another subject, I spoke some time ago to the then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and now Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) about the problem many people were finding themselves having with regard to the franchising of milk outlets. I asked for an inquiry. I did not get it. I got instead a fête, a game, a big play. He set up a committee which apparently studied and listened to the problems of these people but nothing has happened since the day that committee met, which is now some six months ago.

There has been no move made by this government to determine the propriety of the actions of the Becker Milk Company.

There has been no move made by this government to sit down with the people who are aggrieved and discuss whether or not the situation in which they found themselves placed by virtue of inventory and contract requires change and government investigation.

I had perhaps up to 500 people contact me in regard to the dealings they had with the Becker Milk Company. Each person came to me with exactly the same story, each person laying out his detailed accounting of the dealings he had and each telling me much the same story. They each lost between $1,000 and $1,500 to the company.

When 500 people in the province come forward and say that they are dealing with a company and they find it is impossible to maintain the relationship because the company kicks them out, withholding their deposits and their wages, without giving them adequate opportunity to determine the reasonableness or the truth behind the allegations which the company puts forward, it is time for investigation.

Mr. Lawlor: What is the new minister doing about it?

Mr. Deans: I asked for an investigation and I have not yet received it. I asked the new minister, some six weeks ago perhaps, when the committee that sat was going to make its report. He had not even heard of it.

Mr. Lawlor: There you are.

Mr. Deans: How can we have hearings all across this province? How can we spend days in the Macdonald block when the minister in charge does not even know that the committee sat?

Mr. Lawlor: He still does not know. He is not going to find out this morning either.

Mr. Deans: Once again, it seems that when you take a look at the human resources, this government opts to protect the financial resources and pays little attention to the effect of the decisions of the corporate bodies in this province on the people who must work for them. I say to the minister that he would do himself proud if he would just investigate in total all of the allegations and all of the statements that were made. I think he will find that the answer is fairly simple. I think, if the minister were to sit down and take a look at the manner in which the retail sales tax is applied against the individual operator, he would find that the parent company applies it on a bulk basis and the product is sold on an individual basis and there is a shortage resulting in the total revenues to the individual operator.

Let me explain it. What happens is that the parent company pays the retail sales tax on all of its commodities. It then applies that against the individual operator. You know as well as I that, if one sells a case of Coca-Cola, there is considerable retail sales tax, but if one sells a can there is none. This is what has happened. I have looked through a number of the audited reports, and I now discover that if you take a look at the amount that is being charged against the retail operator for shortages in retail sales tax, it accounts in large measure for much of the loss.

I want to ask the government if it will please institute an investigation into this operation. I was always under the impression that it was at the retail level that the sales tax was applied. I did not believe it was the wholesale level. I did not understand that. I never believed that the wholesaler was the person who paid or who had the tax levied against him.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister has an investigating staff on sales tax.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Yes, we will look after it. Do not worry.

Mr. Lawlor: I will bet you. Beckers has been around a long time.

Mr. MacDonald: In the fullness of time.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would just make way for a minute or two while I introduce same distinguished guests?

Mr. Speaker, we have in the Speaker's gallery some distinguished guests from the United Kingdom. I am sure the hon. members would like me to introduce them: Rt. Hon. Michael Noble, Minister of Trade for the United Kingdom; Sir Peter Heyman, High Commissioner for Canada and Mr. Ben Strachan, trade commissioner for Toronto, who are visiting our city and our province and who are here on a mission which will be good for the United Kingdom, for Ontario and for Canada.

I am sure the hon. members would like to give them a welcome.

Mr. Lewis: Do the Tories attend this way in the UK House? I hope they are a little better than they are here.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, let me just take a moment to say that I always believed that the application of retail sales tax applied to the retailer, it was at the retailer level that the sales tax was computed and it was at the retail level that the responsibility lay. The minister may want to correct me, but I thought that was how it worked. I do not know how it is that the parent company and wholesalers are charged with the responsibility of determining what ought to be levied in retail sales tax and then collecting it from the retailer.

I ask the minister if he would look into this matter for me, because I feel it may well be a way of uncovering what has happened in many areas of this province in regard to Becker managers. And it could well be in conjunction with a number of other things that this will account for a considerable amount of the money that these people have lost, that may well have been paid into the coffers of the Province of Ontario that in actual fact was uncollectable at the retail level.

I am prepared to discuss this with the minister and to show him documentation, such as it is. I do not have the staff nor the expertise to make the final decision as to whether that is correct or not, but I am now persuaded that there is some problem resting in the area in the application of the retail sales tax. I ask the minister to make a study, since his counterpart in the other department obviously does not care.

I want to say a few words in regard to The Department of Health. It has always worried me that people were not treated equally within The Department of Health in regard to payments for medical coverage. It has been said a lot—I am not going to dwell on it, but I want to say it again—that the time has now passed when there ought to have been changes made to allow persons who are presently qualified to receive OHSIP coverage free or subsidized, to receive the same coverage for hospitalization.

It makes no sense to say that a person is too poor to be able to pay for his doctor coverage but that he can afford to pay for hospital coverage, which is at least equal in total cost.

The doctor coverage is vital, but everyone here knows that the cost of being in hospital is so great that to go there without any coverage guarantees that one will never again have any money, because he will be paying for the rest of his life, if he has a major illness.

There are any number of young people and old people who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in the situation where they have insufficient income to enable them to pay the premiums, and it is time that we treated the two medical services equally. If a person qualifies to receive his medical coverage free, then surely he ought to qualify to go into hospital under the same conditions. All I do, as I say, is make the very simple point that this change must be made. It will be made, why not make it now? It should have been made years ago. There is absolutely no rationalizing it. There is no justification for the situation.

In the area of child safety, I also want to ask why it is that this government has not yet implemented a law which makes the use of childproof drug containers mandatory in this province? With all the statistical evidence that has been prepared and documented, showing the drastic reduction in the numbers of child poisonings in test areas where this particular safety feature has been used, why is it that they cannot draft a simple bill that will make the use of these childproof drug containers mandatory?

Why can we not give every child in the province the benefit of the maximum protection, recognizing that parents are perhaps occasionally careless or that children can climb rather high? In the interests of the young people of this province, why can we not pass a simple law that will make available to the children in Essex and Kent, the benefits that have shown up in numerous studies in the United States—benefits that every child can obtain in this province?

These are the simple things that government can do that will show quite clearly that they have a feeling for people, that they do in fact believe that people are important. They are not impossible things. They are not costly items. They certainly cannot be against Tory philosophy—whatever that is—simple matters that would aid in the safety of children in this province. And all you get is a blank stare and nothing ever happens. I have tried every year for the last three years to get this government to move that tiny wee step without any success. I ask again. It is important. Is this how you show your concern? By taking the steps that are necessary to protect young ones, those who cannot

protect themselves and that can be done quite easily.

I also stated earlier in this House that it is important that we take steps in the area of additives for glue sniffing, for solvent sniffing. It is becoming a major problem in the area I represent and I ask once again, very simply.

But enough of the local matters, I want to talk to you now for a few moments, a very few moments, about something of much wider concern. I am very concerned about the attitude of this government to the raising of money in the Province of Ontario. I frankly believe that this government has set out on a policy that will eliminate corporate tax as a major source of revenue for this province within the next decade.

Mr. MacDonald: It has already.

Mr. Deans: This government has by its policies over the last 10 years successfully reduced the amount of the burden that the corporate sector must carry from something in the order of 20 per cent down to about 7.8 per cent. At the same time, they have raised the personal income tax in terms of the percentage of the total raised in the Province of Ontario from about 14.5 per cent up to over 28 per cent.

At a point some 10 years ago when corporate tax raised the second largest amount of revenue in this province it was in fact paying its share. Maybe. It was at least paying a portion of its share. At that point it was the second largest producer of revenue for the Province of Ontario. It has now dropped, by your own statistics, to a point where personal income tax raises more money, retail sales tax raises more money, gasoline tax raises more money.

Mr. Lawlor: Liquor?

Mr. Deans: No. In fact, Medicare premiums raise more money than corporation tax. This year this government has taken a step that will reduce the amount in dollars of corporate tax raised in this province to a level that was raised in 1967. But in the year 1971 we will be raising in dollars an amount equal to the amount that we were able to raise in the year 1967.

This year, by the government's action, we have reduced the amount of corporate tax to be raised in this province from $414 million down to $290 million. We have done this by the five per cent rebate. A rebate which will not serve the purpose for which it was intended. A rebate which will not provide another job in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Winker: That is wrong.

Mr. Deans: A rebate which is not necessary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is wrong and you know it.

Mr. Deans: We will debate that in a moment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will prove it to you one of these days as soon as I have the details.

Mr. Deans: As soon as you have the details?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Deans: The thing that amuses me—that is a very interesting point—how then does the government come to the conclusion that it should make these decisions if the minister does not already have the details?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The details of the results? The member does not know what he is talking about half the time, anyway.

Mr. Deans: The minister means I have to wait while he tries to shore up his weak arguments of some weeks ago.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the same thing the government did in housing! Now they are doing it—

Mr. Deans: The minister suddenly decides. He makes the decisions.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): At least the member knows half the time.

Mr. Jackson: And he says he can get details.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The details of the results, if the member had listened but he never wants to listen.

Mr. Deans: All I say to him is this; that in the year 1967—we are talking of corporate profit in Canada and Ontario is a good reflection of the Canadian corporate profit situation—corporate profit in Canada in 1967 was $6,774 billion. In the year 1970, it was $7,364 billion. It is not expected this year, from the statistics that I can garner, that corporate profit will be any less than the corporate profit of last year.

The move is already under way, with the increase in steel prices announced this week, for the corporate profit of the year 1971 at least to be no less than the corporate profit of the year 1970.

How then does the minister justify reducing the percentage of the revenue of the province, attributable to corporate tax, back to a level that was taken in a time when the corporate profit was considerably lower and even at that point the tax was not adequate? How does he sit and justify that? How does he justify making a decision that out of some $7.5 billion he will take an amount equal to the amount that was taken when the profit was $6.75 billion? And, at the same time recognizing the unemployment that is occurring in this province, expect to raise more from the income tax, the personal income tax, of the workers of this province? Recognizing at this particular point that fewer people will be working than worked last year.

Surely in a period such as this, it makes good sense to reduce wherever possible the direct cost to the individual in the Province of Ontario, through whatever measures are available to the minister. A reduction in the retail sales tax was suggested. Surely it makes sense to put more purchasing power in the pockets of the people of this province in order that they can buy the goods that can be produced but are not being produced because people are not able to buy?

Surely it makes sense to increase the purchasing power of the people and thereby, through that measure, increase the productivity and increase the employment rather than to hand out to people, who do not need it, $125 million, much of which was already determined to be spent? A great portion of the benefit will accrue to countries outside of Canada and will not create any employment change to speak of.

It is said, and I believe it, that due to the technological changes that have taken place, the introduction of new and more sophisticated machinery, rather than improving employment, produces less employment. Fewer people are required to produce as many goods today because of the changes in technological equipment. What the minister has said is that we will make money available to buy the equipment which inevitably will create fewer jobs, and that the only people who can benefit from that move will be the manufacturers of the equipment.

Where are they located? Well, the manufacturers of the equipment are not in Canada. For the most part they are not here because a situation has prevailed throughout Canada that made it extremely difficult for them to be competitive.

We said to the minister if he was going to take this move—and we do not like it in the first place—but if he was going to take this move and reduce the revenues of the province; and if he was going to deficit finance—and let me say to him as an aside that I am positive that on the day that the government decides to balance the budget, it will not be by an increase in the corporate sector; it will be by an increase in the retail sales tax or the gasoline tax or the personal tax of the people of this province—some day in the future, perhaps a year or two years from now, assuming he is still there, when the decision is made that the time has come to balance the budget and we have to recover some of the moneys that we deficited, I wager that that money will be raised not from the corporate sector to whom it was given but rather from the public sector in terms of income, retail sales tax, gasoline tax and additional levies.

Now, the situation was that we asked the minister, if it was his desire to stimulate employment, that he take some measures that would ensure that the benefit from the money that was going to be removed from the coffers of this province would indeed go to the people in this province. We suggested that if there was going to be any lessening of the tax on machinery, that should be applicable only to machinery manufactured in Canada, when it was possible to get machinery in Canada.

In other words, we would have to draft up a list of all of the types of machines that would benefit from the reduction in the machinery sales tax. And we recognize that there are certain things that are not manufactured here, but it is conceivable with the expertise that we have in this country that the manufacturers, given the slight edge, and it is a slight edge, but given it nevertheless, would be able to expand their operations and to produce many of the machines and much of the equipment that now must be purchased outside the country.

We said that if there is going to be any edge given to anyone it must be given to the Canadian manufacturer, and there is how to create employment in the manufacturing industry in Canada. That is how you create employment. It is not done by reducing the cost to the importer. It is done by reducing the cost to the home manufacturer.

I suggest to the minister that there is still time to make that change. If this is going to be meaningful, then the change has to be made, and we cannot countenance the actions of this government, as it refuses to raise the proper amounts of revenue from the corporate

sector, increases the amounts raised against the private individual and then hands out money in such a way that there will be absolutely no benefits, or whatever benefit there is will be so tiny as to be almost unrecognizable.

I suggest to this ministry that if this is the way that the new Davis government intends to deal with the affairs of this province, then we can well do without you, and the people of the province can well do without you, and it is being made abundantly clear with every passing day.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that can be said in a budget speech, and so much time that can be taken. I want to say in closing that I have no confidence whatsoever in the will of this government to truly set its mind to resolving the problems of people. I think it is evident in the examples that I gave, the attitude of the individual minister toward the problems that affects the average citizen as he goes about his day to day work.

I think it is evident in the taxing policy of this government that its major concern is to ensure that the corporate sector has the benefit and that the individual through income and additional taxes will carry the burden. I do not agree with that policy. I do not agree with a policy that hands out, in a time of public need, $125 million to corporations whose profits far exceed the revenue of the Province of Ontario. I do not agree with a policy that reduces the dependency of this government and this province on corporate tax from 20 per cent to less than eight per cent over two years. And that, in the reverse, increases the dependency on personal income tax from 15 per cent to 28 per cent in the same period.

I think that this budget is a document that we could well have done without. It is a document that does not contain anything to meet the major problems in this province. It does not contain any concrete measures to combat unemployment. It does not contain any concrete measures to assist in taxation. In fact, as a budget, it is a farce. And I suggest to the ministry that it is time that they went to the people of the Province of Ontario and ask whether they share my feeling of lack of confidence. I think they do. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to commend the Speaker and Mrs. Cass for the remarkable effort they have made on behalf of the youths who look after us, the pages in this House. I observe that a remarkable esprit de corps has developed as a result of their interest in these youngsters, and I think it does a lot of good back in the community from where they come. I hear many reports about what they learn down here, and it is a lot more than is just involved in dealing with us. I think the interest of the Speaker has a lot to do with it.

The other point I bring to the attention of the House is my deep disappointment this morning in the way that we carried out the matter of the Lieutenant Governor giving royal assent to those bills. It seems to me disgraceful that the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province should be out in the hallway, being interviewed by television, when the Lieutenant Governor comes in with his aide. If we are going to have this procedure of royal assent in our manner of governing our province, we should at least have the decency—the leader of our government should have the decency—of being present when the Lieutenant Governor is coming in and not being out in the hall.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the budget that has been given to us, I note that the spending of government in this province continues to grow at quite a rate despite the fact that there is a real effort made in this last budget to control spending. The fact that our spending in this province has multiplied threefold in the past six or seven years shows that the major culprit in increased requirements and increased taxes in our whole sector of government from federal through to municipal is really this level of government, the provincial government

It is not all because of an increase in civil service; we cannot place all the blame there. We have actually undertaken major new areas of concern and responsibility that formerly were done in other ways, particularly the Medicare programme, which we all ascribe as being a very fine and a very needed service that we are providing the people in this province. But this growth of expenditures does point out that we have failed to really determine the most efficient manner that we can handle our funds and have these funds expended.

A major portion of the funds that we collect are actually transfer payments to other commissions and municipal governments, and our problem in dealing with these

is that we have assumed that since we are the ones who collect the funds, we should therefore have a great deal of control and direction in how the funds are spent. I agree very strongly that we should control how much we turn over to them, but I think our role is not to determine in detail, to the extent we do, how the funds are spent but rather to see that those who receive these funds are accountable to the public and to ourselves for how they spent them.

In other words, we should be seeing that there is available, in an understandable form, accountability reports on various school boards, the universities and the municipalities that receive substantial payments so that it is very apparent to us and to the taxpayers of this province that those separate jurisdictions are utilizing very wisely the transfer payments we put across to them.

In this way we can eliminate a great deal of the paperwork and the waste and interference that now frustrate many of the programmes that we set up, that we hope are going to achieve great things, and then we find that we are very disappointed. A tremendous civil service has to administer them, a tremendous cost is faced by the commissions or levels of government that receive the funds in trying to meet all the requirements being imposed upon them, and we do not get the efficiency or the value out of the funds that we could if we changed our concept.

Certainly the philosophy of this government has been that since it collects the money it has got to see how every single dollar is spent and control how it is spent. It is just too much interference. There is just far too much interference with the way it is spent at the local levels.

I was very pleased to see in the budget the new programme that is promised for next year, not this year, I still cannot understand the delay of one year in extending nursing home care. I do bring to the attention of the government the fact that in Alberta senior-citizen care there—according to articles that were in the Globe and Mail and other papers recently—the costs of this care are considerably less than ours. They seem to have undertaken a programme of providing shortcuts and other means of reducing the basic cost of caring for those that require nursing care and for senior citizens.

Perhaps the level of care is not as high as ours; perhaps the amenities are not as good; perhaps we would want to add to what they now have by one means or another, but I think that we are not doing anything like as much as they are in Alberta to try to get the cost of nursing care and senior-citizen care down to a more acceptable level. I am pleased to see that the programme at least is in the planning stage for the next year.

The next major area where I was really pleased to see some effort, though I think misdirected, is that of trying to get a programme going that will help the unemployment problem. The procedure used of a delayed tax, I think is a most wasteful and inept approach. I felt that the other thing that was planned, that of a different role for the Ontario Development Corporation, may work. But it is a strange thing that this so-called free enterprise government in this province should fail to recognize the important manner and difference between a government controlled, directed loan programme, and one where a government forms a partnership with business and enlists the financial resources, the managerial resources of business in a partnership arrangement, to solve and to provide a greater employment opportunity for the people of this province.

I mention this whole approach as being wrong because we have been forcing those who want to get government support to come to one single group, the Ontario Development Corporation, which means a civil service under a political leadership, one single group, to make a decision whether or not a venture is worthwhile. This to me is a wrong approach for any free-enterprise government to take. Government should recognize it has a much more significant impact if it is a junior partner to free enterprise—free enterprise of individuals on a much broader basis.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Sounds like creeping socialism to me.

Mr. Deacon: Well, I am interested in the talk and the mention of socialism. If that is socialism I guess I have probably misunderstood it, from past experience—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Oh, he is a socialist.

Mr. Lawlor: The member did misunderstand, I assure him.

Mr. Deacon: —of ventures by the socialists, because what I saw in the way of partnership in Britain was not considered by industry to be a very helpful partnership under the Labour government. It certainly killed their trading position.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, come off it. You see we won a by-election in Britain yesterday. You better be careful, boy.

Mr. Deacon: It is great to have you win. Once in a while you win and once in a while you lose.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What is more, that is just the first of transcontinental victories for us.

Mr. Lawlor: The Tories begin to go downhill.

Mr. Deacon: I will never deny that there have been many contributions made by those who have been on the left side, contributions to advances in society, just as there have been advances from those on the right side of society.

Mr. Lawlor: This place has been an educational institute for the member. He has come a long way.

Mr. Deacon: I come back to reciting and providing you with some of the ideas that I feel this government should adopt to spur industrial development and employment opportunity in this province. First of all, there is a multitude of people who have ideas as to how they could run a business and develop employment opportunities. The difficulty, time and time again, is how to get the capital to do it.

I have many calls from constituents who are asking me to introduce them to somebody at Ontario Development Corporation who will help them, and they get into that maze. Sometimes they are very efficiently handled, and other times they get completely lost, and nothing ever happens. The latter, unfortunately, is what usually is the case, but if this government would catalogue the existing sources of capital that there are available to us, it would make a lot of difference. There are many, many private funds that are seeking good venture opportunities for them to back, but the difficulty is there is no ready medium provided by the investment industry of bringing those sources of funds together with those opportunities for investment. A catalogue of these sources, brought up-to-date with what they have invested in and what type of investment they are particularly interested in supporting, would be of great help to these people. I understand that such an attempt has been made or there has been consideration given to providing such a catalogue, but nothing has been done in that direction at this point. We feel that this is something that would immediately make available to those who have good investment ideas and good ideas for opportunity for employment, the necessary capital to proceed.

A second area I have talked about before, and I am going to reiterate, is the importance of having large pools of capital available in this province—not a single Ontario Development Corporation, but a score of development groups in which the government has perhaps a 25 to 40 per cent interest, but where the public, along with the groups of those who have expertise in the field, can come together and form these pools of capital, and where these pools of capital will be directed by those who have successful experience sufficient to attract public support in investment.

The fact that the government would go into these ventures would encourage many people who now hesitate to invest in private enterprise development because, for a good and sufficient reason in the past, they have found that it is not always the safest place to put their money. But if the government were putting money into it, they would have a feeling that there was a watchful eye seeing that everything was being given a good, fair look; that there was no hanky-panky; that if things went wrong, at least it was an honest effort and one that did not succeed, but they got a good run for their money.

In addition, there are many pools of capital—considerable capital—available from institutions which continually state they do not want to invest in some situation, because there is not sufficient market for it or it is not a broad enough holding, not big enough. By the government participating to the extent of, say $5 million as a minimum, in one of these groups, and also provided that there had to be at least twice as much outside capital coming in, we would accomplish several things.

First of all, we could ensure that we had sufficient interest in it to prevent any foreign takeover. The second thing:

We would give it that air of respectability I have mentioned before that is so important. The third thing is we make it a big enough size, so that the marketability of the securities would be much better than it otherwise would be.

The fourth thing: we would be backing people in business who have already proved by their experience and by their record, that they are competent to make judgements as to whether enterprises are good or not. By having scores of these, instead of one Ontario Development Corporation, and adding them to the catalogue of the existing private sources of capital, we would then make available to our people in this province who have good ideas, and to others from outside who want to develop good ideas in here, that we make available to them many alternative sources of funds for their venture.

Our present effort is one that means government getting into business it does not know much about.

There is another aspect, and a great advantage that I want to add as a final point in this. If we put $5 million into a venture, we require that there be at least double that amount from the public and those that are the key guide in that venture. We would be tripling the effect of the money we would be putting in, from a risk point of view. But also, on the basis that often there is a 50-50 debt-to-equity or debt-to-risk capital ratio in ventures, we could be making six times the impact in the availability of funds that we would in our present system of just lending money.

In addition, this means that the people of this province would be getting a share of the profit as a result of their risk, instead of just an interest return. In many cases we are actually forgiving the loans in areas where we think this will provide employment opportunities and where these are needed. If we had areas where employment opportunities are needed, the key way we should at least be assisting those areas is meeting the deficiencies they have. Perhaps it is a deficiency in transportation. We should be helping to subsidize transportation costs to make that regional area more competitive. We should be making the services more attractive, so that they have the sewerage and other necessary equipment for recycling water, or whatever other things they need. We should be certain they have the basic amenities for running their business on a competitive basis. Lastly, and probably more important than anything else, we should be ensuring that there are amenities in that community that the people really require, such as access to other points and medical needs.

There are so many things that make a community attractive, that will attract labour, and persuade people to settle there—to move there instead of moving away from there. One of the key things in this is this availability of services and the availability for employment opportunities.

So these are the ways that I feel the government should have been stimulating employment, rather than by the reduction in the corporate income tax available some time from now.

Another major area in the budget which was a shock to me, Mr. Speaker, and which I wanted to talk about was the setting up of a $10 million land bank without having made any provision for reducing the exorbitant cost of raw land in this province, which is the result of our policies over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member prefer to break his speech at this time before he embarks on a new area?

Mr. Deacon: I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deacon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. E. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I should like to inform the hon. members that on Monday next we will continue with the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, followed by The Department of Correctional Services. Outside the House in committee, as the members are aware, The Department of Social and Family Services estimates are presently in committee. These will be followed by The Department of Labour and The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, just one question. Has the minister any motion at all about Correctional Services?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, unfortunately I cannot inform the member of that today.

Mr. Lawlor: I would ask the minister if he would do it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is there something specifically the member is worried about that I can inform him of?

Mr. Lawlor: Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I cannot give the member that information today. Accordingly, I move the adjournment of the House.

An hon. member: The minister is going to leave the hon. member worried.

Hon Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 28, 1971

Seizure of broilers to be marketed from Hawkesbury outlet, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon 2079

Barber commission recommendations on farm machinery and farm costs, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nixon 2079

Cost to taxpayers of Secant Construction bankruptcy re Ontario Place, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon 2080

Negotiations with Newfoundland on purchasing power surpluses, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon 2080

Establishing uranium enrichment programme using surplus power, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon 2081

Continuing Great Lakes basin pollution conference, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. B. Newman 2081

Odour problem of mink feed processing plant in St. Marys, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis 2083

Status of Century City in Toronto-centred region development, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 2083

Government's decision on location of new airport, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent 2084

Residents covered in $30 supplement announced by Minister of Social and Family Services, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 2085

Ontario Place deriving inspiration from Disneyland re sale of articles, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis 2085

Rental arrears in Ontario Housing Corporation, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 2086

Modular housing system similar to that in Avon, New York, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Sargent 2089

Land offering for location for tourist information centre near Pigeon River, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Stokes 2089

Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 2090

Presenting annual reports, Tourism and Information, Public Records and Archives and Niagara Parks Commission, Mr. Yaremko 2090

Presenting report, Littering Control Council, Mr. Kerr 2090

Motion to refer Labour and Mines and Northern Affairs, estimates to committees, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2090

City of Brantford, bill respecting, Mr. Makarchuk, second reading 2090

Protestant Children's Homes, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, second reading 2091

Thunder Bay Foundation, bill respecting, Mr. Jessiman, second reading 2091
Huntington University, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, second reading 2091
Reliable Plastering Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, second reading 2091
Brock University bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, second reading 2091
Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. J. Smith, second reading 2091
Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 2091
Town of Mississauga, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 2091
Hillbrook Investments Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Deans, second reading 2091
Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada, bill respecting, Mr. J. Smith, second reading 2091
Kedar Mines Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, second reading 2091
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. Boyer, second reading 2091
City of Woodstock, bill respecting, Mr. Innes, second reading 2091
Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, second reading 2091
Timothy Investments Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Gilbertson, second reading 2092
Cadmus Associates Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Morin, second reading 2092
City of Sudbury bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, second reading 2092
City of North Bay, bill respecting, Mr. R. S. Smith, second reading 2092
City of Guelph, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, second reading 2092
City of Cornwall bill respecting, Mr. Villeneuve, second reading 2092
City of Barrie, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading 2092
Village of Wasaga Beach, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading 2092
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. Pitman, second reading 2092
Consumer Protection Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 2092
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Deans, Mr. Deacon 2093
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deacon, agreed to 2109
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2110

No. 51

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 31, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 31, 1971

The House met at 2 o clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon, as our guests, in both galleries, we have students from George S. Henry Secondary School in Don Mills and St. John's School, Woodslee.

Later this afternoon there will be students with us from Bloor Collegiate Institute in Toronto, Kenner Collegiate and Vocational Institute in Peterborough and from Mildmay-Carrick Public School in Mildmay.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker I have questions of the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman)—

An hon. member: No hope, they are all gone!

Mr. Singer: —the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) and none of them are here, so I will pass for the moment.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could in the absence of these ministers, ask the Minister of Health a question?

Mr. Speaker: It would appear that we are about even because the leaders of both opposition parties are not present.

The member for Peterborough.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is business as usual over here though.

HOSTEL ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSIENT YOUTH

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he is prepared to take on any responsibility whatsoever in regard to the hostelling arrangements which are going on in this province in the coming summer. In spite of the fact that the federal government is essentially financing this venture, does he feel that it is any of his responsibility to see that there is some level of quality in terms of the service provided in each municipality, and indeed to see that there are some services at all in some cases?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): I have not directed my mind to it, Mr. Speaker. I would think that it would probably be a question that would require government policy as distinct from being a particular activity of this department. I will speak to my colleagues about it as a question of government policy.

Mr. Pitman: Well Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary: I wonder if, in view of the fact that this might very well become a direct health problem if nothing is done with it, would the minister be prepared to make a statement in the very near future as to what that policy will be? Because it will be June tomorrow and these arrangements are being made in some areas.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, if it does become a health problem, of course I can in no way avoid the responsibility for it.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Health have any objections, for health reasons, to the use of the former Mercer Reformatory grounds in the west end of Toronto for a tent city this summer?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I have not put my mind to the question at all. I think that even the use of one particular institution would require an overall policy to be developed by the government.

Mr. Pitman: Well, if I might—has the member for Downsview found his minister yet?

Mr. Singer: I have found him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough will please carry on.

LEGISLATION ON QUARRIES

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs in regard to the quarries?

Could the minister indicate when he is going to bring legislation down to regulate the quarries in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I gather the member for Peterborough has very thoroughly read the editorial in the Globe and Mail today. I might say that I read it on the plane flight from Winnipeg at 6 o'clock this morning.

I cannot add much to the reply I gave the leader of the Liberal Party some time ago. I said that the whole thing is in the hopper. We would have visited the various pits and quarries along the southern part of the province last Tuesday, but bad weather made it impossible to go. This trip is now slated for Monday next. I am as anxious as the member is, sir, to get this legislation introduced and certainly I will do everything I can.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why does the minister not introduce it then? He is the minister.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister could indicate whether he has called off the aerial survey, which I think he gave as one of the reasons for the delay in this legislation some weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just answered that. If the member was not listening, I am sorry.

Mr. Pitman: There was an official aerial survey, was there not?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Official?

Mr. Pitman: A departmental aerial survey?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Additional?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, there was no official departmental survey. Just the one I was going to take.

Mr. Pitman: Not the minister's?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This was the one I was going to take. We had to cancel because of the bad weather. It is now slated for Monday next.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary Mr. Speaker, is the minister not prepared to accept the research done by his predecessor, the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), or does he have to start all over again?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh definitely not! The member for St. George did a tremendous job in this portfolio. There are just a few things I want to look at to satisfy my own thoughts.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, is the minister not prepared to accept the legislation that was drafted at the behest of the member for St. George, or does he think that legislation is no good?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know about that. We are looking at the legislation again and, as I said earlier there are certain aspects that I want to check for myself.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, how long is it going to be before the legislation can be designed to save such areas of the Niagara Escarpment as parts of Chinguacousy and Esquesing and Erin townships, where the Consolidated Sand and Gravel Company Limited is presently desecrating the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated to the House on a number of occasions that I am just as anxious as the gentleman on the other side of the House to bring this legislation in. I will be bringing it in at the first opportunity.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, has the minister as yet replied to a letter sent to him by Dr. Temelcoff, protesting activities of Consolidated Sand and Gravel Company Limited, which letter was dated May 20?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I do not recall that specific letter, Mr. Speaker, but I will certainly check into it. I am sure that I have replied to it.

Mr. Singer: But what is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I do not know offhand. I do not know the contents of the letter.

Mr. Singer: No, the minister has done nothing.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): An offhand minister.

Hon Mr. Bernier: Certainly we are going to do something.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Could the minister indicate to the House what it is he hopes to be able to determine by flying over the escarpment on a clear day and viewing the quarries from the air?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think, Mr. Speaker, I can leave that to my own good judgement. When I have the information that I want, I shall be bringing in the legislation.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: Is the minister saying that his judgement in regard to his view of the quarries from the air is more pertinent to the legislation that might be produced than the investigation conducted by the ministers previously?

Mr. W. Hodgson: He may even ask the hon. member for his judgement on it.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Peterborough completed his question?

REPORT OF TRENT-SEVERN COMMISSION

Mr. Pitman: No. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has he yet received the report of the Trent-Severn Commission, the federal-provincial commission that was examining the entire Trent-Severn area in terms of its recreational use? Has the minister received that report yet, and if so when will he be making it public?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): I have received that report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask a supplementary: when does he intend to make this report public?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I do not believe it is my responsibility, Mr. Speaker. That report was not commissioned by our department.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary: Could the minister not say that it is his responsibility along with the federal government in view of the co-operation and participation which the Ontario government gave, and indeed the leadership that the government gave in terms of the setting up of that study?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. Yes, our department had a responsibility and was very much involved but I would also like to mention that there are many other departments involved in that study. I received a copy only recently and I have not had time to read it yet, and I am sure this applies to other departments.

Again I must say that this—I believe Mr. Cranston who is the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council was the chairman or the co-chairman of that committee—

Mr. Pitman: Exactly. As a supplementary, would the minister not feel that it would be the responsibility of this House to discuss and debate what measures are the responsibility of this government in relation to that recreation area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it certainly will be put forward in due course.

Mr. Pitman: As a final supplementary: Why would it not be worthwhile to have the report—at least those sections that refer to the government's responsibility—made public and brought before this House so that we could debate it effectively and intelligently?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is not my responsibility to make this report available. It was not commissioned by The Department of Lands and Forests.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask a final question of the Minister of University Affairs: Is the minister prepared to bring down any legislation relating to the commission on university government which is now before the University of Toronto?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): I am glad to have this question today, Mr. Speaker, because we anticipate receiving a draft bill back from the legislative council later today or tomorrow. When that draft bill is available, I propose to make copies available to those interested in this Legislature, and to the various constituencies within the University of Toronto.

The bill is drafted along the lines of the Commission on University Government and along the lines of certain recommendations in the University Wide Committee. The government has not scrutinized this bill, and at this point, I think, it cannot be deemed a government bill. We are very largely attempting to accommodate the wishes of the

University of Toronto. When the bill comes into the Legislature it will be a government bill from a technical point of view. It will have many of the characteristics of a private bill in that we are prepared to make alterations on the recommendation of the standing committee of the Legislature.

There are two items, however, which the government is informed about and on which the government has a policy. The first of these two relates to the form of government, and it has been adopted as a matter of government policy that it will be a unicameral system.

If I may speak for myself in the matter, I am not convinced that this is the best form of government for a university. On the other hand, this idea has been very well discussed, very well scrutinized, by those affected at the university and the idea of a unicameral system has gained very wide support during the past two or three years.

The government has concluded that the support for unicameral government was such that it should be proceeded with. Of course if it proves not to be effective and as efficient as is envisaged, then at some point in time it could be corrected, it could be amended again.

The second matter about which the government has formulated a policy has to do with the representation on the council. The government, as a matter of policy, has insisted that 50 per cent of the council be drawn from outside the university. This term "outside" is to include those members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, those members elected by the alumni and the chancellor who, by the statute, must be neither a student nor a faculty member.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he means that government policy, in relation to 50 per cent representation on the governing council from outside and the unicameral system, relates only to the University of Toronto? Or is it the expectation of the minister that other universities will be expected to move toward that form of university government in the future?

Hon. Mr. White: No, it relates to the University of Toronto in this particular Act.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker; would the minister give the House some assurance this bill will come before the human resources committee and that we will be able to call representatives of the faculty, representatives of the student body and representatives of the administration; and that it will receive a full debate at that level before it does harden and moves from what the minister calls the nature of a private bill into a bill which is brought by the government of Ontario into this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. White: I should have thought that the draft bill which we are offering for comment would have to be, perhaps amended, perhaps not amended, and then would constitute a bill with the backing of the government; and in this respect it would be like any other government bill. It will receive first reading here, debated on principle during second reading and then go to the standing committee on human resources. This is the sequence that I envisaged. But as I say, we are not married to the details of this bill, with the exception of the two which I have mentioned.

Mr. Pitman: Well would representatives be able to come at the point of second reading?

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough East have a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Do I understand the minister correctly, Mr. Speaker, that the draft bill which he has received from the University of Toronto differs in those two important respects? That is to say, does the draft bill stipulate fewer than 50 per cent being appointed from outside? Secondly, does the draft bill state a unicameral system, and the minister is stating the government policy is a bicameral system? I am sorry, I am somewhat confused on this.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think we received a draft bill as such. We did receive two reports and we did receive a number of submissions from interested persons. The president, members of the board of governors and the students have made some comment on it and so forth.

In order to move the thing ahead it had to receive very exhaustive study for an extended period of time. I thought we were entitled to prepare a draft bill, having in mind the reports and the other comments made available to us. The reason I thought the initiative lay with us at that point is because the University of Toronto historically is the provincial university and this Act, unlike many, is a public Act.

So one of the first things I did when I became Minister of University Affairs was to instruct my officials to prepare a draft bill, having in mind the recommendations of those two reports. I think there was no draft bill received from the University of Toronto as such.

The reports both recommended the unicameral system and our draft bill establishes a unicameral system. This is one of the two features that we have, to this point, adopted as government policy.

The other matter relates to the numbers on the council and from where these members should come. There were different numbers in the Commission on University Government and the University Wide Committee, which are reflected in the composition of the council as determined by the government, but which are not identical to those numbers in that the outside representation, as shown in the draft bill, is larger proportionately than was the case in either of the university reports.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: No, we have explored this matter sufficiently for the present time. Has the member for Peterborough further questions?

SCHOOL BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Pitman: A final question of the Minister of Education: I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he could tell me how many school board advisory committees have been set up under the legislation which was passed in this House?

Hon. Mr. Welch (Minister of Education): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to provide the member with that information now, but I will get it for him.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question: Whether if it is fewer than 50 per cent if the minister would be prepared to carry out the obligation assumed by his predecessor that legislation would be brought in which would make it obligatory for school boards to set up school board advisory committees, in view of the minister's interest in the widest participation of the community in educational affairs?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will be glad to take that under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview will please proceed with all his questions now.

ROCHDALE COLLEGE

Mr. Singer: Thank you. I have some questions of the Premier.

The first one: In view of the petulance exhibited by the Minister of Trade and Development in his statement last Thursday, addressed particularly to Mr. Andras, a minister at Ottawa, and in view of his strong feelings about Rochdale, could the Premier advise us why the province refused to send any representation at all, even through invited and urged to attend, to a conference held in Toronto the week before last, and convened by Mr. Herbert Hignett, the head of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while I think the question might more properly be directed to my colleague, I will answer the first part of it very easily, by saying that I do not agree with the editorial comment proposed by the member for Downsview as to the petulant nature of the statement made in this House by my colleague.

Mr. Singer: That was not the question.

Mr. Speaker: Well, if it was not the question then it should not have been included in the member's comments.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that you observed that the member for Downsview did add some editorial comment.

As it relates to the question of sending personnel to that particular meeting, Mr. Speaker, as far as the Rochdale aspect of it is concerned, it is doubtful whether representation from here might have resolved that particular problem.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the Premier not have thought that at least there might have been someone there to express the provincial point of view, if any such exists and if Rochdale is such a thorn in the side of his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development, and that perhaps some good could have come from attending that conference?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the views of this government as they relate to

Rochdale have been expressed on more than one occasion right here in this House and I think they are rather well known to the federal government.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, does the Premier then refuse to enter into this kind of joint discussion in order to apparently try to solve a problem that bothers governments on both levels?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the federal minister had some specific proposal as to the resolution of the problem at Rochdale to communicate to this government, not only my minister but I would be delighted to enter into discussions with him.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ONTARIO HOUSING

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the second question.

Could the Premier advise us when the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Halton East (Mr. Snow), is going to be charged with the responsibility for Ontario housing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that the member for Downsview is dealing in the area of hypothesis again, it is quite obvious that I would come up with something of that nature as an answer. But in that there has been no determination to create a separate Department of Housing at the moment, of course the answer to that is that there has been no date set.

PROVINCIAL ROLE IN SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. Singer: A further question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Premier tell us the position of the Province of Ontario as compared with that of the Province of Quebec, in that Quebec is apparently going to urge at the Victoria Conference that all social services, which include family allowances, youth allowances, unemployment insurance and old age security, be given by the federal government to that provincial government? Does Ontario share that view?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very unwise to speculate until we know specifically what Quebec's proposals may or may not be. There is a meeting going on in Ottawa at this present moment with some of the ministers from the various governments across Canada. While there have been reports in the press as to some of these suggestions that may come from some of the provinces, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be appropriate at this moment for me to comment on what Ontario's reaction would be until we know specifically what requests may emanate from any of our sister provinces.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, is the Premier not prepared to advise us as to what initiative, if any, Ontario is prepared to take on its own in regard to the taking over of these four programmes that I just mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication from there, and it is not part of Ontario's, shall we say proposal, in Victoria—we have never requested, per se, the taking over of the social programmes. What the Province of Ontario has asked over the past number of years is a redistribution of powers; and of course, just as important—and perhaps this comes first—some reallocation or some priority given to tax reform. It is quite possible that within the provincial jurisdiction here in this province, we can resolve some of our problems by tax reform alone without getting into questions of social programmes as compared to other kinds of programmes. I believe this position was put by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) during his budget. And as I said just a moment or two ago, I do not think it would be appropriate for me at this moment to comment on what may or may not be a position of one of our sister provinces.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary: Without commenting on what may be anyone else's position except Ontario's, is Ontario either going to urge at the conference that these four programmes be given back to Ontario; or is it going to oppose this suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Ontario will not, as this province's position, be urging that these four programmes be given back to the Province of Ontario.

POST-RELEASE TREATMENT OF RETARDED PERSONS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Could the Minister of Health advise us as to whether

or not he has as yet determined if there is going to be an inquiry, and if so what form it will take, into the question of post-release treatment of retarded persons?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not yet, Mr. Speaker. I simply have not had an opportunity of discussing it with my colleagues.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, could the minister advise us when it is likely that a decision in this regard will be announced to us?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would think in the next week or so. It is not a matter I would like to see left in abeyance very long, Mr. Speaker.

SYDENHAM RIVER FISHING RESTRICTIONS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Could the Minister of Lands and Forests advise us why the Sydenham River, which is stocked from a provincial fish hatchery, is posted all the way from the fish hatchery to Owen Sound, and is unavailable generally to the citizens of Ontario who want to fish and catch the fish with which Ontario has been stocking that river?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to take that question as notice.

Mr. Singer: That is all for the moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

DUMPING OF WASTE IN DETROIT RIVER

Mr. Peacock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Has the department exempted the Wyandotte Chemical Company from the provisions of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act in respect to its dumping of waste from Fighting Island in the Detroit River?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lack of exemption, what programme is the minister going to propose for the control of the effluent from the disposal site?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, Mr. Speaker, OWRC is pretty well continuously inspecting or monitoring the disposal site on Fighting Island to make sure there is no leaching, that the waste that is being dumped and retained there does not lose that particular lagoon area and that the Detroit River is not contaminated as a result of the disposal site.

Mr. Peacock: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider applying the recommendation of Mr. Justice McRuer in his latest report, number 3, volume 5, that the public should have the right to be heard as to an acceptable standard of pollution abatement in regard to Wyandotte's dumping of effluent on Fighting Island?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, with the recommendation of Mr. Justice McRuer. I know that this particular disposal site in the Windsor area is a very controversial one. I think, certainly from an aesthetic point of view, it is an eyesore. And the idea of so much waste being contained in this manner in a large, fast-flowing waterway does give people cause for concern; and this is one of the reasons the commission is continuously inspecting the walls of that island, if you will, or the diking, to make sure there is no leakage.

Mr. Peacock: Will the minister set up a public hearing?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well I do not know what a public hearing would accomplish, Mr. Speaker. All we could do, of course, would be to give information to that hearing that we are satisfied, at this stage and from day to day, that this particular site is not a danger. There could be an extreme situation, I suppose, for example an earthquake, where the liquid waste that is contained there could escape. This would cause some trouble, there is no question about that.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that dealing with this particular site, I do not think I am revealing any secret when I tell the hon. member that it is a cause of concern because of some emergency that might develop and also, as I say, from an aesthetic point of view, the idea that a company in the United States is dumping waste within Ontario, regardless of the fact that the island is owned by that company. All these things are under consideration with the idea of phasing out that island as a disposal site.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Windsor-Walkerville?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the minister if he is prepared to review the agreement

with The Department of Lands and Forests concerning the transmission of the wastes by means of pipeline? Apparently there is a pipeline agreement with The Department of Lands and Forests, and the cancellation or suspension of that agreement might solve the problem.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker; and this, of course, would be part of the total consideration regarding this site.

Mr. B. Newman: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister conveyed his feelings to the Wyandotte Chemical people?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No.

Mr. B. Newman: Does he intend to convey his feelings to them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. If there is any decision as far as a change in the use of that particular site is concerned, we would, before any decisions are made, communicate with Wyandotte.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the minister conveyed the feelings of—

Mr. Peacock: It does not have to be proved now.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if he has conveyed his displeasure at the method used by Wyandotte Chemical in the disposal of its liquid wastes.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, certainly the company is aware of the fact that we do not feel that this type of disposal—that particular site—is an ideal situation. It concerns us as it requires constant monitoring. In other words, it requires us to continuously, shall we say, police that area where another proper area would not require the activity of manpower of the department.

They are aware of our feelings about this whole thing. They are also aware that if there is any leaking, if there is, in fact, pollution from the island into the river, they will be prosecuted. Our concern, of course, is to find another suitable site, or to make sure the company finds another suitable site, rather than just using the Detroit River in a more direct way. These are all things we have to consider before we make any decision as to the future of that island.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Lands and Forests has a reply to a question asked last week.

LANDS AND FORESTS
BUILDING AT WINGHAM

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Huron-Bruce asked if I could tell the House what arrangements the department has made with Kenno Properties Limited in the building of the new Lands and Forests building in Wingham.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of The Department of Lands and Forests The Department of Public Works has entered into a leaseback agreement with Kenno Properties of Guelph for a building to be built at a site on Highway 4 near Wingham. Building plans are near completion and construction will begin shortly.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): May I ask the minister, is it known what financial arrangements are entailed in the leaseback?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These questions, Mr. Speaker, should be more properly directed to the Minister of Public Works whose department is responsible for leases.

Mr. Speaker: If the member wishes to direct the question, then, to the Minister of Public Works, he may.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I pose the question to the Minister of Public Works then. What financial arrangements are entailed in the leaseback agreement to which reference was just made?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit me, I have not seen the information which was sent to the Minister of Lands and Forests, but I can read to him the offer to lease signed by Kenno Properties. The total rent is $15,645 per year, commencing June 1, 1971, and including an escalation clause regarding taxes and hydro, using 1971 as the base year. Is that the information the hon. member wants?

Mr. Gaunt: How many years does that extend for?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Ten years, with the right of the province to renew for a further period of 10 years.

Mr. Gaunt: May the department also purchase at the end of that 10-year period?

An hon. member: At a depreciated value!

Hon. Mr. Auld: "The province shall have the right to assign the lease or sublet the whole or any part of the demised premises subject to approval of the lessor, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld."

This is the offer to lease. I do not have the lease in front of me, but in this type of thing I would doubt that at the end of a 20-year period the province acquires title to the building. I will get that information for the hon. member; but in the normal course of events that would be in the operative bill, which is the usual kind of leaseback, rather than a straight lease which I assume this is.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

HOSTEL ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSIENT YOUTH

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, the question I put to the House leader on Friday.

What specific facilities has the government of the Province of Ontario made for sheltering youths travelling in the Province of Ontario; how much money has been allocated for this and in what ways will this money be allocated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the province itself has not set up any programme for sheltering youths who are travelling this summer through any provincial facility that I know of. The youth and recreation branch of the Minister of Education's department is allocating certain funds to certain community organizations. Whether part of their work this summer will be involved in this I could not quite honestly say, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure we would be able to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question if I might, Mr. Speaker: In view of the apparent fact that there are at least some local councils and school boards who are vetoing various youth hostel proposals, does the Premier feel he has any responsibility in taking an initiative to ensure that travelling youths in this province have a place to stay during their travels throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assume from the hon. member's question that he is being critical of the decision made by some municipalities, and I assume boards, with respect to certain specific programmes.

I cannot comment on the decision of those municipalities or boards which have made these decisions. The decisions may be quite valid; I do not possess the facts upon which the decisions were based.

Quite obviously we are going into the summer period, and I think it is true that for some period of time an increasing percentage of young people will be travelling. I would express a personal point of view that I think if we can see that accommodation—and anything that we might be able to arrange—is provided in some supervised fashion, so much the better, Mr. Speaker.

But I think at the same time it is an area of very direct municipal interest and this is where the problem, by and large, should be resolved.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary, if I might, Mr. Speaker: Could not the Premier in particular, in conjunction with his cabinet colleagues, ensure that at least some residences in the provincially assisted universities are made available to youths who are travelling throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recall some information—I am not sure whether it was in the press or elsewhere—that one or two universities are discussing this at the moment.

The other point which has to be made, Mr. Speaker, is that with the summer schools and the other activities which have been part of the university responsibilities in the past number of years, the number of residences available for this sort of programme, I think, would be somewhat limited. In other words, they are being rather fully utilized.

Another point too, Mr. Speaker, is whether they are geographically located in those communities where young people are going to be travelling. In other words, is this the sort of route they take? This, Mr. Speaker, I could not comment on.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries? The member for Downsview.

OFF-TRACK BETTING

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier in the apparent absence today of the Attorney General.

Could the Premier advise us if the government is now prepared to make representations to Ottawa to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code to allow the taking

over of betting shops by the government of Ontario so that the greatest good will be done for the greatest number of people in Ontario, and we can avoid the shutdown of the racetracks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is in Ottawa today as part of the Ontario group discussing with the federal government matters related to the constitutional conference. I understand the Minister of Justice, under whose jurisdiction this matter is federally, is also attending that meeting. Whether or not they will be discussing this particular item, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say. I can only say that as far as the province is concerned, we are exploring it actively.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary: Could the Premier advise us if Ontario, on May 31, has any position at all about offtrack betting shops and their present conduct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the Attorney General pointed out to the House the legal situation that presently exists. This has not changed, to my knowledge at least. As to whether or not there will be discussions, as I say, today or tomorrow between the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice, I cannot comment at this moment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary: Since Mr. Turner, the federal Minister of Justice, has indicated that he has sought on several occasions an opinion from Ontario but none has been forthcoming, could the Premier advise us whether any such opinion is likely to be forthcoming during the present talks between Ontario's Attorney General and the Minister of Justice in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on this at the moment. Perhaps either the Attorney General or I might have —I was going to say Wednesday, but it will not be on Wednesday—some further indication on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS ON ANTIPOLLUTION INSTALLATIONS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is the minister satisfied, by virtue of investigations conducted by his department, that the major manufacturers in the Province of Ontario are indeed living up to their agreements in regard to antipollution installations?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Generally, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: By way of supplementary, is the minister aware of the statement made on cable television in the Hamilton area some seven days ago by a prominent conservationist, that there were major companies in Ontario which were not carrying out their programmes as they announced them to the public?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if that was motivated by some political objective or not, or whether it was a fact. But I think if it was political we should take it as that and the member does not require an answer from me.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister is never political; that is what we like.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But if it was a sincere observation—

Mr. Ruston: Does the minister mean he is not political? What about the Detroit River?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member knows who it is, does he not? He knows who it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Now, getting back to Hamilton—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All I am saying is that if that individual, that person, would give me the names of those companies to which he referred, I will check with my people to see whether or not it is a fact.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: Am I correct in assuming that no presentation has been made to the minister by this individual in regard to this matter?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is quite correct.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for York Centre.

TENDER FOR COURTHOUSE AT RICHMOND HILL

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the new Minister

of Public Works: Was the tender for the new Richmond Hill courthouse, recently awarded to Rice Construction, the lowest bid or tender submitted? If not, would the minister provide me with a list of the proposals or tenders and explain the reason for selecting the Rice proposal?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I just dug this out of my file.

Mr. Ruston: The minister just carries it in his back pocket?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have this information for the hon. member today because he asked me about it last week. There were 12 firms which made submissions to The Department of Public Works for the space that was required. The first thing that happened was we had to take a look at the locations and check with The Department of Justice to find which locations were suitable. I have about six pages which I must admit to the hon. member, I have not read yet. I can read the whole thing. If I send him this information, as I propose to do, if there is some further question when he has seen it, I will be delighted to answer it for him. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, but as I say I have just received it.

UPGRADING OF ROAD TO MINE

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs: Has a decision now been reached to upgrade the Papakemika road from Timmins to the Texmont mine in order to facilitate that mine when it comes into production later this year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, this matter is on the agenda for the next committee meeting which I think is slated for this Thursday.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Are they going to fly over?

Mr. Ferrier: Is the minister aware of the very unsatisfactory conditions and the fact that it is likely this mine will come into operation around July 1?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes I am, Mr. Speaker. This information has been relayed to us and will be discussed at Thursday's meeting.

HEARING AID LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Does the minister plan on introducing legislation governing and licensing the sale and distribution of hearing aids?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have been considering the matter. It is one of the matters that we discussed at Ottawa last week with the hon. Mr. Basford there. I think the hon. member is aware that That Department of Health had some concern with this matter, but I understand at the moment my colleague, the minister, has turned it over to us. I had his statement in the House a few days ago. We are considering it, but I cannot give an undertaking that we will be introducing legislation in this session. I have not got so far as to propose any legislation to my colleague; it is possible, but that is all I would say at the moment.

Mr. B. Newman: They had better hurry or we will introduce it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well that would be a welcome innovation.

Mr. Speaker: We have perhaps time for one more question.

MINING POLICY

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. Has the minister seen the news item in one of the Thunder Bay papers, stating that "Bernier Promises Mine If Minerals Mineable"? I quote:

> Thus, from the point of view of real effort to prove up mineral values, we can be reasonably confident that if a mineable mineral is found in this part of the province, a mine will be developed to produce it.

In view of the situation with regard to Canfer, Anaconda and several others, what does the minister intend to do about these mineable minerals?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the news release, but I would be glad to send the member a copy

of my remarks that I made at Thunder Bay. I am not completely familiar with the other question that he raised, but I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Before the orders of the day I would like to ask the members, through you, sir, to take a careful look at the colourful brochure that was placed on their desks today.

This year I have waited until one week before the gala opening, which is June 7, to again draw to your attention the internationally famous Stratford festival. This is a last-minute reminder so that the members, and I hope many of their constituents, will consider visiting Stratford this year.

As you will note by the brochure, there are two plays by Shakespeare, of course, and two plays by his friends and rivals, John Webster and Ben Jonson. Along with these productions there will be musical concerts, a film festival, two French plays at the Avon Theatre and, for the first time, this year there will be a third stage in the park.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this all adds up to another exciting season and no doubt will again prove to be one of Ontario's largest and best tourist attractions.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 47, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966.

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Homes.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Thunder Bay Foundation.

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Huntington University.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Reliable Casting Limited.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Brock University.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Society of Industrial Accountants of Ontario.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Zurich Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Town of Mississauga.

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Hillbrook Investments Limited.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Abbey Life Insurance Company of Canada.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting Kedar Mines Limited.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting Triangle Swine Enterprises Limited.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting Timothy Investments Limited.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Cadmus Associates Limited.

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the City of Sudbury.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the City of North Bay.

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Cornwall.

Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the City of Barrie.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the Village of Wasaga Beach.

Bill Pr39, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Clerk of the House: The 36th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(continued)

On vote 2601:

Mr. Chairman: The Department of University Affairs. Was the hon. minister finished with his comments?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): I was. I have a couple of answers from the Thursday evening, which perhaps I should give now.

The question was asked, what were the major research projects of the research branch? I should like to read the following reply.

The major project areas of research and policy analysis are:

A. Comprehensive compilation and analysis of data, both historical and forecast, respecting the provincially assisted universities, produced by the committee on university affairs in its annual major policy analysis meetings.

B. Research and policy analysis in the area of student aid.

C. Analysis of university enrolment and related considerations, such as aspect of entrants, academic progress and movement, and graduation of students within various elements of the Ontario university system.

D. The development and improvement of data sources and techniques to enhance the department's existing capability of performing policy analysis and research projects.

I have some other information here. I think I will send it over to the hon. member. It is three pages long and if there are questions emanating from this, I will attempt to answer them.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Is that on the research?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: Those three pages?

Hon. Mr. White: Was that your question?

Mr. Pitman: I asked for the major research projects.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me send this over to you then and you can share it with the—

Mr. Pitman: Right.

Hon. Mr. White: —member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid).

Now I have a list here entitled, "Brief and Preliminary Outline of Research and Analytical Projects Related to Higher Education in Ontario." It is a memorandum about 10 pages long. I think I will send this over.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Surely the minister would have two copies?

Hon. Mr. White: I will get the member for Scarborough East another copy then if he wishes to retain it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Throw in another one.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, just a point of procedure.

I think I asked the minister on Thursday or Friday whether he could provide the two opposition parties with a more detailed breakdown of his budget data. At that time, I believe the minister said that with specific exceptions he thought that he might be able to do so. I was wondering if he has done that?

Hon. Mr. White: I said I would not have any personal objection to it. After the session had adjourned that evening, I spoke to my officials who pointed out to me that the internal memoranda and statistical presentations did include items which had not in fact met with the approval of the Treasury Board of the government. It was thought that if a more exhaustive summary of financial developments were required this request should be put to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and we will certainly adhere to any instructions we receive from him. It was thought by my advisers, and I concur, that we should not, as a department, embark upon a somewhat different procedure from the other departments of government.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask one or two questions? I would like to ask the minister why it would not be a better thing for the committee on university affairs to have its own research? It seems to me that what he is asking the committee on university affairs to be is an advisory committee to the minister, to The Department of University Affairs, and yet The Department of University Affairs is in a position of providing all the research data for the committee on university affairs. Is that not the case?

I was just wondering why it would not be a better thing if the minister set up a research budget for the committee on university affairs and have them do their own thing, so that in a sense they would be providing some degree of policy which was completely apart from his department. There would be no suggestion or suspicion that he was cooking the books, since the research thrust and the direction of research was poised in such a way that the conclusions came up with a policy which the government wanted rather than what the committee on universiy affairs might have come upon by itself.

Hon. Mr. White: The third page of the memo which I sent to the member shows that the committee on university affairs does have $135,000 for this purpose. But dealing with his question in a broader context, that was one of the first questions I put to the chairman of the committee on university affairs, Dr. Douglas Wright: Why do we undertake this research for you? Why do we not give you the money and then you can buy the research from The Department of University Affairs, or from OISE, or from a management consultant firm or from a university or whoever?

He replied that existing arrangements are quite satisfactory so far as the committee and the department were concerned. A method of working together has been evolved over the years which has been acceptable to both of these groups.

Secondly, The Department of University Affairs has in its possession the statistical data and other detailed material to provide information on request to the committee on university affairs, and if the committee on university affairs were to start from scratch, so to speak, it would perhaps unknowingly, be duplicating much of the work now being done in The Department of University Affairs. At any rate, that is rather a brief summary of the response I got from that query, and frankly I was satisfied that the existing arrangements were all right.

Mr. Pitman: Just another question on the same point: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that some of this kind of work is also learned at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. For example, the comprehensive compilation and analysis of data respecting provincially assisted universities, particularly in the area of enrolment, entrance, academic progression and so on. Is not much of that already done at OISE? Are you sure, as minister, that you are not duplicating research that is being done in other contexts in another institution? Are you coming out with different answers in some cases?

Hon. Mr. White: Well we have the impression that they have not got the money to explore that particular area.

Mr. Pitman: They do not have the money?

Hon. Mr. White: Not now! We have changed to the BIU system of making funds available to OISE, and they get exactly the same BIU grants as they would get if they were a university. And we have reason to believe that these somewhat diminished funds will not leave any room for duplication of efforts taking place in our department, in our committee of university affairs, and so on.

Mr. Pitman: Are you satisfied that all their equipment and computers are not going to be left idle as a result of the fact that you are no longer giving them these grants and you are no longer carrying out this research?

Hon. Mr. White: I have no direct responsibility in this matter. I think certain of these questions would be better put to the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch). If they have more typewriters than they need or fewer typewriters—that does not happen to be my responsibility.

Mr. Pitman: That is why we should only have the one department.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2601 carried?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): No.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments on this vote. I want to start out with the proposition that the province should be very nearly self-sufficient in medical manpower. In other words, what I am saying is that in my view we, in this province, are not graduating enough doctors.

Take, for instance, last year: In the province of Ontario we graduated 372 doctors. There were 540 doctors enticed into the province from outside its boundaries. In other words, the total was 910 doctors who started medical practice in this province last year. Of that 910 we graduated 372, and if my mathematics figure out properly, that is 40 per cent.

In my view that constitutes very close to a provincial disgrace; because it was not because of lack of student applicants—for instance at Western there were more than 800 students who applied for the 85 first-year openings. The dean said that the applicants were of such high quality that an entire second first-year class could have been accepted if the resources had been available.

It seems to me with such high calibre young people wanting to get into our medical schools, and given the fact that the vast percentages in terms of last year—60 per cent to be precise—of the medical doctors who started to practise came from outside the boundaries of this province, The Department of University Affairs, in conjunction with

The Department of Health, should be embarking on a crash programme to graduate more doctors in this province. Because I will tell you what is happening: These young people are being forced into other areas of endeavour. We are forcing our best brains into other areas such as biochemistry.

What happens is, for instance, a young person who decided to take a PhD in biochemistry in all likelihood is unemployed because he cannot get a job. And he would not be alone in that! There are many PhDs across this province right at the moment who cannot get employment; this is what is happening.

It is interesting to note Mr. Chairman, that the United Nations actually made a comment about this situation. They said in a resolution which they passed last year: "The western nations, particularly the United States and Canada, have been enticing doctors away from developing nations." In the resolution they said that as far as they were concerned they recommended that the educational system be upgraded in these countries to provide additional doctors and remove the dependency upon foreign medical grads.

What is really happening in essence, Mr. Chairman, is that we are raiding these other countries. In some cases we are raiding underdeveloped countries who need these people even more than we do. I am not saying for a moment that we have to take steps to shut off all doctors coming in from outside our boundaries, of course not. Those who wish to come in should be allowed to do so—but they come in for one purpose, because the medical population ratio is very attractive.

In other words, they know they can make a good living here, and that is why they come here. If we had more graduates coming into the field and if the medical population ratio was not quite so attractive, there would not be so much enticing—there would not be such an attractive market here insofar as medical practice is concerned.

I want the minister's comment on this. I feel it is very important. I feel that we should be actually embarking upon some type of crash programme. As a matter of fact, the OMA suggested that we should be utilizing the concept of teaching in satellite hospitals as well as extending the use of the basic science facilities to accommodate more students.

I think they made that recommendation at one of their more recent meetings. At least it was reported in the press that they had, in any case. I really think that the minister should give this matter his very serious attention. We are really denying opportunity to our own young people by enlisting other doctors from outside the province. Frankly, I do not feel that this is right.

As a matter of fact since 1965, we have been dependent on immigrant doctors in this province. In other words, we have had more immigrant doctors come in to practise in the province than we have graduated. I think this is a need and it is an area that we should be moving into right away.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not disagree with the substance of the hon. member's remarks. The Committee on Post-Secondary Education will no doubt be offering commentary and recommendations in this area, because if we were to announce today that we were building a new medical school in this province there would not be a single doctor produced by that for 10 years.

As an alternative the committee is exploring a number of possibilities including the following:

To lengthen the school year; to shorten the number of years required perhaps by putting the final years into a clinical setting, whether that be a small hospital in Wingham or a group practice in Seaforth. This depends in part on the availability of group practices, which is rather a new thing in this province. In fact it was very greatly discouraged, you will recall, by the OMA, until recently.

So in a variety of ways, there are alternatives. Another possibility is to have a category of super-nurses who would take over some of the less exotic responsibilities of medical doctors. In a variety of ways we are attempting to find alternatives to creating enormously expensive medical schools which can only be provided after a very undesirable time lag.

I can comment at very great length on this if the hon. member wishes; perhaps that will suffice for the moment.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I just wonder; is not one of the major expenses in connection with the medical institutions the cost of setting up specialists' training? An awful lot of our money is directed toward the more advanced stages of medical training. It would be in fact, not nearly as expensive if we restricted ourselves to getting people through to the general practice level. There is a great emphasis within the medical profession itself to press for these more specialized areas of education in the medical profession.

Does the minister not think that this is an area the minister's department should analyse and give emphasis to: How we can get the doctors we really need, that is the general practitioners, and give more encouragement to people to stay at that point instead of having so many specialists who are not capable of dealing with many aspects of practice other than that in which they have decided to specialize?

Our real need is for more doctors in more remote areas where the specialists will not be of as great a value as the general practitioner.

Hon. Mr. White: That may be, but we happen to live in a democracy. If a person, having graduated with an MD—that is to say a general practitioner—wishes to take graduate work, whether that be here or in Boston or somewhere else, at this point in time nobody is going to say: "No, you cannot do so." That is point number one.

Point number two: Even in Russia, where they tell practitioners where they are going to practice and where they have bonuses up to double the salary for people in remote areas, there is still a very pressing shortage of doctors in the less desirable parts of the country.

Point number three: A very deliberate effort has been made on the part of leaders among the general practitioners, including Dr. Andrew Hunter of London, to set up what might be termed a specialty of family practice to strengthen the general practitioner area.

Point number four: Certainly in the most recent OHSIP increases, and I think I am correct in saying in the previous OHSIP increases, the bulk of the increased expenditures were in the area of general practioners rather than in the area of the specialties; and in fact some specialists' tariff items came down a little bit.

So in a number of different ways efforts are being made to meet the point mentioned by the hon. member; but it is an enormously complicated matter, of course. These individuals in a democratic society do not respond immediately to the requests of the president of the OMA or of the Minister of Health or whoever.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think the point that I want to get across here is that the departmental system of grants, which gives so much incentive to post-graduates, is one reason that we are getting this emphasis on specialist training.

The thing we have got to do is decrease the money we are supplying to the specialists and let those who want to go into that training and those who are in the profession who want to do that carry much more of the burden themselves; but let the public purse help them much more substantially up to the point of being a graduate medical doctor.

I think these other points that the hon. minister has brought out are good. I am glad to hear it is being done. Incentive to go into remote areas is fine, but in those remote areas one of the problems is that by themselves they cannot work in clinics. So the government has to do things to make these remote areas more accessible so that we do not have to have them as isolated. Being on his own at these points is a great strain of a man working 24 hours a day, 365 days a year which some doctors find they almost have to do.

I am pleased to hear that the specialty of family practice is being encouraged. But again the reason doctors are going to the specialty rather than getting out in to the field of general practice is that there is a grant to help them go on to this post-graduate work, which the university is anxious to help them get. I hope the minister will press for more grants in the lower levels.

Hon. Mr. White: Much of what we are saying now is the responsibility of the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence). I will be presumptuous enough to expand on the family practice approach, if I may, for a moment or two.

The Department of Health made quite a substantial grant available for this experiment in the London area, which involved, I think, a three-year internship, the last year of which was in situ in a small municipality within communicating distance of London, Ontario.

I am not willing to accept the proposition that our grant system induces larger numbers of post-graduate students in the medical profession than is necessary. I really do not think that has much to do with it, because an MD, that is an undergraduate medical student, is given a factor weighting of five units, whereas all graduates are given a factor weighting of six units. So that differential, I think, is not large enough to bring about the result which you deplore, and which concerned me too.

Mr. Deacon: You would never turn down a 16 per cent pay increment.

Hon. Mr. White: This is not given to the student. This is a sum of money made available to the university on behalf of the student. If I had to guess, my guess would be that the 16 per cent increment—in fact it is a 20 per cent increment, one over five—would be no more than the additional cost of providing that more advanced education.

Mr. Deacon: That is right, and the universities are after the money.

Hon. Mr. White: Be that as it may—

Mr. Deacon: What if you reverse that?

Hon. Mr. White: All right, just a minute; two things are happening to meet the purpose which you have described.

First of all, in my letter to the university presidents dated April 26, I said that all of these factors were under review and that we were prepared to alter them as proven by the fact that we have altered the factor for part-time students from one-sixth to one-fifth over two years.

Secondly, as I mentioned before—and I think this is a most important aspect of it—the differential between the earnings of specialists and the earnings of general practitioners has been narrowed over time by the medical profession through a series of tariff changes, I think in co-operation with The Department of Health; and it seems to me that that is going to a be a very important factor in the future.

In all likelihood the status given to specialists is of even greater importance than the monetary rewards available to them, and that is one of the reasons why I was able to support the request for this experimental programme which emanated in London and which was supported financially by The Department of Health. They are trying to give the general practitioner the same status as that now enjoyed by the specialist, and I think they are having a degree of success with that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce was on this topic to begin with. He is entitled to the floor.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make one additional comment with respect to this matter. The OMA has said that as far as it is concerned it does not like what it terms the big box type of medical school. Now I am not exactly sure what that means, but the essence of what it says—

Mr. Pitman: Like the one across the road.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, like across the road; I suspected that is what it would be.

But the essence of what it says is that this type of medical school produces specialists, not general practitioners, and if we are going to try and encourage the general practitioner we have got to change the entire structure of the medical school.

I would like to have the minister's comments on that. Are those observations valid; and if so how can we change it?

Hon. Mr. White: If you want some philosophy and observation from me on the medical profession I would be glad to give it, but it is a long story.

Mr. Gaunt: Well let us have it, we have got all afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. White: Take it as read?

All right, to answer your question very briefly: It was said some time last fall that Ontario needed another medical school. Within a matter of a week or two the committee of university affairs expressed the conclusion that we did not and should not have another medical school, that by utilizing our resources—which is to say the big boxes and little boxes too—we could generate far more medical graduates and paramedical technologists; and this is the direction which medical education in this province is going to take, I feel quite sure.

Here again the specifics will be available when COPSE publishes its draft final statement this fall.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to just make one or two observations on this, because I think this is one of the most important areas where the minister is going to have to do some very clear and very hard thinking.

I was heartened by the degree of grasp he seems to have on this area of medical costs. I think you would agree this is an area which involves all the professions, and it seems to me that in the name of democracy he is suggesting that the people of Ontario can carry the kinds of costs which professionalism has thrown upon its back over the past 10 years. I do not think that Ontario can do this in the name of democracy or anything else; besides, I do not think it is in the name of democracy.

Now I think one of the problems I see here is this feeling—and it has been expressed several times during this debate when the minister says, "Do you want me to appoint the professors? Do you want me to appoint what the textbooks are going to be?" I suppose now he can say: "Do you want me to tell the University of Toronto how many doctors they must produce?" Or the University of Western Ontario or Queen's.

And I say no, I do not think so. I think I have a feeling of desire to see as much freedom and autonomy within the university as possible but I think the minister does have a role in relation to these burgeoning costs of professional training, and one of them I think surely is to carry on a continuous dialogue with those who are involved in this.

I do not think this has been done. I sympathize with this whole business of the number of doctors and the fact that we have raided other countries. I am sure historians will make some pretty serious judgements on our society in Canada, that at a time when the developing countries desperately needed medical personnel we were raiding those very countries, very much in the same way that we raided them for teachers when our educational system did not have enough of those.

I really think it is time the Minister of University Affairs at least played this much of a role. He does not go to the University of Toronto and tell them how many doctors or specialists we are to have in the Province of Ontario, but the Minister of Health was down at committee room No. 1 a couple of weeks ago telling us about all the plans he has for Ontario in terms of the tremendous expansion that is going to take place as a result of the government's generosity, one might say, or new-found generosity, in the areas of medical insurance and the whole new spectrum of services that will be available—residential services, going right from home care right up to the expensive, highly trained type of hospital personnel we have at the other end.

Where are we going to get the people to fill all these institutions unless we have a tremendous variety of people in the medical pyramid, to put it that way? It seems to me that the time surely has come for the minister to say this much to the universities of Ontario: "We need so many people with this kind of skill. We need so many people of that kind of skill. Now you and the medical faculties have a responsibility to produce this. We are going to change our formula financing. We are not going to give you the opportunity to grow at the graduate level."

I think the minister would agree—he may want to differentiate whether the 16 per cent, the five to six BIU, is enough. I think he would find that most universities are delighted to get six BIU for a graduate because it means they can grow and it means they get just that much more in terms of capital investment and in terms of high-powered professors. The whole thing is a burgeoning, growing kind of thing, and in some universities I think it gets out of hand. I think that the people realize they would like to stay a certain size, but they just do not know how they can cut their cloth to meet their needs unless they start providing all these exotic and pretty expensive kinds of extensions.

I cannot help feeling the Minister of University Affairs, along with his colleague the Minister of Health, has to take a look at what the needs of the people of Ontario will be in this tremendous spectrum of health needs which we have coming over the horizon. I think he has to sit down in a continuous and continuing dialogue with the medical schools. I think he has to start talking turkey to the medical schools in terms of what I would call the provision of a spectrum of medical needs. In other words, I think we have to start talking turkey in terms of what nurses can do, what the minister alluded to just a few minutes ago. I have a very voluble dentist who usually fills my mouth full of material and then starts talking at me about the fact we do not need more dentists in Ontario; if we just organized the dentists we have so they carried on in some sort of efficient, effective manner we would not need to be producing all these people.

I think if one takes a look at the medical area, I think there are too many doctors taking temperatures, too many doctors carrying out activities which are pretty low-level skill areas. On top of that, they deprive other people who perhaps do not have the training, the ability, or who just do not have the resources to achieve the height of medical prominence from taking part on that area of service, which I am sure the minister realizes is going to be the main area.

We are no longer in the game of producing durable goods as the main purpose of our society; more and more people will be involved in the area of services. Education

services are the largest set of services we are going to have to change, but certainly medical services are important and we just have not done anything in the area of doctors' aides and doctors' assistants, defining what they should be and then turning to the medical schools.

I do not know how much I should be lecturing the minister or how much time we should spend with the Commission on Post-Secondary Education, because I hope to heaven these are the kinds of things that committee is going to come up with. It is going to demand a minister who is going to be prepared, as I say, not to direct the medical schools as to what textbooks are to be used or who is going to be a professor at the University of Western Ontario, but who must be prepared to sit down with all those institutions.

Maybe we need a symposium on health needs in Ontario which is called by the Minister of University Affairs and the Minister of Health. We have to bring public pressure on some of those who are in these fields who seem to think they have been given a gift from God to decide what we in Ontario need. I do not think the minister believes that, and I surely do not believe it.

As I say, we will have a chance to talk about this on another vote. The minister, I hope, is not going to stand up—I am sure he is not going to stand up—and start telling me I am trying to tell the universities what to do. I am not. But I am suggesting to him that the universities are here to serve the people of Ontario, and particularly in the area of professional development.

I am prepared to allow all kinds of things to happen in what I call human developmental terms. I do not think any course in English literature or any course in philosophy, any course in sociology, is going to hurt anybody. But I do resent it when I see particular narrow vocational activities going on which are wasted; when we do produce too many specialists in a certain area and then we have people in northern Ontario who cannot even get the service of a GP. That, I think, is a misallocation of human resources and I think even in a democracy.

To some extent, you know, there is a cost to democracy, and we have to pay those costs. In fact some of the people who talk about the cost of education really are talking about the cost of democracy. You can organize the system of education if you really want to organize it, but the thing is you cannot have a planned education system until you have some kind of a planned economy, some kind of a planned activity after. In a sense, education bears the cost of not organizing your society, but that is something else we can talk about another time.

I think in this particular area, the minister has a responsibility. I think he has a responsibility to get at this particular area very quickly because that is an area where the costs are massive and growing and are becoming quite unconscionable.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes. I am sorry the hon. member inferred from my remarks last week that I saw myself as not responsible for giving guidance in matters of this kind, namely the provision of health services. I said no such thing, I implied no such thing.

I asked a series of rhetorical questions to which the member's leader, in his nervous anxiety to get into the debate, was good enough to answer no. "Do you want the Minister of University Affairs to appoint professors? No"—and so on. I have always believed, as previous debates in this chamber will prove, that the government has a direct responsibility so far as university policies were concerned when the subject at hand was beyond the horizon of the university proper.

Applying this general principle to the matter under discussion here now, of course the government must give direction if we are producing twice as many dentists and half as many doctors as are required by the society. We have a responsibility there and we are prepared to meet it. We are waiting for the draft final report from COPSE, expected next September or October, before we proceed with new policy. I have touched upon certain of the changes that might be recommended, which we might find it possible to adopt as policy here in this province.

This is a tremendously interesting and important subject. I question if this is the best place to deal with the supply of health services. I have explained that we do not now visualize needing another medical school; that we think we can use the existing resources to turn out larger numbers and also to strengthen the paramedical level. I think that is quite properly my responsibility. It certainly will be when I get the CAATs. About 80 per cent of what the hon. member is talking about now is better dealt with by the Minister of Health.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I hope in what the minister is doing he will not be discouraged because it takes eight to 10 years to

produce a practising physician from the time he enters university.

We have thousands of youngsters in this province who want to get into the medical school. We are turning them down. We need 900 or more physicians in the province per year right now. We need—

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, what I said was if I announced today that a new medical school were being built, it would be 10 years before there was a doctor produced. In preference to building new medical schools, we have taken a somewhat different direction; namely let us use the facilities we now have with shorter courses perhaps, with longer school years, by double-shifting on occasion, and so on, to increase the numbers without incurring the enormous expense of another medical school and without inviting this six- or seven-year time lag.

Mr. Deacon: I am just suggesting; I am not telling the minister how he is going to do it. I suggest that he will find universities have the answer when he puts the right type of incentives in front of them and says: "You give me the answers. What have I got to do to produce the 1,000 graduates a year for the 900 we need and so that we will maybe have some of them available for the countries from whom we have been stealing for many years?" Then maybe we will get on with the job.

It is so important if we are going to have proper relationships and confidence between the medical profession of this province and the people of this province to eliminate this present closed-shop feeling that there is toward the medical profession.

If we have more physicians graduating than we actually require, then we will eliminate that. The supply and demand which is so important in any aspect of our society will be looked after. I think the minister is the one that has the key to the thing, because he is the one who funds these learning institutions.

Hon. Mr. White: Does the hon. member not know that the greedy monopoly guild known as the AMA has so structured medical school requirements—standards, tariffs and so on—that virtually every country in the western world has had imposed on it enormous and unnecessary costs? That is the root of the problem, but I cannot do anything about that and the U.S. Congress is not willing to.

Mr. Pitman: Right you are. Darn right. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point.

Hon. Mr. White: Exactly!

Mr. Pitman: How do you break out of it? Certainly an individual university cannot break out of it. Surely we, in the Province of Ontario, with all of our medical schools put together, with the muscle of this government, can do something to decide what we in Ontario need for our medical needs. This is the worst form of Americanization I can think of—

Mr. Gaunt: That is for sure.

Mr. Pitman: —far worse even than taking over the economy, when we cannot even provide the needs for our people because such a bunch of narrow-minded bigots down in Washington has decided what is going to be done with the medical profession of this continent—indeed of the whole western world.

I could not agree with the minister more, but I say to the minister that there is probably no group of people who have less respect in the United States, in many cases. Of all of the corporations in the United States, they have the largest, most highly paid group of people in Washington to hold back legislation. They held back the development of any kind of medical aid, or Medicare, even to the aged in the United States until they were fought down by just the sheer decency of the American people as represented in Congress, and it finally got through.

I am not prepared to accept that as the final answer in Ontario, because this comes down in so many other areas. The whole paper mess we have—BAs, MAs, PhDs—this is what it is all about. This is what we are tied into.

It is an international plot you are involved with.

It is an international conspiracy which makes it impossible for you to break out of those kinds of bounds, unless we in Ontario are going to decide what we need for the people and what we are prepared to do for our own graduates in our own system. We must simply and brazenly say: "To hell with the American Medical Association and any other professional group of people who are going to tell us how we are going to spend our money in post-secondary education and how we are going to serve the people of this province."

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think it is an international conspiracy. I do not think that the AMA deliberately goes about—

Mr. Pitman: Well they are wrong.

Hon. Mr. White: They established a particular style, they established particular standards, and much of the rest of the western world wants to live up to what they see as the best standards available, and the CMA and the OMA no doubt want to put themselves on all fours with these standards created, in effect, by the AMA. Now—

Mr. Pitman: Can we not break it down?

Hon. Mr. White: —it is going to be very difficult and maybe impossible to persuade the leaders of the OMA and the CMA to set off on a different course without regard to the American standards and conventions, and such like. My own expectation is that it is going to be impossible, so in the final analysis, if we were really to take hold of this I think you would find the government assuming the responsibility for licensing and everything that goes with it.

As a Conservative I am not prepared to make that break, because while the present system no doubt has imperfections as to its economies and the extravagancies and so on, I think even that is preferable to having a politician as the czar of the medical profession—

Mr. Pitman: Obviously! Are there not any Canadian nationalists in the OMA or the CMA?

Hon. Mr. White: —and those are the alternatives as I see it. As a matter of fact, I have wondered to myself if at some point in time the Canadian government—I think it could not be the Ontario government—might not be wise to say: "From now on, it is illegal in Canada to invite or accept accreditation by the AMA or the American Hospital Association or the American dental people or the American Veterinary Society" and so on; because this is one of the ways in which these very high costs and restrictive supplies are imposed on this society.

Mr. Pitman: It is the worst form of colonialism!

Hon. Mr. White: But there again, I do not think that we in Ontario, have the responsibility. It seems to me this is a national problem, that this is something that might be contemplated by the federal government.

Mr. Pitman: Medical schools should have quite a bit of muscle together.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, as an extension of this particular phase of debate, it does strike me impressionistically there are fairly rigid exclusions from the university in terms of the medical school. I think there is an incipient move in that direction in the legal profession, because for the first time in the history of the legal profession the graduates of the legal schools have appeared on the markets and been unable to find jobs, although I think they are being picked up now.

I say impressionistically because I have not before me precise figures of those who appear to be totally qualified and have been turned down, very arbitrarily and excluded from the work that they want to do in the medical profession.

May I say that this report on the issues in post-secondary education has some very absurd things to say about professionalism and the standards and the way in which we operate—in which I think all governments operate—about how much they want to keep their hands clean like Pontius Pilate and have some responsibility. We could discuss this, but certainly there is at present responsibility on the minister's part to see to the kind of prejudice, the ingrown abuse this report refers to and has some sharp things to say about. In the process of referring to it, it goes back to the McRuer report in which self-governing professions are taken to task very assiduously by the former Chief Justice and the Committee on the Healing Arts. In this regard there is a footnote on page 7 of the report—which is done on what, fourth-class paper.

It is quite all right: they should not be spending any more than necessary, but this is not the best paper available. I think there is another report printed but I, as a good socialist would, prefer to use the more inferior bond against the slick stuff.

They say here in both reports—"Also we are unhappy with the present structure of recommended changes." The committee also found—this is the Committee of the Healing Arts—that

> The history of the regulatory bodies in Ontario abounds in decision, policies and regulations of a truly or apparently restrictive practice nature. Our examinations of the practices of the profession discloses an inclination on the part of the statutory governing body to see itself as the defender of the interests of its members.

This is precisely what McRuer says they must not do and may not do, since their powers are pure delegation from this body. The only reason for their existence is to serve the general public. We confer upon them self-governing powers so that they may carry out that mandate.

The tendency in all institutional practices is to turn in upon themselves and I think it has happened very severely in the case of the medical profession. I think the minister, in his quiet way, ought to rap a few knuckles behind the scenes, whether or not there is a new medical school with a total of 800 or 900 students necessary and many more applying. But to make the market flexible and fluid, it would seem to me that he very well should consider another medical school in the province with the very great demand and weight being imposed.

We moved into McMaster and permitted it there. The renovations at the University of Toronto are magnificent and to good purpose, but we have got this ingrained feeling. The minister should quietly speak to these people and say that this must be for the purposes of the market economy of which he happens to be a trumpeter and for the purposes of giving the life-healing sciences to the people of the province, and in a sufficient scale, without imparting them under duress or under bonus situations to send them up to some out of the way place up in northern Ontario. If we had sufficient they would gravitate to these regions without having to do that just as the lawyers have done up to this time.

There are many amenities in a small town that would attract men to both medical training and law, apart from the sheer business of making the dough. The minister seems to me to say that he wants to escape this responsibility. I suggest to him that he cannot. He may not do it in an overt way. He may not do it by legislation. But surely with the kind of money he is spending on the education of the medical graduates and other professional schools in the province he is under an obligation to oversee it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2601. The member for York North.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the—

Hon. Mr. White: I think I had better offer just a comment on this. The hon. member would not conclude, would he, that it would be wise for me and my colleague, the Minister of Health to embark on new directions to the medical schools and universities in June, 1971, when the extensive and expensive COPSE report is going to be available in September, I think. That is what it amounts to.

I anticipate rather far-reaching recommendations affecting this particular area to be in the COPSE report. My guess is that this will change very considerably, if not radically, the nature of health services education and the provision of those services subsequently.

Certainly I think it would be the height of folly for us to jump into this tremendously complex and long-lived problem before we have the fruits of the labours of the very clever people who are working on these matters and who will be making recommendations in these areas.

I did say earlier the hon. member for Peterborough was incorrect in inferring that I am not prepared to give direction in a variety of forms to the universities in those matters which lay over their horizon, because I am willing to do so.

Incidentally, this is interesting to me because the debate we have been having is one that I embarked on after the 1959 election. My first speech in this chamber was on the provision of health services, and at that time I urged that the Frost administration implement a conservative Medicare plan so that some wild men, perhaps in Ottawa, would not come in with an unneeded, radical plan later.

It was probably the only time Mr. Frost disregarded my advice, but in that instance he did so and we have all lived to regret it. From time to time since then I have made it a point to offer advice to all of those connected with health services. So this is a minor specialty of mine.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, what I would ask the minister to abide in mind in his relationships with the governing bodies of the various professions is that: I do not care what the recommendations may be; I do not see how they can in any way affect the determination of policy with respect to exclusion. That is more subtle stuff. That is underneath the covers. It will be to no avail if the minister does not have that well in mind when he is talking with them, and in a quiet way bring the weight of this government to bear upon that area, asking them to keep their processes democratic and

to keep the doors opened up for qualified people and that is an obligation of theirs. I think they have to be constantly reminded.

Hon. Mr. White: That is not the gospel you were preaching last week.

Mr. Lawlor: What was I preaching last week?

Hon. Mr. White: Exclusivity!

Mr. Lawlor: No, I was not.

Mr. Pitman: If I might ask the minister a question. If he is going to take us during these estimates into this never-never land where we must wait in limbo until the committee on post-secondary education brings down its report, I wonder how he knew that that committee was going to come down with the recommendation that Ryerson should be a degree-granting university?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think that we knew they were going to make that recommendation.

Mr. Pitman: No, that was one area where you moved very quickly.

Hon. Mr. White: That is an area in which the government had a particular interest and where there had been vigorous representations made, and—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You are not interested in health services in the north.

Mr. T. Reid: Who is the chairman of the board?

Hon. Mr. White: —and where the lieutenant-Governor-in-Council elected to act without waiting for the COPSE report.

Mr. Pitman: In other words, you decided which you were going to act on and which you were not going to act on. You cannot do this.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not saying we cannot do it, because we can do it.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, right!

Hon. Mr. White: And in my meeting with COPSE early in March I said, "I cannot give you the assurance that the government will not act in certain areas which you yourselves are studying. Certainly we would not do so unless it were considered by the government to be of particular importance.

"I did ask them to provide me with a list of areas in which they would not like to see us act without prior consultation of some kind.

Mr. Pitman: And Ryerson was not on the list, eh?

Hon. Mr. White: I think this was after the announcement about Ryerson.

Mr. Pitman: I see. Because if you start to answer those questions they asked you, they would come out with the degree-granting institution at Ryerson.

Hon. Mr. White: And they very pleasantly undertook to consider that suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2601.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the minister's recently announced and very commendable policy of asking for more reports from universities in the matter of accountability that he is waiting to emphasize, would the minister consider having graduates upon graduation, perhaps five years after graduation, and 10 years after graduation, provide an evaluation of the courses they took, of the people that gave those courses, what was good about them and what changes they feel should be made?

One of the points that has been made to me by different people about their university training is that there are certain features of the training that stood out either as being completely useless or of considerable value. Their views on this changed as they proceeded through into their chosen field of work. I think this sort of running analysis of each year is what the department should do, not in evaluating graduates of the various universities, not asking universities to do this, but the department doing an independent evaluation of this, would be of great value in assessing, and publishing these results. The universities could just see what their own graduates think of the type of assistance and training they are giving them for their afterwork.

Hon. Mr. White: I will ask my deputy minister, who is the secretary to the committee on university affairs, to ask the committee to explore that suggestion. It sounds rather attractive on first glance and I would like to explore the ramifications.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: There are two small matters of two items on this particular vote on which I would like to get a clearer picture. One of them is the business of health sciences.

Now the health sciences project—whatever that is—has been transferred away from your department to The Department of Health I understand. Nevertheless you seem to go on with some kinds of projects as this within your own area, but mainly: "Office landscaping," you call it. Just what is landscaping an office? What is involved in that?

Mr. Pitman: Green carpeting?

Mr. Lawlor: It was set out in last year's report. Is it tied in with the Health department?

Secondly, your architectural services branch has been working closely with the Health department. Is that switched over too at the present time? Or only portions of it? Could you give us a bit of a picture of them?

Hon. Mr. White: Office landscaping is the term used for putting dividers of one kind and another in a large space to separate personnel and different functions in preference to building—

Mr. Lawlor: No fountains? No rocks?

Hon. Mr. White: —up and down walls from ceiling to floor. It is somewhat more pleasing in appearance, or so some believe. It is much more flexible because one can move the dividers around; they are on casters or stands so one does have that flexibility. I was told that one can make much better use of the space available so it is less expensive on day one. So that is what—

Mr. Lawlor: Like a Japanese house?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I suppose so.

Now the architectural branch of The Department of University Affairs has among its responsibilities that of vetting the requests for capital grants from the various universities, working with them in an attempt to get the cost of construction down. I must say I have been rather impressed by some of the illustrations given to me.

As you know we are paying grants at the present time on the same basis as was established several years ago, even though construction costs have gone up by 15 per cent or more. We are paying $55 per net usable square foot of space and we are assigning 96 square feet per student.

We had estimations come in on a new building on a university campus at something over $80 per foot. The director of our branch and his personnel conferred with the people at that university and it eventually came in at $57.50 a square foot.

Of course we paid our grants on the basis of $55 and that $2.50 increment had to be found by them from sources other than our capital grants. However, this is an instance where the cost of the edifice was reduced from more than $80 to $57.50.

The specialized expertise developed in the architectural branch, which deals with this type of problem and nothing else, I think, has been very helpful to the universities concerned and has had very, very economical consequences for the jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: On that question of architectural services, to what extent has that branch now turned to modular construction as being the major emphasis for educational institutions from now on? Did the minister ever find out about that student union building in Waterloo that had all the parking space for the faculty? It seemed to be rather a strange way for them to be spending grants for the university.

Hon. Mr. White: I must confess that I heard somebody—

Mr. Pitman: I asked the minister that about four weeks ago, I think. I forgot about it, too.

Hon. Mr. White: It slipped my attention. I shall have to get the member a report on that. Now then, what was the first question?

Mr. Pitman: Modular construction.

Hon. Mr. White: Modular construction: I am not aware that this is being undertaken by our staff. But just a minute—there is a project under way which is shown on a summary which I provided the member for Scarborough East. It is under research and analytical projects, item 4, study of systems building. It has been undertaken by the committee on university affairs and the council of universities. Fifty thousand dollars has been allocated for this year. The first steps will be the feasibility of user needs and user needs analysis.

Vote 2601 agreed to.

On vote 2602.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2602! Just before we start, can we come to some agreement? I notice there are three items here which seem to be quite separate ones. Would it be agreeable to do these separately.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I would think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 then. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, support to universities and colleges: I would like to talk about the grants for research and relate it to a particular area of research. Mr. Chairman, I have here two lists summarizing the research activities in the 1971-1972 year for The Department of University Affairs. In the previous vote under item 2 the minister lists on approximately one and one-half pages the grants and funds being used within his department for certain research funds. In this vote, 2602, the minister was kind enough to supply me with, I think, a 10-page summary entitled "Brief and Preliminary Outline of Research and Analytical Projects Related to Higher Education in Ontario," prepared by his department and dated May 31, 1971.

The list of research projects I think is most indicative, if you like, of the priorities of this government. It is too soon to say, Mr. Chairman, whether they represent the priorities of the new minister because he has inherited, I would suggest, the priorities of another minister, and in fact those of a previous deputy minister of university affairs.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order. The sequence is not significant.

Mr. T. Reid: No, I am talking about the sequence, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the total package, if you like, of research projects which are being financed by The Department of University Affairs of the Province of Ontario. I have not had time to analyse it as closely as I would like, but I would make perhaps this single point. I do not believe in talking too long on these issues. The point is that on the one hand we had a former Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) and we now have a Minister of University Affairs who both acknowledge the fact of the question of the de-Canadianization of the universities in the Province of Ontario is an important issue of public concern. In fact we find in the statement by The Department of University Affairs, on their 1969-1970 provincial grants to universities and colleges, the following statement, Mr. Chairman, and it is dated March 4, 1969—over two years ago, if I have got it right.

Just by way of example, in that report, on page 2, one finds the following quote:

> The need for very careful study of future developments, with particular attention being given to a determination of the percentage of non-Canadian students who should be enrolled in the graduate schools of Ontario universities, has been recognized.

There you have a clear statement that there is a problem, not only with the de-Canadianization of faculty but, if you like, with the question of what could be called the de-Canadianization of certain graduate departments across the Province of Ontario—graduate departments, of course, which receive the vast majority of their funds from the public purse of the province.

The previous Minister of University Affairs in his bid for the leadership of the party sent out a letter to the university presidents stating that he considered the issue of the de-Canadianization of faculty important and asking the university presidents to do something about it.

The present Minister of University Affairs is, I believe, very much concerned with this question. I think he is still trying to think out the ramifications of the problem, particularly in the course of action that a government should pursue, rather than the fact that a problem exists. I think he believes the problem does exist.

I find it very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that in the lists of research projects—totalling, if I understand the minister correctly, $650,000 in this vote and approximately $100,000 or $160,000 in the previous vote—there is not yet—

Hon. Mr. White: Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars are grants-in-aid of research, which are moneys granted in amounts of $5,000 and $10,000 and $15,000 to an individual faculty member or several faculty members to submit a project for support. All of these applications go to the advisory committee on grants-in-aid of research and they recommend that certain of these applications be accepted and that other applications be not accepted.

In the process I sent out something like 80 letters a month ago which granted $516,000 to the successful applicant for use in projects which they themselves had initiated, but which seemed meritorious to the advisory committee.

In no instance did the advisory committee make a recommendation which I did not accept.

Mr. T. Reid: Right! I may not have expressed my thoughts clearly. I think my following statement is still correct, that the Minister of University Affairs of the Province of Ontario has in his budget under this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, $650,000 which he makes available for grants for research. The means whereby he makes those grants, the criteria which he uses, whether it is advice from the committee or whether it is internal to his own department, does not concern me here.

The point is that he has got over half a million dollars in funds here which he is making available for research into, I quote, "or related to, higher education in Ontario." In addition to that, as we saw in the previous vote, there is a sum of money, I quote: "Total estimates of $160,000, including $100,000 specifically for research and analytical projects."

I simply add up at least $100,000 in that vote, plus $650,000 here, and I get $750,000 which this minister—his department—is putting into research projects concerning higher education in the Province of Ontario.

And I am making—I will not belabour this point, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is an obvious one—out of all this money there is not a penny that I can see from the two lists of detailed projects which he has supplied to me; there is not one penny going into the question of the de-Canadianization of the universities in this province.

There is no money going into the research concerning—as I have stated many times before—the citizenship analysis by departments, such as the department of sociology of York University. There is no money going, from what I can see, and I would be delighted if the minister could assure me otherwise, into the purchasing practices of university libraries in this province, which are buying around publishers located in Canada.

For example, York University spends $1 million a year on books, Mr. Chairman, and fewer than five per cent of that goes to book publishing firms located in Canada. It is a de-Canadianization process there. There is no study, from what I can see from the minister's research project concerning—and I quote from the March 4 statement of the department itself, which the minister's predecessor made; there is not a penny going into: "The need for a very careful study of future development," et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, of—"the de-Canadianization of the graduate schools in this province."

I will just conclude with this, Mr. Chairman, because I do not think there is anything more to say. I am trying to be polite about it, I am trying to be rational about it, but I just do not believe this minister or his predecessor when they say they are taking effective action, if only in the areas of gathering information and knowledge on which to base public policy concerning the continual de-Canadianization of the universities in this province.

I would invite the minister to respond.

Hon. Mr. White: On one of the documents sent to the hon. member entitled "Summary of Research Activities in the 1971-1972 Estimates of The Department of University Affairs," vote 2601, item 2 on the first page under A—Comprehensive Compilation and Analysis of Data, both Historical and Forecast, Affecting Provincially Assisted Universities, for Use by the Committee on University Affairs in its Annual Major Policy Analysis Meetings: this is a gathering of data and analysis concerning the nationality of the faculty and the students, among other things, so in fact we are doing as the member suggested. And on the third page of the same memorandum, vote 2601, item I under D—

Mr. T. Reid: What page?

Hon. Mr. White: Page three.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: One will see here an anticipated analytical study of the use of library resources by Ontario universities. So this special study is contemplated and touches on the other need, which was pointed out to me by the member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, we have a problem on this side. May I just state what it is? I sent over a note to the minister asking if I could have the summary of his $650,000 research items here and he was very kind enough to send it back to me—and I appreciate it—but the members of the New Democratic Party do not have a copy of this and they are quite upset and agitated—quite properly—and I refuse to let my copy go because there is a lot of good information.

Hon. Mr. White: What has the hon. member got and what has he not got, and what would he like?

Mr. Lawlor: Let us have a look at it.

Hon. Mr. White: Here is a memo—Grants in Aid of Research, dated May, 1971. I have one copy—who would like it?

Mr. T. Reid: I am fine.

Mr. Pitman: He has got it.

Hon. Mr. White: You have one—okay. Is anything else missing?

Mr. Pitman: How many more millions of dollars has the minister got and the minister cannot make a copy.

Hon. Mr. White: Has the member for Scarborough East got the summary of—

Mr. T. Reid: I am set. I am in a beautiful position.

Hon. Mr. White: Have you got one of those?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: Then everybody has everything.

Mr. T. Reid: I am not too sure of how much we have got now. I am not a lawyer but I can see what a lawyer gets in these.

Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned that included in two of his studies there was some concern with this issue. I am very pleased to hear that. I would like to have him clarify and state in more detail, and perhaps give us how much money is being spent on these particular research projects. Let me take the one he mentioned first, the one that is concerned with "Comprehensive Compilation and Analysis of Data, both Historical and Forecast, Affecting Provincially-Assisted Universities For Use by the CUA in Its Annual Major Policy Analysis Meetings."

Fine! Does the minister have a two-page elaboration of just what is meant by that gobbledy-gook? How much money is being spent to get that information? Is it $5,000? Is it $100,000? What methods are being used to get the information—I again quote him directly: "Concerning the nationality of students"? Is it a sample survey technique? Is a letter going to the—what is the present committee called now?

Hon. Mr. White: Council of Ontario Universities.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the university council being asked to supply this information in the same way they were asked to supply information concerning the nationality of their faculties? In other words I want to know exactly what data is being collected concerning the nationality of graduate students in this province.

Mr. Chairman, for example, my information is that of the 300 graduate students of the University of Toronto English department. more than half of those students are non-Canadian. I think I could quote some of Dr. Wright's reports, the committee on university affairs report where he uses as examples the fact that out of a graduate student body in a certain discipline of 50, fewer than half are Canadian. My understanding is that if you take the average across the Province of Ontario we will find that two-thirds of the graduate students are Canadian citizens.

The point is, are we going to find out by department, by university, the nationality of the Canadian graduate student? Is the minister going to find out, Mr. Chairman, whether there is a correlation between, for example, a high level of Americanization in a certain graduate department and undergraduate department and the Americanization of the graduate student body in that particular department? Is the minister even asking these types of questions in that particular research grant?

He has pointed out one piece of research. I would like to know whether that is $5,000 of $750,000 or whether it is $50,000 of $750,000 available for research.

I would like to know exactly what questions are being asked and who is in charge of the responsibility of collecting that information? Whether he has a cross-check on the reliability of that information, such as the DBS becoming involved?

Then I turn to this other thing about the libraries; but perhaps we can examine that after the minister has told me more about this particular research project.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes; we are working with DBS on this. We are collecting the data in co-operation with them from the universities, and here is some of the information we are asking for concerning enrolment. Let us skip down several of the items which relate very directly to his comments.

We are asking for a summary of undergraduate enrolment and the criteria are set forth. We are asking for the sources of intake of new undergraduate students. We are asking for the movement of undergraduate students, freshmen and others, as defined by certain other detailed criteria. We are asking for graduate enrolment this year and next

year, for masters and doctoral candidates, the sources of intake of new graduate students this year and last year, the graduate degrees to be awarded at various levels, with the projection of graduate enrolment year for year.

We are asking for certain financial information, including questions concerning the characteristics of the faculty. For example, university comments on general conditions and finding qualified faculty members, especially qualified Canadian faculty; detailed outline of sources of new faculty appointed during the period of September 15, 1970, to September 15, 1971, as called for on another itemized form—so I think that we are going to have the information that the hon. member thinks is appropriate.

Mr. T. Reid: Just to follow up briefly, Mr. Chairman, could the minister let me know what he means by identification of "sources of intake"? Are we talking about nationality of the students? Are we talking about the high school each comes from? I think it is very important to know what is meant by the term "sources of intake."

Secondly, is this information being asked by department or is it simply being asked by university or faculties or groupings of departments? Thirdly, is it a sample survey or a total census or a total analysis of the population available concerned; and fourth—this is very relevant to the problem we had last year—what steps would the minister take if the university refuses to supply information that he has asked for? Would he, for example, cut off grants? And that is not a hypothetical question!

Hon. Mr. White: To answer the questions in order. Here is one of the undergraduate forms. On the left hand side it shows, in the left hand column, humanities and related subjects, broken down by full-time masters-doctoral total, part-time masters-doctoral total. Social sciences and related is the next sub-heading—full-time masters-doctoral total, part-time masters-doctoral total; and so on by disciplines.

Across the top it has, it calls for—by the way this is, as the second question asked, a survey using the total student population and not a sample—so then it calls for the number of Canadians in each of these two years, the number of landed immigrants and there the term is broken down into those who are landed immigrants as of the date of application and those who are landed immigrants after the date of application. And then it has a series of columnar heads for foreign students which are headed United States, United Kingdom and other, and the final columnar heading on the extreme right-hand side is for total.

I have answer the second question. This is a survey of the total population. And the third question was what would happen if the university said we will not give you this information?

Mr. T. Reid: That happened last year. One university would not do it.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh before I get into that. Here is an undergraduate enrolment sheet which calls for sources of full-time freshman intake by programme area. Across the top are the headings Ontario secondary schools, CAATS, preliminary year, mature students, other than from CAATS, other Canadian citizens, other foreign citizens. Quite an exhausive survey I would say.

If a university refused to provide the information requested, I would not want to speculate about what we would have to do in instances like that.

Mr. T. Reid: Would you be annoyed?

Hon. Mr. White: I think that would depend on the nature of the questions. Because it must be said some questions are indiscreet. I would not want to generalize on that one.

Mr. T. Reid: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are coming down to an understanding of the basic questions as to whether or not we are getting this type of practical information, I would point out two very serious weaknesses.

The key weakness is that the minister has not even asked one of the most important questions, and this is the whole point of my opening remarks. Unless the minister asks for this type of information concerning the citizenship issued by department, then I am sorry—we in this party just cannot really take him too seriously.

I have tried to document why it is important to arrive at a quantitative basis on which to make an analysis of decision-making by department. Because that is where the issue lies. That is where decision-making, I would say, within the university, is most effective. That is where—a hiring committee at the departmental level made up of 10 people or five people, four to five of whom are non-Canadian citizens—that is where the issue becomes relevant and pertinent. That is where the public requires the information. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to hold the—

Hon. Mr. White: Well, you say so.

Mr. T. Reid: —universities to account to the public for what it is they are doing to our Canadian society, because all we know is that at such and such a university, 47 per cent of the teachers in the humanities or the social sciences are Canadians.

What we have to know is what is happening in each department under that general grouping called humanities and what is known about each department under that general grouping called the social sciences.

Because in some departments you will have no problem of de-Canadianization in the social sciences at a particular university, Mr. Chairman. In another department, in that same university, in the social sciences division you will have a de-Canadianized department. And the average statistic hides that fairly deep important fact.

Unless we can hold the universities to account at that departmental level, which is the key decision-making level in terms of hiring, in terms of curriculum, in terms of decisions about who become the senior people in that department, we will not be able to formulate a public policy of accountability. So I say to the minister that we are disappointed in that regard.

Hon. Mr. White: Before you move on, in fact there is a form here in this survey requiring the sources of full-time faculty by citizenship and discipline.

Across the top are the headings: "Discipline area—Canada, United States, United Kingdom, other Commonwealth, France, and other." Then, on the left-hand side it calls for figures by discipline area. Once again, not a sample, but figures for the population, using the word statistically.

It calls for the numbers according to country of residence in year previous to appointment, citizenship status at date of appointment, citizen status at birth, country of first degree and country of last degree. In every instance for the discipline areas—education, fine and applied arts, humanities, social sciences, agricultural and biological sciences, engineering, health professions, mathematics and physical sciences—I think we are acquiring the information we need to make an assessment of this.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not nearly as nationalistic as the hon. member opposite and I think the situation which he has described came about very largely several years ago, when the output of Canadian PhDs was grossly insufficient for the needs of this rapidly expanding university community.

I think I am correct in saying that the university community hired 5,000 PhDs in a number of disciplines when 2,000 PhDs were produced by our own system. So of course people had to be employed from elsewhere. This has now levelled off.

The reasons we diminished the extra special incentives available to graduate students is because of the enormous in-flow of graduate students resulting from a number of special provisions, like the Ontario graduate scholarship programme. The letter which I read on Thursday evening—if my hon. friend will refer to it in Hansard—shows that the output of such PhD graduates will be increased by a factor of four within, I think, a three-year period.

Mr. T. Reid: And half of this would be non-Canadian?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not want to give a quick answer to that.

Mr. T. Reid: I am sorry, not a half but something between a third and a half; would the minister agree?

Hon. Mr. White: At any rate, my expectation is the problem is very largely solved. In today's Toronto Daily Star, for instance, is an article reporting certain remarks of Dr. David Slade, the president of York, over the weekend in which he points out seven criteria which are in existence at York University—I do not know if they are new or old—in which he points out the tests by which a non-Canadian applicant might be, test is not the word, the way in which a non-Canadian applicant might be assessed. He points out something that had not actually occurred to me before, which is no doubt a part of the general consideration, namely, that having a vigorous university community depends in part on having employment opportunities for the graduates. So it shows the change in thinking, and in fact the change in circumstances in recent years abroad. I myself dread the idea of having quotas à la The McCarran Act in the States where 3,000 Portuguese and 35,000 Italians can come in. Is it the McCarran Act?

Mr. Peacock: We used to have it in Canada.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes; Mr. Diefenbaker changed that. I do not like that idea of

rationing space for human beings. It is anathema to me. I think the hon. member for Scarborough East is getting himself into rather dangerous ground here. I think he will conclude in the weeks to come that he is overestimating this problem, and consequently making recommendations—that is what they are—that are more extreme than the circumstances warrant.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to think this is the best debate we have had on this issue in this House. I appreciate that from the minister.

Mr. Peacock: We do not all share that opinion.

Mr. T. Reid: Well I share it because he is being honest. He said a couple of things, but before I get into some quotations, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister may have missed my point when he stood up and read off again what is being asked in universities. He did not mention departments. He talked about, and I quote: "discipline areas." The essential point I made is that that is insufficient information.

Hon. Mr. White: The member thinks so, but I do not.

Mr. T. Reid: No, the minister stood up to rebut that point and he did not rebut that point at all. I am saying that the average for the humanities in a particular university and the average for the social sciences within a university hides situations in which departments have been, if you like, de-Canadianized. We can agree to disagree on this.

I point to York University. In the social sciences I believe the ratio is something like 50 per cent Canadian, 50 per cent non-Canadian; but in a particular department, for example, the department of sociology and anthropology, of a total teaching staff of 36, six only are Canadian citizens. That is 14 per cent, I believe, and 48 per cent are American citizens. I state the averages will hide the key problem in some universities.

So I state to the minister again that the key reservation we have in terms of the questions he is asking universities are that he is not asking the most fundamental question concerning the question of the issue of decision-making within the university.

The minister, I believe, said this problem is very probably solved. I will say to the minister the problem is taking on a new context, and in a sense it is becoming more difficult to solve. I think Dr. Slater referred to this in his remarks.

Dr. Slater made a particular reference to the question of continuing appointments. I am very pleased that Dr. Slater referred to that problem, because that is the issue I raised in using the University of Windsor law school.

Now that so many of the new appointments have been non-Canadian, the key issue emerging is which people get tenure, which people get continuing appointments at the universities. So we are talking about a sophisticated analysis of decision-making and power within an institution. We are talking about who gets those senior positions.

I say the problem is not being solved. The problem has become vastly more complicated and I think the minister must be very much aware of this.

I would just like to state a couple of things. No, I have to clarify some—

Hon. Mr. White: Is the hon. member moving onto a new point?

Mr. T. Reid: No, it is the same point.

The minister states that he considers himself to be less nationalistic than myself. I just want to make sure this is on the record, Mr. Chairman. The concept of nationalism as developed by some countries in the 1930's I cannot tolerate. The minister is right in saying that one must try to be very clear in one's own mind what is one's concern on this issue.

I would state this; that in certain departments in certain universities in this province what I am concerned with is a lack of an effective Canadian presence in the decision-making of those departments as to what courses are taught; how those courses are taught; what the library acquisitions are and so forth.

And I say—and the minister has not done this to me, although some of his colleagues have—I am concerned with the lack of a Canadian presence in that type of decision-making. I become very much more concerned when for example, in the department of sociology at York University almost half of the full-time teachers are nationals from some other country.

Now that is a problem in addition to de-Canadianization. That is the problem of Americanization in this particular case. Now what I like to see in Canada, in our universities, are centres of learning, but centres

of learning that pay attention to the particular culture in which they are located. Centres that look at the world not through the eyes, for example, of Americans teaching in a few departments, but look at the world from a Canadian perspective, which is different.

When one examines, for example, the examples I put before this House on Tuesday last—the question of the race-relations course at York University in which the American Negro problem was used as the benchmark for all other problems of race relations—I would say, sir, that in conjunction with the fact that no other courses were available for the study of ethnic groups in Canada, there has been a perversion, an Americanization of our curriculum in a particular department in a particular university.

That is the point I am concerned with. I know the minister will give me the benefit of the doubt before he calls me an ultra-nationalist.

Mr. Chairman, the second point of reservation we have on this issue is that the minister could well have the same problem that his predecessor had. That was universities deciding that the public had no right to this information, and what was the Minister of University Affairs to do about it? I think and I hope—let us put it this way—that the minister will make it clear to the universities that this information is the right of the public and the universities are under an obligation to supply the information which they are being asked to supply. I guess I have finished my remarks on that theme, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not know. It seems to me the member's energies might be better expended on some other aspect, something more profound and longer living; but anyway that is a decision he will have to make.

Mr. T. Reid: I hope Canada will last.

Hon. Mr. White: It was said by the member for Scarborough East a few minutes ago that half of the university graduates—

Mr. T. Reid: Too high!

Hon. Mr. White: —and postgraduates whom Dr. Slater would like to see employed, would be foreign. This is the kind of misleading approximation that I think should be set straight, as I am now able to do.

Mr. T. Reid: I said between one-half and one-third.

Hon. Mr. White: Eighteen per cent of the full-time graduate students in provincially-assisted universities are foreign, and 82 per cent are Canadian and landed immigrants.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get a point of clarification. This is for the 14 provincially-assisted universities for the current year. The minister has said that 82 per cent are Canadian citizens and landed immigrants? Or just 82 per cent are Canadian citizens?

Hon. Mr. White: This is for 1970-1971 and the source is the 1970 briefs to the committee on university affairs.

Mr. T. Reid: And what were the—

Hon. Mr. White: Sixty-two per cent Canadians, 20 per cent landed immigrants—that is to say people who have come here to Canada intending to become citizens of Canada remaining in Canada—and 18 per cent foreign students.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the minister is quite correct in putting this very clearly on the record. At the present time then, less than two-thirds are Canadian citizens—about 63 per cent are Canadian citizens—another 20 per cent are landed immigrants and the rest are people whose status—

Hon. Mr. White, Sixty-two, 20 and 18.

Mr. T. Reid: I would point out to the minister that I too hope that the vast majority of people who have registered themselves as landed immigrants will become citizens of this country. I hope they do. But the minister might well be advised to look into that a bit further because one of the conditions—

Hon. Mr. White: I have not known very many that wanted to go back home, I will tell you that. Right?

Mr. T. Reid: I will not pursue this any further because there is a very interesting problem about how one gets hold of an Ontario post—what is it called—the graduate scholarship from the graduate fund; the Ontario graduate fellowships as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. White: It is a matter of some concern to us, because if the federal government gives landed immigrant status to the student then he does qualify for certain of these awards in the way it would not be the case if the federal government did not give him landed immigrant status. From my personal observation, I think that most of these

men and women do indeed want to stay in Canada, and I think my hon. friend would agree with me that this is all right. If there are some games being played in order to maximize student grants, student loans, I think it would be a very small proportion of the landed immigrant group.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly accept the minister's analysis of that situation.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wish the member for Scarborough East would get off that particular topic. You know we can induce in ourselves phobias or philias or various forms of monomania, and it may just degenerate into a mental condition closely resembling jingoism at a certain point.

I too wish to go on the record that I am not as nationalistic as all that. I think if we could possibly attract Paul Tillich over here to give a few lectures in theology I just might bow my head and say that the foreign influence was not altogether right for us, or for the major mathematicians in the world.

I wanted to speak for a few moments about research and the change in a somewhat searching—that is very apropos of research is it not—change in policy that has been brought about by this government in the past few years and particularly this year.

In the 1966-1967 year there were 167 awards amounting to $395,000. The next year there were 365. Then they jumped quite considerably to 435 and the sum of money went to $746,000 from about $550,000. Last year there were 446.

Then, talking last year, on your 1969-1970 situation these awards previous to that time were given to junior faculty members, if you noticed, $2,000 apiece. Then you determined on a policy whereby you would give up to $50,000 to groups, to inter-disciplinary groupings.

And now, looking at the list that we received, with some difficulty, there are 29 projects I can count on this list, all of which appear to be—or am I mistaken?—grants on the broad scale according to the new concept, having to do with the inter-disciplinary groupings.

Last year you donated 16 major grants. You call them major grants, I suppose, as against minor grants; and some of them this year, 11 of them I believe, are being repeated in the estimates for this period.

Now the question is, have you placed, have you swung over in a change of policy in this regard, looking for a broader base in disciplinary granting structures for various schemes?

Secondly, many of these grants are given in the area of another department, namely that of Energy and Resources Management. To what extent are you in accord with them?

I have not had an opportunity to look up their structure. I suspect they have research grants in that department too. To what extent is there overlapping of operations between those of this department and the other? And finally, do you feel this is the wisest policy to be achieved, working on this particular basis rather than with a greater emphasis upon individual grants?

Hon. Mr. White: Well you are quite right in saying that we have altered the nature of these grants in aid of research to some extent. We did grant, I think, in the paragraph you are looking at, 111 individual awards. I have not got that in front of me still, but it amounted to $200,000 and some odd dollars; and then a larger sum of money, something like $400,000, for 16 larger interdisciplinary projects.

It was concluded by people more expert than I am that these rather larger numbers of relatively small awards were not as productive as concentrating the resources available in some smaller number of integrated, interdisciplinary projects. Now this is an area in which I suppose both of us simply have to accept the advice of scientific experts, because these are scientific research undertakings, as opposed to literary or other non-scientific endeavours.

In the matter of overlap, we think there may have been some in previous years, but in the last year or two there has been a co-ordinating committee and we have access through the co-ordinating committee to The Department of Energy and Resources Management, for instance, and any overlap that did exist has been eliminated.

Now there was a third question. I am sorry, I did not—

Mr. Lawlor: I think that is basis. I asked the minister about wisdom.

Hon. Mr. White: Do you think that covers it?

Mr. Lawlor: I think so.

Mr. Chairman: Item number one. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I would like to continue this discussion of research for a moment.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what the minister can do then with these research grants—I mean, this is a very small amount of money that is spent on research in the university. This would be the major amount of money being expended to universities. So what you really are doing then is trying to get some kind of direction, some kind of encouragement to make research multi-university, at least to make it multi-subject; to direct universities toward areas which need a certain degree of exploring rather than the kind of esoteric research which we talked about the other night, so much of which seems to be really being used as a means to get somebody his degree.

This is something which has bothered me. I would suggest to the minister this might indeed be an area for research. He might start to research research. Because it seems there is a great deal of money being spent in universities, and university personnel themselves frankly would tell him that much of it is pointless and irrelevant, once again because it is a part of the whole international bit; that we must have these pieces of so-called original material in order to get a degree.

Hon. Mr. White: Well half of it is wasted. We do not know which half.

Mr. Pitman: I think probably it is getting clearer and clearer which half is being wasted. I think probably if we both sat together and looked at—you might say 150 or 200 titles of periodicals or of pieces of research that are being produced in order to get a degree in Ontario that we could come across a pretty good compendium of those that we might think, both of us, were pretty wasted in terms of effort.

I cannot help thinking that surely there is some other way. An immense amount of human resources are going in this direction, many young people are being paid to help in this research as assistants. To a large extent they are library or laboratory oriented and might well question that orientation in a world which is far more directed toward computerization than toward other forms of communication. It seems to me that much of it is not community-oriented, that it does not have too much of an effect on the community.

Too much of it is subject-oriented and not enough issue-oriented. It seems that we have a great many in-depth pieces of work, day after day, coming out of universities. Yet we do not seem to know what to do about inflation or unemployment or some of the more obvious problems which beset our society and for which full page advertisements in Saturday's paper, I do not think, will provide the answer either.

I am groping for the machinery. I would agree with the minister. I am not at all convinced that large research centres are the total answer. I think they have been tried in some other jurisdictions and not been thought particularly productive. They have been tried in education in the United States and many of them are being phased out because they have not been very productive.

I am wondering if there is not some way we can find of rationalizing research, so that before we put a person to work and give him a great deal of taxpayers' money for a year, there has to be some degree of examination of what he is doing within the university and within a group of universities. Instead of being examined as a candidate after he has finished the research, perhaps he should be examined as a candidate before he begins his research. That would leave the government out of it.

I think this should keep the minister slightly happier. I think there might be some indication also of what kind of role this would have in terms of the community. I think there has to be more community involvement in this area, not just in terms of academic involvement. There is a lot of public money going into this, and although a certain amount of pure research has to be done to provide the base for the kind of practical research which produces things that we live with, I think that we are not spending enough time in really determining what the graduate degree should be.

I think we are starting to realize now that, for example, an MA may very well be a prerequisite for teaching at the secondary level.

Should it really demand a high degree of personalized research? I am not sure, and I think that we should talk about research in terms of preparing people for the future.

I think we should recognize the fact that universities tend to look backwards. Once again, they fear for their graduates because their graduates must have gone through this same series of hoops which

they have gone through for the last 200 or 300 years. I just wonder about that whole direction.

At the same time, I wonder about what we are not doing in the area of research. For example, I have had brought to my attention—and I hope the minister has—in the University of Guelph, for example, they have a centre for children with learning disabilities. This is a research-oriented activity to try to find out how you can better teach children who have learning disabilities; the hundreds of thousands of them who are in our school system.

It is being widely used by county boards around there. They are sending their children to this setting and they have been looking after 100 to 200 children a year. Yet this kind of research is being phased out. They cannot afford to do it. They got going on a Carnegie grant; they have been approaching The Department of Education—

Hon. Mr. White: I think you will find that the Ontario government has been the largest contributor to that particular study.

Mr. Pitman: I am quite sure that they were contributing to the research part of it, but the problem is that the research part is based on the practical activities and this is what is not being supported. Dr. Scott makes it very clear that he is going to have to phase it out after two years. I suggest there should be more thought vis-à-vis the relationship of research to this kind of community activity; that it should not be so narrow and so profoundly academic that it has so little meaning that matters like this should be deprived of proper public support.

Hon. Mr. White: I think my hon. friend has now touched on one of the three or four most important considerations when it comes to the quality and the quantity of university and post-secondary institutions services in the community. We did deal with this one or two days last week, and that is the appropriate balance between research or scholarship and teaching. I think it is absolutely essential that there be some research and scholarship in the university or else one is not going to get vigorous, aggressive, able scholars in that university, because they will want to spend some part of their time, certainly, pursuing new truths and new scientific facts and theories.

At the same time, the university is uniquely qualified, unlike many other types of institutions, to provide an opportunity for learning, for the men and women called students, and I dare to say for the men and women called faculty members.

So it is a learning centre, an assignment which it, and only it—I am going to say this with the CAATS in mind also—can do.

Let me now note what seems to me one of the inefficiencies that have crept into the system since research became the open-sesame to public treasure, and since education more generally became the quickest way to a politician's heart. In that decade from about 1960 to about 1970 there were enormous resources made available for universities, colleges, and so on. I think that in this period of time one of the shifts was away from teaching, to some extent. I would hate to have to prove that but I have the feeling that quite a large proportion of total energy went into research and scholarship, some of which may have been less than essential, some of which may have been completely productive, some of which may have been undertaken at the whim of the researcher. Now I think the time has come for some kind of shift to the learning responsibility of the universities and I presume to say in the community colleges too, although the problem is not nearly as critical in that particular type of institution.

We are doing several things which are going to alter the imbalance, as we understand it. We are cutting down, relatively speaking, the total resources available. I am referring now to the greater control we are imposing on the BIU values. We are diminishing to some extent the extra-special inducements, financial inducements, at the graduate level, which links directly with research in a way that the under-graduate programmes do not.

We are calling upon the universities to make themselves completely accountable to the public. A week or two ago I think it was —two weeks ago maybe—I presented for the first time ever the 14 financial reports of the universities. A year from now we will have them in a uniform form.

And so in these several ways we are in fact inducing a shift towards the learning process, and away from what has been called, using the term very broadly, research.

Mr. Pitman: Well I wonder if I might comment on the reply of the minister. You said a moment ago in your comment that we do not know which half is going to be non-productive.

Hon. Mr. White: It was a paraphrase of an old joke.

Mr. Pitman: Well the point is, I am wondering if what you are doing now is not going to affect the unproductive half. We may very well be, because we come back to this old problem: As minister of University Affairs how much power do you have in dealing with 14 autonomous universities? I suggest that you may not have the power to tell what research should be done and what should not be done, or how the shift to learning away from research, although that to me is not the major problem. But I think you do have the responsibility to call the universities together, provide them with some criteria in terms of what the government and the people of Ontario need from their universities in terms of research and get them moving in that direction on a co-operative basis.

I do not think the universities are log-jamming you. I do not think you found that they have risen up in righteous indignation to call down the gods upon an anti-intellectual government because it wants to rationalize what resources are available for post-secondary education. I think that they would appreciate knowing what the government, the people of Ontario really want in this area. That is why I think that in a sense it is your responsibility to call these universities together to get a continuous dialogue going with these various universities.

I do not want to see a University of Ontario, a highly structured, top-to-bottom kind of system of university education, in which decisions are meted out by one body and carried out in the various campuses across Ontario. I do not want to see that. I think one of the proudest things we have in Ontario is this degree of freedom and autonomy.

I think the minister would agree that one of the things the universities ask for is some idea of what direction they are going in, in terms of budget, over two, three, four or five years, instead of this year-by-year kind of meeting and the decisions of what resources were available. What I am suggesting here in relation to this system of research is that, for example, with the whole business of the graduate, you turn the tap off, you lessen the flow.

But, once again, who is it that got the greatest degree of pressure? It was the social sciences, was it not? It was the social sciences, and I suppose the humanities. And whereas the National Research Council is going to fund all the physical sciences, or at least a great deal of the physical sciences, so they really did feel the pinch, but you have the social sciences and, aside from the humanities, in many cases, they are the ones we are going to need in terms of the member for Scarborough East's concern over Americanization; all of our concern over Americanization.

By 1975 the possibility is that we will not have enough in humanities and particular areas of sociology and psychology. Once again, we will have to go looking abroad to get people for these areas. In other words, by not determining what our priorities are and by cutting the tap off, we may very well be producing the wrong solution.

Simply saying that, as Minister of Education I cannot tell the university what to do, what kind of people to produce, what subjects to stress, is not the answer. What you have to do is bring them together, tell them what the needs are for 1980, that we are going to need so many sociologists, that a percentage of these probably will leave our universities, and ask what the various graduate schools in sociology will be able to do, how can they ration their resources and their directions.

But cutting off on the graduates in those areas may have been the worst possible decision in terms of what our needs will be four or five years from now, and we will be haranguing you, or somebody will be haranguing whoever is the minister of university affairs as to why there are not enough Canadians in the sociology department at York University. I think these are the kinds of priorities that have to be stressed and have to be sorted out.

The same sort of thing, I think, comes into the area of research. I think the Minister of University Affairs has got to be more active in bringing them together in a co-operative way. They have begun and they have come a long way in their committee of university presidents, which is now the Committee of Ontario Universities. They are coming a long way, but I think they need more encouragement, more direction, more assistance and once again grants going into those areas that will produce what you want them to produce, rather than simply cutting the tap off. In many cases, work that had been begun was cut off and people who had begun studies had to quit. There was a tremendous wastage of several months when that happened, and I think the whole

matter could have been more rationally, more effectively, harboured if the minister had played a more active role.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I am not prepared to concede that. I think it is very largely a matter of philosophy, and in effect we are now rehashing some of the debate we had last week.

Mr. Pitman: We may be rehashing but I think it is worth it.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not as quick to impose my will on the universities as a socialist Minister of University Affairs would be. That is one of the essential differences between the socialists and—

Mr. Pitman: It is not that at all.

Hon. Mr. White: —those of us who are Progressive Conservatives—

Mr. Pitman: It is not the point at all. I did not say that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: It reveals itself in every debate we have. That is the inclination of socialists.

Mr. Pitman: No it is not!

Hon. Mr. White: They know what the people should have and they are going to force the people to have it.

Mr. Pitman: The minister is disappointing me.

Mr. Stokes: The whole concept of education is socialistic. It has to be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Now then, I will deal with these several points.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I forgot to mention earlier that I think that taking larger numbers of students into the university governments will have an efficacious result in shifting the emphasis more towards learning. I think the more active role university students are playing in every form of the university governance is going to have a very important influence on the developments within the university community. I think that this influence is certainly towards the—

Mr. Pitman: I would like to see it more effectively focused.

Hon. Mr. White: —central purpose of the university, which I see as being learning. It was suggested that I meet the universities and in some way express—

Mr. Pitman: Continuing dialogue!

Hon. Mr. White: —society's needs as understood by the government here. I think I have done that. I have met with dozens of groups. Specifically, I met with the committee, then called the Committee of University Presidents, and their academic colleagues at Kingston on March 12—I think it was—at which time I did attempt to express the needs of society, as I understood them, as the government interprets them, and the way in which those needs should be fullfilled by the universities.

I think this is a continuing dialogue, I do not think it can be done in a mass meeting or anything of that kind. I can assure the hon. member that the dialogue has started. I have not wanted to be too dogmatic, because quite frankly being in this position—I think three months to date—I have a lot of unanswered questions in my own mind. As I gain some experience and as—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury): It will not be for very long.

Hon. Mr. White: —certain of these considerations become somewhat clearer to all interested observers, then no doubt we can make our case in certain areas somewhat more forcefully.

Some mention was made of producing a long-term solution. If my hon. friend will refer to the paper last Thursday night and read the letter written by one of my advisers on this subject, he will see that all of the data we have indicated this shift away from—

Mr. Pitman: I have read it and I was here.

Hon. Mr. White: —the social sciences and certain of these other disciplines is not going to be destructive, but in fact had these special incentives been continued, a critical situation might have arisen—the surplus of graduates in these fields would have been extremely troublesome for the people directly concerned and all of the others.

Mr. Pitman: I agree.

Hon. Mr. White: I think if the member rereads it, he will agree that this was sensible.

Now the fourth point in this particular presentation had to with forecasting needs. As I announced a couple of weeks ago, I

have asked the Committee on University Affairs to explore the possibility of establishing somewhat more accurate forecasts—not more accurate because there is no such forecast available to students now that I know of. If there is it is in a sort of casual state in isolated institutions.

We are going to explore in this year coming the possibility of forecasting requirements for graduates of a variety of disciplines in a way not undertaken previously. I think one should not underestimate the difficulty of doing that, because of changing tastes and changing technology. We are certainly going to explore that possibility.

Then a final matter had to do with research. I forget the particulars referred to.

Mr. Pitman: I forget.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to turn from research and get into the area of operating grants. But I will leap over the wall at the moment because of the provocative statements made by the minister a few moments ago.

Talk about moving in where you think you want to, where it would suit your own purposes, socialistic or not. You certainly twist the tail of the lion in a most questionable way. The whole business of the way you moved into graduate studies; you said you "saw fit." It is not a question of dictating, but in effect, you do control from the outside by where your grants go and whether you simply give the grants holus-bolus, without too great an investigation.

Simply exceeding that too is a policy. Omission in contemporary government is as much a policy as commission and in the areas where you commit yourself, you thump yourself on the chest, give yourself all kinds of airs, say, "we cut down by $7 million as far as graduate studies are concerned."

You did it in the purblind, backward way that you normally do things. There was no selectivity involved in the process. That is the only way in which you should have done it. You think that selecting certain areas that are already well financed through the Canada grants, and perhaps easing back on that, and maintaining a certain growth in the graduate faculties of the social sciences so we would supply future teachers and not have to go abroad, might that not have been a rather more balanced and more logical policy? Instead of the across-the-board, cleaver-like tactics that you used in that particular regard, would that not have some sense?

I will come back to graduate matters in a few moments, but for the moment, one thing bemuses me as one of the new boys in this particular department. Maybe the other new boy could tell me, for instance when you started your basic income unit way back in 1969, 1967, 1968—plucked the sum of $1,320 out of clean air and have been increasing that sum until this year it is estimated it will be $1,730 per student, which is an increase of $80 over last year; and next year it will be $1,765, an increase of three per cent. In order to give the universities some basis on which to make projections. When that original figure was arrived at, could the minister, in the course of his reply, indicate to me what ingredients went into that? Where does that sum come from, so to speak?

Hon. Mr. White: It was just based on experience, here and elsewhere. It was based on actual experience here in Ontario and in comparable jurisdictions.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not want to press the minister, he was not here at the time, but to tell me something is based on experience is to tell me very little. I would think it probably was. I do not know what the hell else it would be based on, really.

In your capital grants formula you are using certain components or ingredients that go into a sort of mathematical calculation of the grant, and the same thing in your operating grants structure now. The whole crucial thing about it is the base, and that is what I was trying to interrogate.

Also one could see what were the elements, if they took it holus-bolus that a certain amount of money was being spent in those days and there were a certain number and they divided one by the other, then I cannot particularly commend the committee upon its sophistication.

Hon. Mr. White: Well commend the committee or not as you wish. This is a new approach to financing the universities and a start had to be made somewhere. The "somewhere" simply was this: How much did it cost us last year to educate an art student, and if that was X number of dollars, how much did it cost us to educate a med student, and that was 5X, and so that the X became whatever the value was that the hon. member mentioned—

Mr. Lawlor: How did the committee know how much it cost to—

Hon. Mr. White: —and this was the way it was done. There were no doubt thousands of variables and no doubt an almost infinite chain of computer computations but this is the way it was done. It was based on actual experience. The same is true with the building formula.

In a letter to university presidents dated a month ago, which I have had occasion to mention before, we have served notice that we know these factors are imperfect. We are prepared at this time to attempt to make the ratios for the various factor categories somewhat more refined and somewhat more in keeping with the actuality in 1971. But that is the way it was done.

Mr. Lawlor: I doubt if that was the way it was done. The minister says "no doubt"; it sounds to me as though he is blowing bubbles.

Hon. Mr. White: No I am not!

Mr. Lawlor: They may be iridescent little bubbles up there in the air, but they burst you know.

Hon. Mr. White: In all fairness, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lawlor: No, Mr. Chairman, I have the floor at the moment and I would like to know—

Hon. Mr. White: This is the explanation offered to me by my officials.

Mr. Lawlor: —whether there was an infinite —what was it, the minister says chain of computer computations.

No doubt there is no such thing. I want to know; you can make—

Mr. Pitman: Surrounded by a great host of witnesses.

Mr. Lawlor: —these things up as you go along and play footsy with the opposition. But was it or was it not—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): And the minister often does!

Mr. Lawlor:—done by computers?

Hon. Mr. White: I will send you over the cost study on the capital side and you will see—

Mr. Lawlor: I want the operating side.

Hon. Mr. White: —a very detailed exposition of how it was done. The basic principles are as I have explained to this House.

Mr. Stokes: You will not give the member for Lakeshore a snow job. He knows you too well.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): He is not trying to.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: We are now talking, I gather, about the grants. I would like to, if I can find my notes, just refer to the way in which the—

Mr. Stokes: Try to keep up!

Mr. T. Reid: Yes. The way in which the grants for graduate—

Mr. Lawlor: As soon as we get away from Americanization you are lost.

Mr. T. Reid: My problem is I had dinner with you.

Mr. Peacock: Liberalization is worse!

Mr. Stokes: And he is a second stringer.

Mr. T. Reid: Very good!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: On item 1?

Mr. T. Reid: On item 1, Mr. Chairman. In a speech given by Douglas T. Wright to the national seminar on cost of post-secondary education for the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, about June 20, 1970, Dr. Wright, on page 19, faces up directly to the issue of the soaring costs of education. He notes that in Britain, and I quote directly:

> In Britain there are signs now of intense concern on the part of government about the cost of post-secondary education. The Department of Education and Science in that country some weeks ago put out for discussion a set of 13 points outlining possibilities for cutting costs.

I was wondering a couple of things, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister comment on those 13 points that have been put forward in Great Britain because I think they could be quite relevant to the needs of Ontario.

Perhaps he could list them for us and particularly would he specifically comment on one of the proposals made in those proposals,

which was that grant support be related to the area of graduate study.

Maybe I have misquoted Dr. Wright a bit, but my question is, has the minister considered differentiating even more between the grants to the university by discipline? I will give one example then sit down. I think I could document fairly well that in terms of the existing demand for people with graduate degrees in chemistry in Canada there is at present too great a supply in the pipeline of PhDs in chemistry. I would suspect that one of these solutions might be, and this would depend of course on rather sophisticated, well not sophisticated but a type of manpower forecasting of saying: "Well you know for the next five years in this area the universities will receive less money for graduate degree work in chemistry than they would for example in the area of sociology and anthropology, in which we may need a greater supply."

In short would the minister comment on the 13 points being discussed in Great Britain at the present time? And would he specifically comment on the concept of differentiating grants by discipline at the post graduate level?

Hon. Mr. White: I am not familiar with the 13 points, although I give the undertaking of the House now that I am quite prepared to go to Europe for whatever number of weeks it takes to go over that matter thoroughly and report back.

Mr. Stokes: You are just too much.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I think we can refine the factor system although when I made mention of this to a group of somewhat irate graduate students and faculty members interested in graduate work at the University of—I guess it was Carleton University in Ottawa—a couple of months ago, one of the deans stood up and said, "Well I think that this should not be decided upon externally by the government or some governmental agency, but rather within the internal administration."

It is self evident, I suppose, that the average PhD student in English literature is going to cost the institution far less than a PhD student in nuclear physics because of the enormously expensive equipment which one needs for the latter of the two subjects.

I think I had, in answer to a faculty member's question, been tentatively inclined to agree with him that this difference should be recognized, and at that point the dean of graduate studies stood up and said, "No I think that would be retrograde, that change. I think we should keep these categories fairly broad, and leave it to the determination of the university administration to sort it out by disciplines and so on."

Mr. Pitman: But how does he know, in a single university, what the needs of Ontario are going to be?

Hon. Mr. White: That is a quite a different subject. That is an entirely different subject. Now we are talking about the factors.

Mr. Pitman: It is not; it is not!

You encourage people to go, by a larger formula financing grant, you encourage them to go in those directions. And it is not entirely different.

Hon. Mr. White: Well it does certainly touch on it—

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Hon. Mr. White: —in a way that was not obvious to me initially. There are arguments on both sides of this question and I have attempted to put forward very briefly and somewhat amateurishly the objections posed by the dean of graduate studies at Carleton. No doubt it will enter into the search and review being made by the committee on university affairs, which I mentioned was communicated to the university affairs group about a month ago.

If the forecasting seems feasible as a consequence of the other study that I have mentioned and if the society's needs are determined by means of a forecasting agency of some kind, whether that be within my department or within the university community I do not know, and if those forecasts prove to be reliable enough to use as a basis for financial resource allocation then I suppose you might alter the PhD geophysics from six to 5.9 and the PhD nuclear physics from six to 6.1; but it seems to me that it is quite a long way away.

Mr. T. Reid: If I could continue on this, Mr. Chairman? If I understand the way the formula of financing works, in terms of operating—and I would like to know if this is still true—the minister determines how many students there are in a particular university by various categories—undergraduates, graduates and perhaps even types of graduate programmes. Then the minister calculates how much money the universities get. But inside

the university there is total freedom to allocate that money anywhere they see fit, and this has led me to state over the past three years that this has been a positive incentive effect, because of the differential between graduate work and undergraduate work, for the universities to expand individualistically into graduate degree programmes, if that was the way to get money.

And it has happened in a few cases, and I am sure the minister's advisors and Dr. Wright are also aware of this, that because there is no control exercised on how the university will spend the bundle of money it gets internally, that the money given in a sense to the university for graduate programmes, has been siphoned off into things like—to take a bizarre example—a football team.

In other words, if the minister did research —in fact I am sure Dr. Wright has already done this—that university X receives Y million dollars for its total graduate degree programmes, the research would show that in fact Y minus Z has been spent in graduate studies and some of that money perhaps reallocated to even non-academic functions at the university. Universities have had that freedom in the past.

And so the question of a public policy in this province, whereby the government differentiated the grants to the institutions, as opposed to grants to students in graduate work—differentiated, say, a higher basic income unit for medical studies, for perhaps areas like sociology and urban studies, that that would be a positive incentive for the universities to expand into certain areas, and to contract or maintain a stability in other areas, even through they still had a freedom to reallocate the funds internally and so forth. And I think this is the point, if I understood some of the proposals that have been made in the past of getting the universities to respond by the grants to them as institutions, rather than by altering—and I will get into this in student aid later—the funds available to students, as students, in the way of awards and scholarships.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest to the minister, because I do not know what the results of analysis would be in this, that if he wishes, through, in a sense, a free-enterprise mechanism, to get the universities to respond collectively in a certain way, then I would suggest to him the way to do this is via differentials by discipline in the grants to the institutions, rather than by cutting back, for example, grants to students in various programmes. I think there are all sorts of inequities involved which I will document later in what he did to the graduate student award programme in the province.

I am really not asking the minister to respond, I am simply saying this type of analysis must be looked into; I think one has to talk in the formal sense of the elasticities of response to this type of change in differential.

I am quite prepared to say that the institutions might be insensitive to certain differential changes in the grants to them based on disciplines. I think the problem is we do not know how the universities respond.

I prefer this incentive and disincentive system to what I call enforceable quotas on the university. I throw that open to the minister as something that I think he must look into very thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: What kind of a snow job are you trying to pull over there?

Mr. Stokes: It did not work.

Mr. Lawlor: I was asking a question about the fundament, about your operating grants and where you got the basic figure for which you have got the BIU set up, and you sent me across something having to do with the capital grants structure.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh Hansard will show I said it is the formulation for the capital grants.

Mr. Lawlor: However I want the minister to know that instead or rising, dripping venom and sweat, I would rise in the spirit of forgiveness and say that if you will let me retain the study, look it over, I would be very grateful to him but I would desist from castigating him further. There are more important things to do.

I did not think that he would be able to come up with the answer to the question right off the cuff so to speak, but I thought he might have enough—what is it that the students have—as the new minister that he would have the humility of the craft to bow his head and say, "Well I will find out for you," So I am going to, in a kind of a school-masterish fashion over against the younger pupil over there, say: "Would you please go and find out and come back and

tell me someday just how you arrived at those figures and what were the infinite number of ingredients that you had that went into the computer?" Then we will have some basis upon which to talk with some sagacity about these operating support grants as to their range of feasibility.

In the minister's statement which, in the blastoderm fashion, he issued a few weeks ago as to operating grants, he says he is going to have a new look at some of the basic factors. He instructed the committee to go out and look at them. I would like to discuss, if the minister is disposed to do so for a few moments, some of these factors. Five of them mentioned here were the ones including staff-student ratios at the universities; second, maximum teaching loads; third, emphasis on research activities, which we have discussed to some length here; fourth, the length of the academic year; and five, the length of the academic programme.

Stopping at number one, that is the staff-student ratios, the minister, I think, looking at the statistics over the past four or five years, will agree with me that on the whole —and quite overwhelmingly really—the ratio as between professor and student has been constantly falling. At different institutions they are at a different level but I would think you would agree one to 12, one to 13, is pretty average as I see it.

In the graduate schools of course, things change remarkably. I remember being in graduate school personally about two or three years ago—before the duties of this place took all intelligence out of me and clouded my mind, I hope not forever, the buzzing and the darkness have kind of settled down—but I was a student for PhD at the University of Toronto. I remember one class, and curiously enough it was with an outstanding Liberal in this area, a man by the name of Mark McGuigan; just the two of us, we sat and discussed jurisprudence every Wednesday afternoon for three hours, and I had no idea—I put my hand over my heart—I had no idea I was costing the taxpayers such great sums of money. Had I known that I should have desisted.

Mr. Peacock: Did you know that was part of a Liberalization of the University of Windsor?

Mr. Lawlor: But some of these courses in graduate school—and many of them have from one-to-three ratios, one-to-two ratios—you know I think they have to be scouted severely. If a course of study is not sufficiently broad-based to acquire eight to 10 students, I have real reservations about it being given. It may be supplemented by conversations between a graduate student in direct rapport with his professor by going into the office and discussing it, but actually conducting courses in which there are very few members, even at graduate schools, seems to me to be a very heavy weight, an onerous weight, upon the people of this province. I think that the whole thing should be deeply surveyed, first of all, to eliminate that if humanly possible.

I know that there are esoteric, vastly-removed, subjects of study—particularly German jurisprudence in which I was particularly interested at that time. I do not suppose there are fewer people know anything about it in the whole world than know about quantum physics.

That is the reason I chose it; it was so remote from human endeavour. There is a certain delight in verging out to the outer reaches of the human mind. Also it has not got any particular weight in the university system and they do not hire that many people —there are not that many openings at the university in that particular regimen.

Of course, if I may say on the side, just to make some justification for the thing, it is probably the single most important thing they could teach at law school if they only had the sense to teach it. Leaving a matter of that kind aside, it is pretty much what we have come to expect of professional schools. Nevertheless, the staff-student ratio was way out of line, and this ties in with, of course, the way in which you are going to use television. I hope we get into something of a debate upon that before we finish here, although I think this debate is going to have to be foreshortened if we are ever going to get on to anything else.

Has the minister any particular thoughts as to staff-student ratio? I am sticking my neck out I would say that on the undergraduate level I can see nothing overwhelmingly wrong with 1 to 20, basically, and in more courses. We are way down below that and every time you go to a percentage point or a ratio point, you are hiring new professors and the cost goes up of the whole educational spectrum. If you have got 1 to 13, and they are decreasing, because of this business of research basically, or because they are tied in with research and want to publish some particular paper or book or some very learned publication in order to attract for themselves the enormous prestige that goes with these

things. Besides that, this is the internal industry of the campuses. If you look at the publications issued by the universities throughout America—practically innumerable publications on everything under the sun. It seems to me that these are self-manufacturing gymnastics that take place, because if you produce a particular journal on phonetics or linguistics or something of that kind emanating from the university, and they do it on a monthly basis, are they not under some obligation to fill it up with tripe month after month?

Is not the point about learned publications that they should be staggered and not on a constant basis? When they have sufficient material of sufficient quality that it would make the publication worthwhile, then they should publish, but why do they have to meet deadlines? Why do they have to go through the whole engineering process of feeding the machine? It is a derogation from scholarship. It is a put on. It is a lowering of standards all the way round, simply in order to meet their own mechanisms that they have set up.

But to go back to the subject. There may be areas in undergraduate studies in which a very close rapport would be crucial as between people and professor. At the same time, the tendency these days—and on the whole I am in accord with it—is to place a greater self-determination upon the head of the learner and to give him guidance by way of conversation; by way of questioning to bring out that student, and by way of a little direction—as to where are the best resources; where is the research stuff; where the best texts are to be found—save him a lot of trouble by reading a lot of garbage that is printed, to get to the central sources of any particular problem; clear the ground for him so to speak. If this is worked conjointly with the television media, where large classes of 200 or 300 students—I remember after the war—I think all of us went through that, particularly at the law school—where the class that I was in was about 400 and some odd people. I do not think that we suffered all that much of it, law being a structured, highly categorical subject that does not need the peculiar charismatic powers of a professor. He simply gets the facts out on the table as to how a particular problem is approached, the case law on both sides of the fence—because there are always two sides, if not more—and simply sets it forth. I think we all came through.

The quality of the lawyer who graduated in those days—partially through self-motivation—was not a betrayal of the system at all as compared to the present. I suspect there is some kind of indulgence worked into this situation. It gives a greater freedom of movement, a greater suzerainty, a greater prestige to the professor, not to be burdened with his numerous students. With their salary increases over the past number of years, they have become people who live in at least a commensurate scale with other professionals in the community and enjoy a more congenial life on the whole than most of those other professionals, I suggest. Surely if in our lifetime we do the work that is closest to our hearts—that is, congenial work—ought we then to say that we should be paid in a mercenary way on a scale commensurate with our work? You people would not come to this Legislature if that were the case. We kind of like the joint—why, I cannot imagine—and are prepared to take scales that are offered because of what we think we can effect in this institution. How much more so than those who are not, in my opinion, nearly as heavily burdened with the sheer onerousness of hard work that is involved in the rather sanguine, salubric life of the university. I have a certain envy, I admit it, of the long peace and of the quiet serenity and of the business of developing slowly, over aeons, when we have to do everything here at the drop of a hat and have to do it nevertheless incisively.

With that in mind, I think you have to have people of this particular kind today in this society. One of my close friends—a professor of metaphysics at the University of Toronto, said to me not so long ago, "Well, Lawlor. It is not much of a civilization, or it is not much of a society, that it cannot afford one or two ginks like me." And I feel that same way myself around this place.

Mr. Peacock: This is not quite the society that can afford you.

Mr. Lawlor: It is not much of a society—I quite agree with Cliff; I think the subject he teaches is crucial. So has the minister any particular thoughts himself, without waiting upon the committee on university affairs to inform him, in his puerile and even putrid ignorance, as to what thoughts go into this matter? Has he any thoughts about these things as to how to save costs?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I read today about a fellow who took out a pair of Siamese twins and the next day a friend of his said to him, "Did you have a good time?" and the fellow said, "Yes and no." That would be my reply

to the hon. member when he asks me if I have any views on these complicated matters.

My friend is tremendously conservative compared to the member for Peterborough and therefore thinks in these rather stereotyped terms: one faculty member for approximately 13 students. If one takes out the medical schools, it becomes one faculty member for something like 17½ or 18 students. I am not so sure you can go a lot higher than that without bumping into certain difficulties unless one subscribes to quite a different point of view.

Now we are talking about equalitative change and not a fractional quantitative change, and that is to utilize the peers of a student within his discipline and within his own particular stage of advancement, and some kind of peer-master relationship with other people who are not necessarily full-time professors. I think this can and should be attempted without de-schooling the entire society à la Illich. I have had occasion two or three times to refer to a little story that the member for London North (Mr. Robarts) used to tell about his daughter, now 17. The outstanding educational experience in her career, or so the member for London North said, was when she took all her mother's pots and pans to grade 8 at Ryerson School in London and helped teach grade 7 youngsters how to bake a cake. I think there is a moral in this and—

Mr. Pitman: A good deal more than a moral.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes; I mean it is a simple little story and does not prove a lot but—

Mr. Pitman: The whole direction of education is involved in that story.

Hon. Mr. White: I think my friend from Lakeshore is unnecessarily constraining himself when he thinks in terms of whether that should be one faculty member for 12.9 students, or something other than that within a very narrow range. It is this larger question which I think is a fascinating one, because then you may have a ratio of one to 1,000.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. members can assure me that this discussion is relevant to item 1? I have great difficulty determining that. The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to talk about this area. We are talking about—

Mr. Chairman: Grants to universities.

Mr. Pitman: This really includes the whole kitchen sink, I do not know how you can narrow it down beyond that, because you are talking about the kind of university and the kind of university education.

Mr. Chairman: I will take the hon. member's word for it.

Mr. Pitman: Please do! I want to say a few words on this, really a few words that I had not intended to say, I must say that this has been a very interesting afternoon and I am being, you might say, compelled to carry on this rather philosophical discussion.

For so many years we have talked about people and grants and money and things and buildings, and for the first time since I have been in this Legislature we are talking about education and the nature and the quality and the style and the façade of education which exists in this province.

Just a moment ago the minister talked a little bit about the whole question of being conservative in relation to universities. I would like to talk a bit about this because I realize that we are on the verge of the report of the committee on post-secondary education.

But it seems to me there has to be preparation. There has to be a good deal of shaking up of the mind cells of everybody in that department, and indeed, in the whole Department of Education, because this is what happened when the Hall-Dennis report came down.

The Hall-Dennis report came down with a plunk because there was not sufficient preparation for the people of this province for what the new kind of education could be. Now I think it is the responsibility of this minister to start talking about what different alternatives there are in post-secondary education and I think we can get off this almost obsession that we have with university as being—as it was only 10 years ago or five years ago—virtually the only direction that was available to students in this province. We have got to take a look at university as being a very small part of a very wide spectrum. I think the whole emphasis is to widen the spectrum by a great many different kinds of services, so that the university provides maybe one small part of the activity of providing for human development and growth for the young people of this province.

I find some of the more interesting comments that are being made about this in the minister's own publication, the report to the committee on university affairs. Just let me quote a paragraph I am sure the minister has read:

> Somewhat tarnished are some of the myths and promises of the past. We are beginning to question higher and higher and more and more educational degrees as an open sesame to greater riches, happiness and a life of quality. Education—we may be called upon to probe in depth, understand, interpret and justify the university experience within a much broader spectrum of educational services to meet the needs of a far larger, more diverse proportion of our society.

The minister the other night talked about a heterogeneous society and a need to provide an educational system which will comprehend that kind of society.

What I am suggesting at the moment is that I do not think the minister has thought sufficiently about finding a particular role for universities in this wider spectrum. What we are continuing to do is to create larger and larger universities, with more and more kids in those universities, at a higher and higher price, when really providing a broader spectrum involving the entire community might be the more logical solution.

Hon. Mr. White: I was just wondering if I could make a comment before—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, sure. I would be grateful. Please do!

Hon. Mr. White: Let us not call them universities. Let us not call them that. Let us call them nothing. We have some number of places—

Mr. Pitman: Institutions!

Hon. Mr. White: —where learning and scholarship—

Mr. Pitman: Learning institutions!

Hon. Mr. White: —take place, and we want a very broad range of such institutions offering a very broad range of subjects of every description, from finger-painting to nuclear physics. Now we will talk, if I may, about post-secondary institutions only, because I think different arguments may be applicable to the primary and secondary schools. I was just wondering if the Hall-Dennis thing does not meet with less support than one might have anticipated, because of the certain basic needs which we have always are needed, and which are acquired in the earlier stages. I think we do not have the same constraints when one talks in terms of post-secondary education.

Now we want a very wide range of institutions—

Mr. Pitman: And non-institutions.

Hon. Mr. White: —and—all right now, that is why I wanted a word other than universities. The one which the hon. member suggested and which I have used as a substitute does not help much.

One reason that I want to see these places autonomous is to maximize the heterogeneity of them. And I think we are making a mistake, you and I, if we, in some attempt, try to circumscribe the activities of the universities and limit the number of entrants, thereby making these particular institutions more exclusive.

I do not know if my hon. friend follows that, which is a philosophical—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I follow it very well.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister would find this a convenient spot to break the remarks.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it would not be productive to force the universities into a narrow range of activity with a smaller number of people, that is what I think.

Mr. Chairman: It being six of the clock, I do now leave the Chair and this will resume at 8 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 31, 1971

Hostelling arrangements for transient youth this summer, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Peacock 2115

Legislation to legislate quarry operations, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Singer, Mr. Deans 2116

Report of federal-provincial Trent-Severn commission, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Pitman 2117

Legislation re commission on university government, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid 2117

Number of school board advisory committees, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Pitman 2119

Representation at conference convened by Herbert Hignett, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Singer 2119

Ministerial responsibility for Ontario housing, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Singer 2120

Ontario position at Victoria Conference re social services, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Singer 2120

Inquiry into post-release treatment of retarded persons, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Singer 2120

Sydenham River, stocked by hatchery, restricted re fishing, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Singer 2121

Dumping of waste from Fighting Island by Wyandotte Chemical, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Peacock, Mr. B. Newman 2121

Arrangements with Kenno Properties re Lands and Forests building in Wingham, questions to Mr. Brunelle and Mr. Auld, Mr. Gaunt 2122

Facilities for sheltering transient youth, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid 2123

Representations to Ottawa to amend Criminal Code re offtrack betting, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Singer 2123

Major manufacturers living up to agreements re antipollution installations, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Deans 2124

Tender for Richmond Hill courthouse, awarded to Rice Construction, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Deacon 2124

Upgrading road from Timmins to Texmont Mine, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Ferrier 2125

Legislation re licensing sale and distribution of hearing aids, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. B. Newman 2125

Mines produced to develop mineable minerals, question to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Stokes 2125

Third readings 2126

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, continued 2126

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2158

No. 52

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 31, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 31, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(*continued*)

On vote 2602:

Mr. Chairman: Item 1. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The north, this afternoon, acquired another champion. The minister made the statement, which is castigating one of my colleagues, that over in the Tory party they know what the people want and they govern themselves accordingly.

That is interesting, Mr. Minister, because that being the case, and you the new minister, we should have no problem then in getting a faculty of engineering at Laurentian University, which the Lapp report suggests we do not get. In fact, the recommendation from the Lapp report is that "the existing engineering programme at Laurentian University be terminated and no freshmen be admitted for 1971-1972."

All the data, Mr. Minister, in this report, "Ring of Iron"—if one reads the preamble by the Lapp committee, one comes to the conclusion, before he comes to that particular recommendation, that he is giving all the reasons why there should be a faculty of engineering at Laurentian. Let me just illustrate a few of the points:

> Therefore it is not surprising that the majority of engineers are employed in management and operations. A survey conducted by the APEO chapters reveal that approximately 900 new engineers will be required during the next 10 years, assuming there will be a major development of natural resources.

Nine hundred students, Mr. Minister. Queen's, in the mining field, graduates 10 a year right now.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Ten?

Mr. Martel: Ten a year! We need 22 a year based on this report.

McMaster graduates some 25 in the field of metallurgy. We need at least that a year.

There is a potential, Mr. Minister, for developing a faculty of engineering—mining and metallurgical—not just for northern Ontario, but for the entire north. It could be for northern Quebec, northern Manitoba, right through. It seems a logical place to be developing a faculty of engineering, mining and metallurgical engineering.

But no, the recommendations come forth from the Lapp committee that we continue to have students come out of Queen's at the rate of 10 a year, which is at least 12 short of what is necessary—that we have graduates coming out of McMaster for metallurgy in numbers which are not going to meet the need.

The first two pages of the report would lead one to believe that the ultimate conclusion will be to expand the present two-year course to a four-year course in mining and metallurgy. The recommendation is not to expand.

What have we got in northern Ontario? First of all, we have the industry where students are guaranteed—and I will read a few letters afterwards—where students are guaranteed on-the-job visits. The top people in the field of mining engineering will come into the universities and give assistance wherever possible. The students will be guaranteed summer employment. There are job opportunities galore. We are going to leave them at Queen's, where they have a little shale to go out and look at. I want to read the recommendation of the two major companies in the area and request that it be continued. And, of course, based on the minister's statement that the people know what they want, and that is what he goes along with—unlike the socialists, who would say: "Well the people need this, so we will give it to them." I presume that if the people themselves are requesting this four-year course, Mr. Minister, there is no way you could turn it down, based on what you said here this afternoon.

I want to read Inco's letter into the record and then that of Falconbridge Nickel. It is addressed to Dr. R. J. Cloutier, acting president:

> International Nickel is a natural resource industry highly dependent on engineering talents and we are very much concerned about the recommendation in the recent report "Ring of Iron" that engineering programmes at Laurentian University be terminated and no freshmen be admitted for the academic year 1971-1972.
>
> The future development of northern Ontario will require a continuing and increased demand for engineers. Laurentian University should be allowed to assist in meeting this demand and we are pleased to endorse the continuation of engineering education at Laurentian.
>
> Laurentian University is ideally located for students who have a northern outlook and whose roots are deep in this area. Young people born and raised in the north should not be required to leave the north to study engineering. Laurentian is in a unique position to be aware of the engineering problems in the development of the north and to respond to them in its teaching programmes.
>
> Located in the heart of one of the largest mining districts in the world, it has the opportunity to combine the teaching of engineering with the advantage of large-scale specialized equipment and senior engineers in industry to assist where required. We of the company would be willing to arrange frequent visits by students to our operations. This would give them experience unobtainable at most other Canadian universities which are removed from an operating mining and metallurgical complex.
>
> Furthermore, we would undertake to give summer employment to suitable students in areas that would give them experience in the science of engineering in which they wished to specialize. The number suggested was 25 and this was satisfactory to us. I want to emphasize the importance to northern Ontario of the continuation of the present engineering programme offered by Laurentian University. Please be assured of the company's desire to co-operate to as large an extent as possible in engineering education at Laurentian.

That is signed by J. McCreedy, vice-president, division general manager for Ontario, of the International Nickel Company.

The second letter is by W. L. Taylor, manager, technical services, of Falconbridge Nickel Company, and their statement is as follows:

> Concerning the discussion we had recently about the opportunities that are available to engineering students to gain practical experience in their chosen field in the mining industry of this district, I am quite happy to assure you that we can make at least 25 jobs available to Laurentian University engineering students each summer. I can make this promise with assurance as for the past two summers we have employed at least twice that number of students from Laurentian, and because of the nature of our operations at least 80 per cent of the summer jobs we have available, from the point of view of the experience they offer, are more beneficial to engineering and applied science students than to any others.
>
> We will also be very happy to co-operate with the university in providing four or five tours for the engineering students accompanied by their instructors to visit the various parts of our operations during the course of the academic year. These can be arranged to stress the all-important part that engineers of every major discipline play in designing and running of an operation such as ours.

Yet, Mr. Minister, we have the committee of university presidents recommending just the contrary—termination. Now I happened to be at a couple of these meetings when Dr. Lapp was in Sudbury.

We had representatives from Algoma Steel in the Soo, and a number of other companies at the present time were still bringing to northern Ontario at least 100 engineers a year from Europe. Now why in the world, except to save the bailiwick—you know, I think most of them spend half their time trying to save their own bailiwick—would we continue a faculty of engineering at Queen's and a faculty of metallurgy at McMaster when the need is in northern Ontario—when the majority of students who go into engineering would remain in northern Ontario; when the industry is located there and the future of mining is there; outside of saving what they presently have?

I realize they have got a few buildings here but those buildings could be used for other purposes, and the equipment purchased by Laurentian to develop an engineering complex to serve at least the need of the

industry in the areas and the rest of northern Ontario and the rest of northern Canada. This could become one of the leading areas for mining engineering in the world if we really worked at it and put some effort forward.

Before I go on, I would like the minister's reaction on why we would not locate in such a logical place as the Sudbury basin, where we have the leading nickel area of the world?

Hon. Mr. White: This is not my report; it is not sponsored by my department. It is not financed by the estimates under discussion here now. I am aware of these recommendations and without pretending to know in great detail about the supply and demand for mining engineers and metallurgists, I should like to assure the hon. member that I expect no change to be made in the forthcoming school year; that is to say, starting September, 1971. I am prepared to give that assurance in writing to Laurentian University if they so require.

I would expect the recommendations to be well studied by the committee of deans of engineering and have reason to believe that is going to be undertaken in August. What the long-term future for the department will be, I think I should not attempt to forecast right now in the absence of those recommendations.

Let me say very generally that I have a real sympathy for the north country and I point to a recent policy decision of this government with respect to the forestry course at the Lakehead. You will recall that they had one or two years of a forestry course there.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Two.

Hon. Mr. White: I guessed it was two years. I was called upon a month or two ago to recommend a course of action to the cabinet concerning the extension or non-extension of that course. There were some number of authorities in this field opposing such an extension. I think I do not have to go into this particular issue in great detail except to say there were a number of authoritative groups who held that the University of Toronto's department of forestry should be the one and only such department. I did not concur with that view.

It seemed to me that if the northern universities, in this case the Lakehead, were to have an opportunity to specialize, to carry out a particular function well, that this was a natural discipline for them in which to take the lead and in which to try to excel, in that they have lots of forests up there, in a way that is not apparent here at Queen's Park. So that was the decision of the government.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): There is a lot of old wood over there.

Hon. Mr. White: Given the same kind of consideration—that is to say, the rather narrow advantages and disadvantages for that department of engineering as evaluated by technologists, however expert, and the broader social needs of this province—I would have to come down on the side of Laurentian, as indeed I did in the case of the Lakehead. So I cite this not by way of a forecast of my future intentions but rather to show you that, all other things being equal, I would give the advantage to the northern university.

On this particular subject I did have a visit about a week ago from one of the members of the board of governors at Laurentian, and he told me something about the history of the recommendation before and after the Lapp report, which I think was published in January. He told me about the meeting that took place in February, about the fact that the head of the department at Laurentian was not included in that meeting because he was not in charge of a full four-year course, and about the fact that there had been a change since then and the head of the department there now has an associate membership in the committee of deans of engineering. So there is an input there at this point in time—I am not disturbing the member for Downsview, am I?

Mr. Chairman: Order please! There is quite a bit of conversation going on; it is difficult to hear the minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not interrupting the member, am I?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister might be, he might be.

Hon. Mr. White: So the fact that the man in charge of that operation at Laurentian is now an associate member, so-called, of the committee of deans of engineering, enables them to get an input from that institution which was lacking previously. I am told by one of the senior members of CODE that there is a sympathy developing for Laurentian's mining engineering course and to that

extent the atmosphere augurs well for the continuation of the course.

At any rate, to sum it up, I am prepared to give an assurance of whatever kind may be required that the existing programme will not be in any way interfered with for the year 1971-1972. And certainly I will give the most sympathetic consideration to those recommendations which emanate from CODE and from the council of universities starting after August this year, insofar as the long-term role of that particular school is concerned.

Mr. Martel: Well Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the university will be delighted to hear that, because it has been a concern. I think what they have in mind is that it will eventually become the leading place in Canada for a faculty of engineering specializing in the mining field. It is only logical.

I am sure they will be delighted with any assurance the minister can give them in writing that the course will not terminate in 1971 as recommended by Dr. Lapp's group and that he will give it at least a fair look.

Hon. Mr. White: When I heard this story about a week ago, in my precipitous fashion I was tempted to write a letter to the university at that time and I thought it might not be appropriate in that it might be seen by that university or others concerned as some kind of infringement on their autonomy.

So I said to this gentleman, if I receive a request from the university along these lines I will respond with the answer I have just given the hon. member. I rather think that at the board of governors meeting Friday, May 28, such a resolution may have been passed. And if in the next day or two I get such a query or request, I propose to answer along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East still has the floor.

Mr. Martel: Has the department given any consideration for a faculty of medicine in the north?

The minister's colleague the other day kind of dispelled any possibility of such a faculty becoming available to northern Ontario. At the present time in North Bay I am sure the minister's two colleagues, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), will see floating around at North Bay a resolution sponsored by the city of Sudbury and endorsed by many mayors and reeves already, recommending that, or requesting that, a faculty of medicine be located in northern Ontario.

I do not think I have to go into too great detail to indicate to the minister why this was necessary, when at the committee meeting last week it was established that some of the areas in Toronto for example have one doctor for 500 people, and in many areas in northern Ontario the rate goes an average—in the Sudbury area I believe it is one doctor for 1,800 people. And there are many municipalities without any doctors at all.

It would seem from the studies taken in England and so on that professional people tend to stay within a close proximity of the institute from which they graduate; this has a large bearing on where they will work. This applies particularly to northerners. The reports indicate that people who graduate from the faculty of medicine, or the faculty for high school teachers—which I want to talk about for a few minutes after—tend to stay either where they graduate from or some will float back to where they came from originally. However, this is not a large number.

I believe out of the 135 doctors in Sudbury at the present time, the general practitioners, about 35 or 36 are originally from Sudbury. The majority of the rest are from Europe, which indicates that there is not much of a tendency for doctors who graduate in southern Ontario who are from southern Ontario to locate in northern Ontario.

It appears logical that the only way we are going to get a sufficient number of doctors is not through the type of programmes that the government is presently offering of incentives and so on, but rather by training these young people right in northern Ontario so that they will ultimately marry people from northern Ontario and consequently stay in the north, because apparently one of the main reasons why they tend to stay in the south is that they marry people from southern Ontario and stay because of their wives or because it is close to maybe where they did their internships and so on.

It would appear to me anyway that the only way we could begin to supply the number of doctors that are necessary is by training, in northern Ontario people who will remain in northern Ontario. Otherwise we are going to be up the proverbial creek, Mr. Minister.

I am just wondering if the minister could give any indication as to whether his department is considering this or not?

Hon. Mr. White: Well if another medical school were founded in this province I would like very much to have a northern

point considered. The probability of another medical school being founded in the foreseeable future was dealt with at length in the debate this afternoon and rather than repeat all of that information I think the hon. member might consult Hansard.

Mr. Martel: I can read that. I came in a little late; the drive down is rather lengthy.

The third point is one that the people from your department know I have spoken on for three years. I tried to elicit the support of the Attorney General, the former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) last year in supporting my contention that we need a faculty at Laurentian for training high-school teachers.

I continue to get upset, Mr. Chairman, when students in northern Ontario can have the benefit of teachers who take a six-week or seven-week summer course at Lakehead. Now it does not apply in southern Ontario. The students who enter the high schools in southern Ontario are fully qualified; they have had a year's training. If it is not good enough for students in southern Ontario, Mr. Chairman, to have teachers with only six weeks of summer course, summer school, why should it be good enough for students in northern Ontario? That is one point.

You might come back with the argument: "Well we have got a fairly good supply of teachers this year." That might be fine, Mr. Minister, but do you know where the C teachers are going to end up? I came out of the teaching profession. You know who is going to get all of the C teachers, do you not, Mr. Minister? The A and the B teachers will stay in this area because there is enough demand and the C teachers will go north because they will not get the jobs. You know, if you have ever been to a day of hiring, you could term it "teachers' college auction day." You will find that the larger areas always got their fair share of A and B rated teachers. The smaller communities were thankful if they end up with the C teacher.

That is the background: We need teachers!

Again the reports out of England indicate that teachers tend to stay within 50 miles of the college they graduate from. I would imagine, Canada being somewhat larger, we could base the figures on a somewhat larger scale. In other words they tend to move out somewhat further. The tendency, however, is to teach in the schools where you did your practice teaching.

There are all kinds of pressures put on when you are a teacher to locate in a particular area; particularly the A and B teachers. They get tremendous invitations and all the job opportunities are available so that teachers tend to stay in the school system where they supply-taught. It still leaves northeastern Ontario with very little.

The other problem, Mr. Minister, is that according to your predecessor, the K-to-8 English will go to North Bay. I understand that is a long-time promise. L'école normale, which is K-to-8 bilingual, is just entering a new building—or has entered a new building—in Sudbury. And Lakehead eventually, I presume, will get a high school course—they have got K-to-8—as well.

The only problem, Mr. Minister, is that students from northeastern Ontario are not going to go to Lakehead. First of all, there are transportation problems of 450 to 500 miles. It is much closer for them to go to Ottawa, or closer for them to go to Toronto, or other OCEs than it is for them to go to Lakehead.

What is irritating are the reports. The McLeod report and the Hall-Dennis report. Both reports differ very little, but nonetheless they recommend K-to-13 on one campus. What we are doing in northern Ontario, Mr. Minister, we are building three, and none will be adequate. There will be duplication—duplication of buildings, cafeterias, gymnasia, you name it. None of them is still going to be adequate; because they are not going to follow the recommendations of both reports, that they locate on one campus. For example, Nipissing will not offer honours courses, and therefore it is going to be somewhat difficult for an honours student to get into teachers' college, unless he comes back to North Bay—or back to Sudbury.

I just think that if we are going to set up committees like the Hall-Dennis or the McLeod, and get these matters researched carefully, and then kick them out and go just completely contrary to what is logical, as we have seen happening in other jurisdictions on the patterns of teachers' training, we are being unrealistic. Unless we get a faculty in northern Ontario, whether it is engineering, whether it is medicine, whether it is teaching, we are always going to have a shortage; or we are going to be left with teachers of not the highest calibre, or professional people of not the highest calibre, unless we try to locate these facilities in northern Ontario.

I just ask the minister to reconsider what they are doing. You could have a complex at Laurentian that would satisfy all of northern Ontario, in that the K-to-8 bilingual is already in a new building.

North Bay is falling apart. That is where I went to teachers' college. It was obsolete 15 years ago. You could have K-to-13 English, and K-to-13 French in one complex. It would be a first. It would satisfy the bilingual needs and it would satisfy the English needs. It would show a little foresight in planning, whereas if you continue to fragment the programmes it is just going to cost people a lot of money to build three different facilities, none of which is going to be adequate. I would appreciate the minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. White: I am very interested in the form my hon. friend's logic takes. When the Lapp report comes down against him, he is against the technologists. When the Hall-Dennis report comes down in favour of him, he accepts the technologists' recommendations. So there is something a little faulty in that presentation. I do not know whether this facility should be on one campus or three. But if it were on one, the hon. member has one chance in three of getting it, in that North Bay and the Lakehead will have comparable claims to make. This being the case, would the hon. member urge that point of view? Yes?

Mr. Martel: Yes, but—

Hon. Mr. White: And De la Salle swinging against them.

Mr. Martel: No, no, I do not mind that! What I am saying is that if you put it in Lakehead though, there are people from northeastern Ontario who will not go there. There are no transportation facilities. It is closer to come to Toronto, Ottawa or a number of places in southern Ontario or eastern Ontario. You would find the students from Timmins, North Bay, Sudbury and the Soo would go to the other localities.

Hon. Mr. White: I know what the member is saying: (a) it should be on one campus; and (b) that campus can only be Laurentian—

Mr. Martel: Or it could be Nipissing if you are going to give all the courses.

Hon. Mr. White: —and (c) because the technologists recommend it, the government must accept it—in this case only and not when the technologists have a point of view different from the hon. member's.

I would like to comment, first of all, that the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) has announced they are likely to terminate the six-week course at Lakehead next year so that will assuage the member's feeling to some extent.

One of my advisors has given me this note which I would like to read. The teachers' colleges will all eventually become faculties of education which may be enlarged to handle both secondary and elementary training when circumstances warrant. At present Sudbury is restricted to the French-speaking education programmes since all must take a BA first now; surely that would provide opportunity to capture the students from the area.

I am not at all sure that the proximity to the learning centre has an important bearing on where that person ends up practising his vocation. I am sure there is a correlation between the two, but I think there is not a casual relationship. If one comes to the city of Toronto to take a course, the likelihood is that he will stay in the city of Toronto—not because he took the course here but because the city of Toronto provides enormous amenities, including the free entertainment available here in this chamber through much of the year.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): You do not call this entertainment now?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): He has a great sense of humour.

Hon. Mr. White: But that cannot be said to be a casual relationship. I will tell you what would hearten my heart: If the two members for Sudbury would stop whining about everything and they would come into this chamber just once and say, "We in Sudbury have the greatest place around. We are going places. We are going to accomplish this and that." I have heard for 12 years the whiners from Sudbury complaining about everything, with a tin cup in their hand every day of their life—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Aluminum!

Hon. Mr. White: I am referring to the member for Sudbury East and the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha)—

Mr. Martel: You never heard of the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers). He has never opened his mouth in four years.

Hon. Mr. White: —going out with a tin cup every day of their lives, soliciting special consideration. I do not think that is necessary. I do not think you have to beg at all.

Mr. Martel: I am not talking—

Hon. Mr. White: I wish you would get off that kick. I am going to tell you, harking back to your earlier question, Sudbury is going to get every consideration, Laurentian is going to get every consideration in this mining matter, because they are at the frontier, because they are in the middle of, I suppose, Ontario's greatest mining area; because there are great people up there, because there are large numbers of expert mining engineers and metallurgists, and because there are enormous mining enterprises! They are not going to get sympathetic consideration because my hon. friend and the member for Sudbury take this childish, cowardly, supplicant point of view; no!

Mr. Martel: What kind of nonsense are you talking?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): You must have had a bad supper.

Mr. Martel: What did you have for supper, may I ask?

Hon. Mr. White: We have all had a bellyful of that approach.

Mr. Martel: What did you have for supper?

Hon. Mr. White: We are sick of it.

Mr. Martel: I do not know what they fed you but whatever it was it was a lot of nonsense, because your predecessors have continually opposed any expansion for the north.

Hon. Mr. White: I would love to be a member from Sudbury. I would be down here selling all the time.

Mr. Martel: Would you?

Hon. Mr. White: And I would not be whining away like you and the member for Sudbury either.

Mr. Martel: Well Mr. Minister, you know Tories represented most of the north for 25 years, and they came down on bended knee and they begged and they coaxed; in fact after 28 years the municipalities of northern Ontario have to come to The Department of Municipal Affairs to get approval for their budgets. That is how the government has treated the north over on that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. White: More of the same!

Mr. Martel: The only thing is that we opposition members have started to come down here. We have started to get a few things for the north, because you know full well after the next election there will not be a Tory left in northern Ontario.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Oh go away; go jump in the lake!

Mr. Chairman: Meanwhile, back to the estimates!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Do you know we are ahead at the moment?

Mr. Martel: I suggest that you do not be too cocksure of yourself because you people will not be around to give these things.

Hon. Mr. White: You may be right.

Mr. Martel: You will not be around.

Hon. Mr. White: I hope the hon. member stops whining once he has a little success.

Mr. Martel: There has been a lot of kicking, but there has not been any whining. At least we say something; that is more than I can say—

Hon. Mr. White: I am going to help Laurentian in spite of the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: The minister's silent colleague from the north, the one whose riding happens to be adjacent to mine—the minister could not say he whines because he has never heard him speak in the last four years. I guess he does it in cabinet or in caucus. He still has his telephone hooked up waiting for the Premier to give him a call to tell him he has got a post, but it has not come yet. Too many people insisted.

I want to get back to—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He has waited quite a while for a post.

Mr. T. Reid: Either that or the telephone does not work.

Mr. Martel: —this bit about the technocrat. The reason I am suggesting that we need a faculty of education is based on studies in other countries, which indicate that students tend to locate where they are raised, where they go to teacher's college and where they do their practise teaching.

Hon. Mr. White: I heard that and I have dealt with it. If the hon. member cannot understand it, I am not going to say it again.

Mr. Martel: I know I am pretty dense, but nonetheless the minister's predecessors in that vote have not given any consideration to the north.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Stay out of this! The minister should look after his own department. He does not know anything about universities.

Hon. Mr. White: Do not answer that!

Mr. Martel: I might leave the minister with one final comment. Would he—again I am begging—could he have someone in his staff send me across the material on library science, where in Ontario people can go to obtain degrees of library science; in the whole field, whether it is a bachelor or a master's and so on? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. White: With very great pleasure, I will have that information sent, and I point out that there is such a course at the University of Western Ontario.

Mr. Martel: Where does the hon. minister come from?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another aspect of the grants for university operating costs. It is related to one of the research projects that I believe the minister is undertaking or having commissioned. It has to do with the question of bilingual studies in Ontario.

I would like to ask the minister a very simple question. Why has this government not made available special grants to Glendon College of York University to enable that college to pursue a proper bilingual programme for all the students there? Why has the Minister of University Affairs in this province not given substance to the statements by the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) that this Legislature and this government cares about the fostering of a bilingual programme, particularly in the heart of English-speaking Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: We have.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask the minister to elaborate on this? Is he suggesting that The Department of University Affairs has made available to Glendon College, or shall be making available to Glendon College under this budget, special grants to enable Glendon College to maintain a unique course for students in this province whereby the curriculum requires that as part of the academic programme they become bilingual? Could the minister elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, because of our aversion to special grants continued in perpetuity, and notwithstanding the fact that we are moving away from special grants to the general formula grant, the Treasurer announced in this chamber on April 26 that we are making a special grant of $100,000 to Glendon College; notwithstanding the fact that the federal government to this point in time has provided absolutely no money along the lines recommended by the bi-bi commission.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure I understand the minister correctly, and I apologize if my information is out of date. If what he has said is that this government, through his department, is making available to Glendon College an additional $100,000 so that that college may maintain its unique programme, then I would like to say to the minister that I am very pleased with this move and I am very pleased that this government has taken this initiative despite a peculiar federal government obstinancy to recognize the uniqueness of this programme in Ontario. I think the grant should be twice that for very good reasons.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid: Now I am quite prepared—and I have got some nattering back here from an NDPer—I am quite prepared to accept the fact that the $100,000 special grant to Glendon College—provided York University does not cut back other grants it would otherwise have made to Glendon College internally—is a significant step in maintaining this programme at Glendon College. I would point out to the minister that the estimates I last saw about six months ago were that what was needed was either $250,000 for two

years each or, I suppose, $100,000 on a continuing basis for five years. Could the minister comment on whether that is a once and for all grant of $100,000 or whether there is implied in that grant for planning purposes, particularly in the recruitment of students and faculty at Glendon, a commitment to a five-year recurring grant of $100,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. White: That depends on a number of things, including the outcome of the next election.

Mr. T. Reid: In that case it is up to $250.

Hon. Mr. White: We would anticipate the federal government eventually in the fullness of time, acting upon the bi-bi commission recommendations as they relate to post-secondary education, and when that time comes we will certainly ensure that these federal resources are made available to the University of Ottawa, Laurentian, Glendon and perhaps some other institutions which may qualify for them.

I think that since we have made this extraordinary grant—and astonishingly the hon. member was not aware of it, although his interest may have been dimmed after he got all of page seven in the Globe about six months ago; maybe that is when he turned his attention to de-Canadianization, I do not know. At any rate I am astonished the hon. member was not aware of this announcement of the Treasurer's on April 26. I would hope this would inspire him to use his enormous influence with the toast of Moscow and his colleagues in Ottawa, to ensure that they should act upon the bi-bi recommendations without further delay.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I partially accept the minister's comments about the inability of the federal government to see the uniqueness of the Glendon programme, but I do not think the minister answered my question. Is he committed to maintaining this $100,000 grant to Glendon College for only one year or two years or three years or four years? Has the minister made it known to York University and Glendon College of that university that that $100,000 grant is available for more than one year?

Mr. Chairman, the point is, very simply—the minister is fairly knowledgeable on this, which is good—in order for Glendon College to carry out a unique recruiting programme among the students of Ontario, both the Francophones and the Anglophones, and students from elsewhere in Canada including Quebec, the college must know whether this extraordinary or unusual or unique grant is to be continued for one year, two years or three years. Otherwise it will be impossible for them to make commitments to students they are now recruiting and indeed to new faculty members whom they are recruiting.

The minister has stated that it is much easier now for the universities of Ontario to plan their future operations because of the formula financing system which enables them to predict what their revenues will be for more than a one-year period. I am simply asking the minister whether he has made it known to York University, and Glendon College in particular, that this will be more than a one-year grant? Is that a fair question, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. White: I think it is a fair question and I would answer along these lines: the federal government has recognized its particular obligation in the field of biculturalism and bilingualism by making grants available at the primary- and secondary-school levels.

The bi-bi commission likewise recommended special assistance at the post-secondary level. My expectation is that the federal government will find it possible and desirable to make such grants. When they do so we will, of course, make these initial funds available to the several institutions concerned.

In the meantime I think it would be imprudent for us to arrogate to ourselves this particular responsibility with all of the attendant costs. And for that reason I think it would be unwise for this government to make a longer-term obligation insofar as Glendon College is concerned.

Mr. T. Reid: Just to summarize then, Mr. Chairman. Glendon College is then only able to plan in terms of a one-shot grant, however good, of $100,000. The minister is stating then—he will correct me if I am wrong—that The Department of University Affairs of the Province of Ontario, for whatever reasons, will not guarantee a repetition of an extra $100,000, whether it be from their funds or jointly with the federal funds. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. White: The word "guarantee" is inappropriate in any case, because while we do provide information to the universities about our intentions for the year following the current year to enable them to plan, this is not a guarantee. Externalities of every kind may make that impossible, either because we ourselves have not the responsibility or because resources are not available, so the word

"guaranteed" is not the word we are looking for.

I am not prepared to use the word "intention" with respect to Glendon College. We have made available $100,000 as a stop-gap measure until such time as the federal government does act upon the bi-bi recommendation. If my hon. friend wants to be constructive and helpful in this matter he might enter into another exchange of correspondence—

Mr. T. Reid: I have blown my bolt!

Hon. Mr. White: —with his allies and colleagues in Ottawa—

Mr. T. Reid: The hon. minister has more influence than I have.

Hon. Mr. White: —in which case all of the assurance he seeks might be forthcoming from them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First I want to say how pleased I am to hear that Glendon College has been given a $100,000 grant for this year. I hope it will be a continued one. I must say I read the document of April 26 with some care and I could not find it then and I still cannot find it now.

Possibly this might have been one of the tables, but I certainly missed it at the time. I have skimmed the speech as quickly as I can and I have looked particularly at the section which dealt with education expenditures at the post-secondary level and I certainly cannot find it.

As I say, this may be my fault but it is as much a surprise to me as it is to the member for Scarborough East that this grant has been forthcoming. I am delighted to hear it.

I would like to return to the discussion that we began before the supper hour on this particular vote, perhaps to fill in the minister after so many gallons of water have gone under the bridge in the last hour and a half. We were discussing the whole question of the need for some kind of preparation if there are going to be any real changes which come as a result of the report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

I suggested I would have liked to have seen a good deal more shaking up of the minister's thinking in regard to universities, some indication that we are just not going to have the old stand. And his reply to my suggestion that possibly we needed to find a role for the universities within a larger spectrum was that possibly universities should assume a larger role and that they should not be—I think he used the words—exclusive and elitist.

I want to answer that because it seems to me that this is so basic, if we are going to be able to change our post-secondary level. I think what it really stems from is the old idea that if you did not go to university you did not go anywhere else, and therefore universities were exclusive in that sense. They excluded all but a very small percentage. I can remember that when I became interested in public affairs something like nine per cent of the age group from 18 to 21 were involved in any kind of post-secondary education and virtually all of them were at universities. There might have been a few in nursing schools and teachers' colleges, but virtually this was the exclusive system.

Surely what we must recognize is that to suggest that universties have a specfic job does not mean that they are being exclusive if they give in to other areas of responsibilities. Surely a medical school is not being exclusive if it excludes all those who do not want to be doctors. Surely it is not exclusive if a college of applied arts and technology excludes certain people from its responsibilities.

All I am trying to say is that really I wish the minister would look a little differently at the views which the university presidents and others have been expressing to him in terms of what the real role of the university should be, because I think they are valid. The university can teach everything from finger painting to horseback riding; and to some extent that is a part of the American tradition. As the minister well knows the American tradition runs from the Harvard all the way down to what are really senior high schools.

I think this is wrong. I do not think it does the university that much good to try to do everything. Because it is much more expensive to teach finger painting at the university than it is to teach it in many other ways and by other means. I think if we are going to make the jump—for example, some of the questions that the post-secondary commission has already put forward are extremely interesting—the thing is if we are going to make any kind of positive assertions in relation to these kinds of questions, the university community and indeed the entire community

is going to have to be ready to accept different roles for different institutions in our society.

For example, "Why do we keep piling one year of schooling after another on our students? Why is it necessary to have 20 years of continuous schooling? Why not break it up, and if necessary space the years over a lifetime? What, indeed, are the emotional and social costs we are imposing upon our youth and ourselves when we in fact conscript them into our educational institutions for so many years?"

Hon. Mr. White: Are you reading from last year's Hansard?

Mr. Pitman: I am reading from the interim report of the Commission on Post-secondary Education of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: Well you are in good company then, because I observe you said this a year ago.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I did indeed. I was far too modest—

Hon. Mr. White: Very perceptive.

Mr. Pitman: I was far too modest, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that these were some ideas that I was probing a year ago.

Hon. Mr. White: Certainly your destiny in the world!

Mr. Pitman: But I just suggest to the minister that these are questions surely that demand a positive response.

And that is why I was just a little disappointed this afternoon, because I thought the minister backed down a bit. You have to have a lot of muscle to be able to say, not just to Ontario, not just to Canada, but to the academic world, that in Ontario we are going to deal with the needs of the people of this province and we are going to set up an educational system at the post-secondary level which will look after those needs.

I think the question is why is it necessary that learning must take place only when it is institutionalized? That is really what we must do, I think, if we are going to get anywhere in this whole game. I am not going to get into this whole business of the nature of the game we are in now. We are no longer in a position of being cocksure, of being able—

Mr. Peacock: We have won Brant.

Mr. Gaunt: Please contain yourself.

Mr. Pitman: I must announce, Mr. Chairman, that the New Democratic Party has just won the by-election in Brant. I am not sure how it relates to this item on the estimates, but nonetheless at least I think it may have some effect.

Now if I might come back to this whole question. We can no longer, like Leacock's hero, leap on a horse and ride off in all directions. We have to select priorities; we have to make use of every education dollar in the most effective way. That is really, I think, what the universities are looking for, what the colleges are looking for—and these other institutional responses.

Perhaps we can deal with these problems in non-institutional responses—educational television, the whole area of informal education—all of these represent, I think, means of doing a job in a way which will not take up the resources of the people of Ontario.

I think when one reads Arthur Smith's comments—I am not going to read them. I am sure the minister read the speech he made at the Ontario Institute not very long ago in which he explored the whole economic spinoff of this level of education. I say the only thing with Arthur Smith's discourse was that I do not think he quite understood that education is not schooling—and that because the United States has a certain level of educational activities, a number of people of education in universities, therefore Canada must make the same response.

This minister took office in the decade of the Seventies in relation to this problem and it seems to me he is going to have to take a very different response from those appropriate to the Sixties. Whereas building universities, adding to universities, adding functions to universities, enlargement and growth, may well have been the kind of response in the Sixties, it is not going to be the response in the Seventies. That is what I am looking for the minister to say here.

You see, really, the minister's comment a day or so ago—he said, "We never, in this government, made any decision about education, particularly about universities in relation to keeping kids off the labour market." I believe he is right. I am convinced that at no time in the cabinet of Ontario did ministers say: "Now look, we are going to have 5,000 people who are going to be standing out in front of the unemployment insurance office. We are going to expand Trent, or York or Toronto or Western or Windsor or Laurentian so that we can get those 5,000 out of the way."

I do not think that is true at all. I just think it is a part of our mind set; it is just a way that everything happened in the Sixties; we just simply expanded the educational system because it seemed to be the thing to do.

I say to the minister this may not be the thing to do now. Of course, one has to admit from a provincial point of view it is a very politically acceptable thing to do, I admit, because it means that at the provincial level we never have to make the unpopular response of denying something to the young people of our province—there is always a place for every young person in the post-secondary educational institution. That has been our catchword, our slogan here in Ontario.

As I say, in the Sixties, that may very well have been the best thing to do. You see what happens is that it just delays the discontent, the outrage, the humiliation of young people, if you provide them with vocational training at the post-secondary level and then you throw them out of a job—because no one says there is going to be a job for every young person when he comes out of that post-secondary institution. I say it is politically popular because of course, who bears all the unpopularity—the federal government. Because they are responsible for Manpower, whereas the provinces are responsible for education.

We walk around with haloes on our heads and we say: "Look what we have done for all the young people of Ontario and that nasty federal government, because of their inflation and employment policies, have destroyed everything which we have tried to do." I think that is part of the trap we fall into; believing that we do not have to disappoint the young people; we do not have to take actions which will be politically difficult to explain. Let the federal government take all the responsibility in providing jobs for the young people of this province.

I simply say to the minister that I think when this report comes out, I would hope that there will be a role for the universities. It may very well be a role which will suggest that there should not be as many as 25 per cent of the group from 18 to 21 in the universities. Perhaps it should be 20 per cent, maybe it should be 15; maybe it should be 50 per cent in the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Maybe it should be 25 per cent in some other kind of institution. Or better, maybe we should get rid of the whole idea of continuous education and be able to spread this whole service out to the entire population of our province, instead of being so obsessed with adolescence and early youth education. I say to the minister that this is not depriving people of education. What we are doing is depriving them of, you might say, the syndrome of schooling at this particular time.

One of the things that has amazed me this summer is how much we discovered young people could do—even with this exercise in chaos which you have in Ottawa, the Opportunities for Youth, which was announced in April to virtually start in May and all the trouble that that has caused. Even with all of that, the one thing that shines through is the fact that young people can do things.

Why is it they can do things in July and August, when they cannot do things in September, October, November, December and January? Why do we have all these needs of emotionally disturbed children and retarded children, of the aged?

Just look at the needs across this society and what young people can do,—and the minister's comment this afternoon on the former Premier, the member for London North (Mr. Robarts); and when his daughter told him about the most important educational experience in her life.

I think that it could probably be repeated for practically every person in this chamber and for the children of those who are in this chamber. Surely we can start building on those kinds of personal experiences when we come to this problem of dealing with post-secondary education.

The terrible thing is, the really irresponsible thing about it is, that we take up resources which should be available to other people. The minister has said himself that what we should be doing is making sure that people throughout their lives have those kinds of services. I am convinced that the reason we have so much outrage about education costs is the fact that the services are to so few and the costs are spread across all the generations.

If we could just get the idea that the university—well, this is the first year that The Department of University Affairs has turned its attention to giving support for part-time students. Is that not true? That is the first step, and it is a big step, and one hopes it is going to be an increasingly important aspect. I have said again and again today, where you put your money is where your priorities are seen to be, and that is in fact,

where they are. It is rather interesting, when the school budgets got cut, what went up, tripled—was the cost of night school. They whipped up the fees for night school three times. I would say, there is a complete misallocation of priority in terms of where we should be giving educational services.

I do not want to harangue the minister too long on this, but I just want to get this across: I am convinced that when young people are coerced by social pressure to go to university because they think it is the elite thing to do, then that is wrong and we are wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars on young people.

To come back again: When we keep a young person for four years in that university because that is the only way they can get a BA—instead of somehow trying to get rid of this paper system by bringing people in for a year or two years, letting them go out and letting them come back again later. We must shake up those professions in such a way that people can go step by step up these professional ladders, up these pyramids so that you do not have this terrible wastage of people starting off in the middle of high school and going to the end of seven or eight years of study at a fantastic public expense to find we do not need any PhDs in chemistry, or nuclear physics.

I just say that those are the kind of things I want to hear the minister say, because when this report comes down, if we are just going to tighten a screw here and loosen a bolt there, and the whole thing is going to keep right on going, God help us, because the Seventies just will not be the same as the Sixties; and we just cannot keep the same old patterns. I just hope that the minister is prepared for that, because it comes right down to this formula financing.

I agree with the minister when he says, "Is there any other way you would rather have it?" And I say to him, "No," in terms of going back to any other system, whether it was Mr. Frost or any other Prime Minister in this province, when the universities would come with their hats in their hands and say, "Come on now, give us some money, $100,000 so we can keep going."

That was a major step forward—and it was not only a major step forward for this jurisdiction but for other jurisdictions because other jurisdictions have followed the lead in this matter of formula financing. But here again, what was a rough, unsophisticated formula for the Sixties may very well defeat our purposes in the Seventies. If we are indeed going to help universities to sort out their priorities, if indeed we are going to be able to encourage them to concern themselves less with enrolment and more with quality in certain areas, then we are going to have to make this a much more sophisticated and much more direct way of helping these universities.

I would suggest, for example, that there should be a basic formula—obviously numbers do mean something in cost, but there are other things which possibly the minister could set up. For instance, there could be some kind of a committee, perhaps with the committee on university affairs, that would perhaps include representation from the Council of Ontario Universities, the faculty association, from the wider communities, which in a sense would be a super-grant body that would be able to sort out some of the priorities in terms of Canadian programmes.

I would think there might well be a means by which we could direct aid to universities that were indeed trying to provide Canadian programmes, Canadian interdisciplinarian studies, Canadian journals—that were making a very real effort in these directions.

That is the other side of the effort to try to control the number of Americans being brought on the faculties. This I think would be a positive approach.

Mr. T. Reid: The member for Lakeshore would call the hon. member a jingoist.

Mr. Pitman: On top of that I think the minister has a responsibility to see that it is possible for a university to control its own growth, to be able to do a specific job not in an elite, exclusive way—I hope the minister will get that—I am not expressing some kind of weird nineteenth-century British view of the university. I am trying to express what I think is the only sensible pattern for post-secondary education in the years ahead, and, as I see it, the universities do have a role in providing certain kinds of academic and intellectual—the minister has expressed it better himself this afternoon in describing the role of a university is in terms of research and teaching and learning.

But it cannot do everything and I would suggest that piling more and more students into a university may be to the disadvantage of the university and the students, and

more than that, to society. Because you continue the same concepts, that the university is the place to go, but if you cannot get there go to a college of applied arts and technology; if you cannot get there you go to some other form of educational opportunity down, down, down the line.

We have just got to break down this idea of an educational ladder, because as the minister has said if this is going to be a heterogenous society, it is going to be a society much more oriented toward, if not leisure, learning and leisure, something of that sort. And it is going to be far less in terms of money and in terms of status in relation to material goods. In other words, the training that we are going to be getting in a university is going to have far less to do with how much money we can make, but rather what kind of people we are going to be and how we are going to live and how we are going to be productive—productive in the fullest sense of services to other people in the role of human beings.

That really is my main point. I just hope that the minister will first somehow get across to the universities in this province that they are part of a continuous opportunity to learn. If they have a particular role to play, they should play it well. The main interest is, of course, to get people in and out of those universties.

The formula financing should provide the heterogenity which he talked about, the plurality which he looked upon as being one of the delights possible in the Seventies.

I would also point this out too: I think the great problem with formula financing is not that it creates bush-league Harvards, but that it creates patterns of the U of T; sort of carbon copies of the University of Toronto.

One of the things that I found quite often in the reports of the committee of university affairs—or The Department of University Affairs, I am not quite sure which—is this constant theme: Why are the universities not more different? Why is it we see so many of the same courses? Why is there not more exciting interdisciplinary activity? Why is there not all kinds of a jumble of experiences possible? Why is not the McLuhan age both inside and outside the university? Why is everything so stereotyped, sort of with one hand in the nineteenth century? Why is there not more imagination?

And I think the minister, in his analysis of the formula financing grants he has talked about in the various press releases that he has made, might very well look at formula financing as one of the reasons why there is not the experimentation which he would like to see and which his committee would like to see.

In other words, I think it is a matter of a greater sophistication of the formula financing grant; possibly along the lines suggested by the member for Scarborough East in terms of discipline, in terms of programmes and in terms of direction, and as I mentioned before, in terms of Canadian studies and the smaller universities.

And finally I would just hope that the minister is prepared to provide the kind of machinery to carry this out. I think the machinery has been sufficient to provide him with a formula for financing grants as long as they were rough and crude, but I think he is going to have to provide a means by which there is far greater input of faculties, universities and general society. He is really going to have to be able to make the universities operate in the context of the educational system in the 1970s.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Hon. Mr. White: May I comment on this?

Mr. Chairman: All right. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I think that we are in very full agreement in the underlying philosophy which my hon. friend has expressed. When I took issue with the remarks made by the hon. member before 6 o'clock, it was because I felt—now I understand quite mistakenly—that he had fallen into the trap of the argument advanced to me time and time again by representatives of the universities, that the only way in which they can appropriately control their cost is by letting in fewer members. Now I understand what the hon. member was saying.

I would like to deal with that for just a minute anyway. In 1960, or thereabouts, of every 100 students that went into grade 9, nine graduated from grade 13, six entered university and three completed university. At that time, the entire educational system was structured to fully benefit the three per cent.

Mr. Pitman: Right; structured for failure!

Hon. Mr. White: About five years ago, a dean from York University who had been at an American university of prestige, told

me—and I cannot be entirely certain of these figures, but this is the order of magnitude—that in England, six per cent of the students between the age of 18 to 23, inclusive —I hope I am right about this, but anyway I am not very far off—were in university. The figure for Canada was 9 per cent and in Ontario, I think it was 12 per cent. In the United States, I think it was 30 per cent, and in the State of California, it was 60 per cent.

Those particular numbers did not satisfy me at all five or six years ago when I heard them. I think it is incumbent on us to provide the resources so that people with the ability and the inclination and the energy to go to one of these several types of post-secondary educational institutions can do so.

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Hon. Mr. White: I hold no particular brief for the universities as such, or for one of the alternatives available, whether that be community college, nursing school, teachers' college or whatever. I am simply not going to accept the proposition that we can maximize the performance of society and optimize fulfilling opportunities available to our young people by making the universities more exclusive. That is not an appropriate answer.

Mr. Pitman: I agree.

Hon. Mr. White: My friend agrees with me, although his remarks before 6 o'clock did not indicate that to me. Now, having said that, we must recognize at the same time that these institutions do not form some kind of upward rise in scale from this low point, whatever type of institution you may choose to plug in there, to the exalted epitome of education called the university.

Mr. Pitman: Another kind, not down!

Hon. Mr. White: As a matter of fact, if one reads the extraordinary report of the Adult Education Association on community colleges—I will commend this to the other members of the House—it is almost impossible to finish that report without having one's hand shaking with excitement, because the community colleges in this province are blazing a completely new trail. Their interaction with the community in two ways, and their innovations of experimentation in every conceivable area of human activity were astonishing to me, even though I have some acquaintanceship with the community college in London.

I do not ask the universities to do this, but I think the universities are deceiving themselves if they do not recognize that what they have done in the past is not the perfect role for them in the future.

I used the term: "finger painting to nuclear physics," earlier. Perhaps that was a mistake, although my hon. friend reveals his biases by saying: "Another kind of institution somewhat further down the vertical scale."

Mr. Pitman: Another kind; across, not down!

Hon. Mr. White: Might better beats that, if you see what I mean. We are all infected to some extent. All right, the phrase, "finger painting to nuclear physics," perhaps was not appropriate and yet it emphasizes in an exaggerated fashion the point I am attempting to make to those people who see the universities as representing a very small number in proportion to the population and carrying on some kind of esoteric pursuit beeond the grasp and understanding and competence of ordinary men.

Now that particular approach I cannot accept. I have gotten into some quarrels on this idea that universities should not be elitist, perhaps because that word is used in a different sense by different people. I read an overtone into that word "elitist" which involves, if not inherited privilege for the individual concerned, inherited privilege for a group, whether they be medical doctors or university professors or whatever. That word has that very strong overtone to me.

Now if we interpret the word differently, if we interpret the word to mean Plato's "Man of Gold," then I have no particular objection to that; whether that be a university or a community college, or indeed this Legislature. But that is not, I think, what is ordinarily meant when one asks that the universities be elitist. This has that—

Mr. Pitman: Great!

Hon. Mr. White: —unhappy connotation of inherited position.

Mr. Pitman: Crazy, I think is the term.

Hon. Mr. White: And—

Mr. Pitman: In the past it has been that.

Hon. Mr. White: —that is not acceptable to me.

Now I would like to speak briefly about this idea of continuous education. I have

no doubt at all, and incidentally while I have not been the most brilliant legislator or economist, I have had a measure of prescience, as my first speech which I referred to earlier—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What is that word again?

Hon. Mr. White: —in this Legislature might indicate, which had to do with the forthcoming, the almost certain advent of Medicare. And on a number of occasions I have been right before, as my hon. friend may be. There is no doubt in my mind at all—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister may have predicted it even while he may have regretted it.

Hon. Mr. White: —that the hon. member for Peterborough has defined the shape of the future when he says that it will not be from the age five to 20 or 25 or something period—

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: —but rather educational opportunities, probably in a non-school setting; notwithstanding Ivan Illich certainly in a non-school setting. And these learning and living experiences will alternate all through a person's life. And in fact by chance that has happened to me, because I have been in a university on three different occasions with separations, consequential separations, in between. I must say that it has been a most enjoyable and fruitful way in which to approach education.

Mr. B. Newman: I did not think the minister had been expelled two times.

Hon. Mr. White: The switch we have made from the one-sixth to one-fifth formula BIU value is tremendously important.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. White: Not only because of the moneys involved but because it gives a very clear signal to those who are listening, including the two senior NDP members sitting here; but perhaps not to any member of the Liberal Party, I suspect it has passed them over entirely if you want my frank opinion. It gives a very clear signal of our determination to make education available for a man of 48 as readily as a man of 18; a man or a woman. And it will no doubt induce an equalizing of the quality available through the several avenues—full-time, daytime, part-time—

Mr. T. Reid: Special students!

Mr. Pitman: Part-time extension!

Hon. Mr. White: —extension, part-time—what is the other word that is used? Anyway, there are several categories that I had described to me not long ago so far as my own university is concerned.

Mr. Gaunt: What is so complicated about that?

Hon. Mr. White: Now these particular gradations which relate to quality are counter productive; they are discriminatory to some extent in a socio-economic fashion, to put a very harsh interpretation on that. And as you may recall, the switch from one-sixth to one-fifth over two years is dependent upon the part-time studies being made in every way equal to the full-time.

I think that does not mean they cannot have a department of extension; they can have that if they want a central home source for information, encouragement and such like. It does not preclude that, but that is the only characteristic in the existing arrangements, I think, that could be continued.

Now my friend referred to the basic formula approach discouraging innovation. I think this is not necessarily true on the operating side, because having gotten a certain number of BIU values times the existing unit bed for a total operating income, they are free from that point to use that income for anything they want, whether that be hiring a new professor, buying a new machine—

Mr. T. Reid: Having a football team!

Hon. Mr. White: —fertilizing their football field or whatever. So I think it cannot be said these enormous sums of money flowing to the universities by way of operating grants inhibit innovation. There may be inhibitions but this, I think, is not one of them.

I do believe on the other hand that the existing capital grant formula may inhibit innovation. Why is that? Because having had a certain increase in student population at a particular university and this being plugged into the formula, and X millions of dollars being available for capital construction, it seems to me we force a choice on the decision-makers in the university, to spend that sum of money for a new science building or a new arts building or a new toolshed or something. I think we do not give them the opportunity to say "We do not want a new

building of any kind here, but what we do want is—" well, whatever.

Mr. Lawlor: Send them out in the community.

Hon. Mr. White: I was hoping that in the early weeks of my new responsibility we might take a small step forward in our conservative fashion by renaming the capital grants something like special grants.

Mr. Gaunt: You always have to underline that. Conservative fashion—it is always conservative.

Hon. Mr. White: However, I was not prepared to do that without knowing quite a lot more about it. We do foresee the possibility of incorporating the capital grants with the operating grants, although this is not easily undertaken when one is based on the total population and the other is based on the incremental population of the university concerned.

Anyway I think we did set up some innovations as far as capital grants are concerned. I am looking forward to exploring alternatives to that in the hope that diseconomies, rigidities and the old-fashioned approach which this induces may be eliminated. I would be glad to go into that in greater detail; actually I am dying to go into it now, but we will talk about it one day. When the member for Lakeshore uncorks that $5,000 bottle of Chateau Lafite Rothschild, 1846, that he bought anonymously last week, we will go into these matters in very great detail.

Mention was made of the idea of controlling growth. I think I interpret the hon. member correctly when I conclude that he is talking about growth in an institution rather than the growth in the proportion of people between a certain age range that are in post-secondary education. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. Pitman: Both! I think there should be the opportunity for the institutions to possibly—let us say, taking the total spectrum, as the minister has been saying—the university may take really a much smaller proportion of the 18 to 21 age group. I mean what have we got now; 50 per cent of the population of 18 to 21 will be in university, or the colleges of technology or university—by 1974. That is 25 to 25.

There is a balance now and I would think there may very well be places for other kinds of institutions or for branches of colleges of technology. You might well find that as it goes up to 60, 70, 80, 90 per cent that those between 18 and 21 are involved in some kind of activity; or you might well bring it down to 40 per cent and have a much larger percentage of the age group 20 to 30; 30 to 40; 40 to 50 involved. You might have a full cross-section going that way.

All that I fear is the effect of the formula of financing as a recruitment activity. The universities go out to recruit people because that is the only way to get the money to carry on their activities.

And it is a recruitment. I can assure you as someone who has been involved in universities, in the administration of universities in the area of admissions, that the tendency has been, year by year, for universities, especially by August, to simply fling the doors open because we have got to get so many students in here to make the university financially solvent.

The minister also notes—and I am not making any kind of plea for the return of grade 13 examinations, let me assure you—but he also notes the much greater opportunity that there is in Ontario now for students to get what could be called a recommendation of grade 13 in place of the old system, which did have a very real control of the numbers that could get into a university.

And it is much easier, I think most university people would say, to secure a 60 per cent recommendation from a principal to go to a university in 1970, than it was to achieve 60 per cent on nine papers—as it was with the minister, who I am sure was involved in this game. Sixty per cent on nine papers on the grade 13 level was the basis of the old departmentals, but I think the game has changed very greatly.

What I am simply saying is that when universities go and recruit people, I think you are doing a disservice in many cases to those people, and you may very well be doing a disservice to the people of Ontario as a whole.

May I just suggest one book that I might ask the minister to read. I am not going to quote any long passages from it, but my colleague gave him some reading to do next week. Maybe the week after he might pick up a book called "Prisoners of Culture" by George Pettitt. He is an anthropologist who is looking at the American system of education and he comes up with that very view, the idea of compulsory education and continuous education was having devastating effects on the young people.

Moreover he comes up with another view which I think perhaps might surprise the minister; he feels that what we are doing in terms of vocational activity is also self-defeating, because we do not need, from an economic point of view, many of the people whom we are training on post-secondary levels in particular vocational ways. Now that is a book I think the minister should take a look at, because I think it has some very real messages in terms of what we should be doing in post-secondary education.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I say, in complete sincerity, that we observe in these discussions a certain bias which our own experience and culture has imposed upon us, and so when we hear a remark from one of us in this debate that the role of the universities should be thus and so, we are singling out that institution as if it were in fact in some way superior on a vertical graph, and that is a fact. And that is what leads the hon. member opposite—

Mr. Pitman: That is exactly the point I am making.

Hon. Mr. White: —to make the plea, as he did before 6 o'clock, that the universities not be compelled to take too many students; and that is what impels me, from a different point of view, to ask that they fully accept their responsibilities in a society. It might be a very good idea if we dropped this particular distinction between nursing schools, universities, polytechnics, community colleges and so on, and let them find their roles according to the intrinsic merit of the faculty and the student body and all the rest of it.

Mr. Pitman: Exactly!

Hon. Mr. White: At any rate it is interesting to observe that we both visualize a particular role for the universities; and that is the price we pay for having been raised during that particular era. I could not accept the proposition that we control the growth of post-secondary education. My hon. friend will not be able to support that point of view either if he harks back to his earlier remarks, which involves a person coming in and out of a relatively more formal learning situation. If one accepts the preposition that this growth is to be controlled, that means at a certain point in this alternating experience that one—

Mr. Pitman: Interrupted education!

Hon. Mr. White: —let us say at the age of what—what age are you, 43?

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: At the age of 43 you knocked on the door and said, "I have been working for 10 years now, I want to come and take a one-year course." "I am awfully sorry you cannot come in, we are controlling the growth. We are up to this number."

Mr. Pitman: Oh no, no!

Hon. Mr. White: Well that is the implication of that approach. So the solution cannot be controlled growth as such.

Mr. Pitman: There has to be more educational opportunity, but what we are going to do is give it to different people than we are now and provide a wider opportunity to more people. The problem is that people come back in their forties and fifties with families that you have to support.

Hon. Mr. White: I said no doubt too quickly. At some point in time I have no doubt that the guaranteed annual income will be in full effect in every modern nation where the resources and the attitudes make it possible. I would like to believe that too, but I guess we will not get around that particular tack right now.

That is not a very dramatic ending to this particular presentation, but I think we simply cannot control growth.

Mr. Pitman: You can limit, you can control and limit.

Hon. Mr. White: May I take one more minute?

Mr. Pitman: Reduce, if not limit!

Hon. Mr. White: I think we should turn our attention to what constitutes the optimum-sized institution, and before one attempts a number along those lines—the member for Scarborough East finds this very dispiriting—we have to try to picture the university maybe five years hence, which is not 10,000 or 20,000 people situated on a campus in a full-time situation but something entirely different from that.

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: Now the numbers 5,000, 10,000 or 20,000 may be almost meaningless. I said in certain introductory remarks Thursday night that Ivan Illich's prognostication

concerning the schooling made in October, 1970, were too extreme for my liking, but nonetheless it is very interesting. In the past couple of weeks I have heard about four instances—you remember he said, "The North American society is going to de-school radically starting within the next eight or 10 months."

Mr. Pitman: He thought it was going to start right here in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: I found it very difficult to accept, but here are the several instances which I referred to without explaining in my remarks Thursday night.

Firstly, the students of the University of Toronto, during a two-hour session which I had with them a few weeks ago, told me they were attempting to induce the administration to make resources available to open up tutorial storefront shops in which instruction could be offered to students enrolled in the university or any other citizen who wanted to walk in.

Secondly, several very important senior officials at York University told me a week or two ago they were exploring ways in which the university could reach out into the community in a way it has not before, and while I did not want to push that too far in that particular social setting, I had the impression that they were thinking in the terms of decentralizing the campus in some fashion.

Thirdly, two young and very clever, very far-sighted young men at the University of Western Ontario told me there had been created in the United States a consortium of universities that work together for graduate work. The way I understand it is this: A student enrolls at a university in the consortium. He is assigned a tutor. With the tutor's guidance he selects a topic. He is sent out on his way.

He has access to each of the universities in the consortium—I think I was told 25—by which I interpret that to mean he could use the libraries or perhaps a particular piece of equipment or whatever he needed. I think I was not told this, but I imagine he has a contact in each of the universities. And after a year or two or three, he comes back to his home university with a thesis. He can spend a day on the campus during that extended period of time, or a thousand days. That is not one of the requirements, I think, for that degree.

Fourthly and, I suppose, most dramatically is the British open university.

So here are four small indications that this is happening rather quickly. I for one would not be foolhardy enough to forecast what this portends. If the process continues to happen, as I rather think it will, then it is very difficult to talk in terms of faculty-student ratio or the optimum size of an institution. If you have an MA student come on the campus for a day and then disappear for two years you could have 100,000 students on a campus and it would still be fairly empty. At any rate, that does relate this idea of growth and this idea of what the optimum size of the university may be. It is going to be fascinating to watch these developments in the next two or three years.

Mr. Pitman: Get rid of the space attendance syndrome. That is what the main problem is with education today.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I want to get down to some of the practical things in the university field, and that is the matter of tuition charges.

For every year that I can remember I have made comment in this field, and that is on the fact that Canadians attending American universities—and I will speak only for the State of Michigan—pay approximately three times the tuition charges than do the resident students.

Is the minister considering reciprocal treatment for students from other jurisdictions, so that we would have a two-tier type of tuition charge? Could I have the minister's comments on that?

Hon. Mr. White: The committee on university affairs became concerned about the disproportionately large numbers of students from out of the province, and more particularly out of the country, who were being enrolled in graduate courses at tremendously heavy expense to the Ontario taxpayers. They did contemplate a quota on people from outside the country. The philosophical disadvantages to a quota turned them against that idea.

Instead, they made a series of recommendations, of which I accepted four, which attempt to bring these particular enrollments within controllable limits and put the supply of the practitioner in the disciplines in balance with the demand. I think that if another

step is necessary, so far as controlling these particular processes are concerned, that Ontario would be fully entitled to say: "We will accept out-of-province students at the same tuition as our own students, only if the home jurisdiction of those students offers similar rights to our students.'

So in brief, yes, I think it is well worth considering.

Mr. B. Newman: I am very pleased to hear that from the minister. I hope he does not wait too long to implement such a policy because now it must be at least six years that I have been making mention of this concerning the unfair treatment given to residents of Ontario attending universities in the State of Michigan.

We accept their students here on the same basis as if they are resident students, yet the State of Michigan penalized our students who had to go there because they would not be accepted in a Canadian university; sometimes could get courses there that were not available in Canada; sometimes it was closer for them to attend an American university, especially coming from the Windsor area, than it would be to attend the Canadian university for certain types of courses.

In addition, some of the courses in these American universities are superior to those in Canadian universities and I think the agreement should be reciprocal, just as the minister said. If they treat our students in the one way attending their universties, we will treat their students in exactly the same fashion. I am very pleased to hear that.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments about Glendon College. I am sure the minister knows that the amount of money necessary for Glendon College, either in a one-shot grant, or over a period of three years, in order to guarantee that their bilingual programme maintains its uniqueness—that is to say that every student registered at Glendon would, as a matter of academic policy, be required to become bilingual is approximately $500,000 as opposed to $100,000 that he has made available.

I in no way want to belittle what the minister has done, except to point out that what was needed was $500,000 to maintain that uniqueness in an institution located in the heart of English-speaking Canada, which is surely the uniqueness of that programme. That took a phone call to verify.

Hon. Mr. White: Anybody we know?

Mr. T. Reid: I am sure you do. I have some friends at York still, I think. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on a practical aspect which I think flows from the minister's comments about his general philosophy or anticipation of the trends in higher education in the western world, and particularly in North America, including Canada. I draw—as I am doing more and more—upon the thoughts of Chairman Wright as I read many more things he produces by himself, as opposed to by the committee—

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member would rather be "Wright" than wrong!

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. T. Reid: I think that he has either got a very good speech writer for some of his speeches, or that he too is becoming wiser as the years go by. I think it is probably as a result of his own thought processes.

But it has to do with the linkage between formal qualifications through the education system and job qualifications for functions to be performed. I suppose I can sort of tell on my own profession. I feel a bit of a fraud and always have. I have three university degrees; one from the University of Toronto, one from Yale and one from Oxford—

Hon. Mr. White: Tell us about it.

Mr. T. Reid: —and I was bored through most of it, but I picked up the ticket and in the 1950s these were the tickets to pick up. And now of course they are depreciating in value rapidly. But I think the point is—and Dr. Wright makes it quite clearly in one speech he made—this suggests that we should look for ways to loosen the characteristically tight coupling between academic credentials and job sorting.

And this is tied up, I think, with the problem let us say a student from high school has, with the problem an older mature student with less high school than a grade 10 has, the student at Ryerson has, the student from the community college has—that is, an objective evaluation of where he stands in terms of what it is he knows as opposed to what process he has gone through.

And let me just take by way of example, the Ryerson situation. I think the Ryerson question—that is a student who completes a course at Ryerson applying to a university in Ontario and being told that he must start at step one again—I think that type of problem could have been met head on by the

government of Ontario by an innovative step along the following lines.

I conceive of it being possible that the government, with the co-operation of business and labour unions by the way, and the institutions of post-secondary education, will get together and will set up an evaluation centre that is divorced from the type of Princeton evaluation type of technique that is being used but of course related to that type of technique. I think that the evaluation centre, called the Ontario Evaluation Centre, would have to be controlled by—I am not too sure about control, but I think the basic question of evaluation should be non-governmental. I think you would want to have government representatives on it so we would know what was going on.

So when a student finishes a course at Ryerson and wants to go into another type of post-secondary education or an extension of what he has done at Ryerson, instead of applying to five different universities in Ontario and getting credit for half a year at one institution, a year at another, a year and a half in another, and a slightly different type of evaluation at another institution, that there would be general agreement among the academic institutions that the evaluation made by the evaluation centre would stand.

Hon. Mr. White: Sort of a CSA approval for homo sapiens?

Mr. T. Reid: Well you have lost me in your philosophy. I am just trying to deal with a practical problem, being a very practical type of person as opposed to a philosopher. I am simply saying a lot of young people and mature adults, whether 23 or 43, are getting the short end of the stick by having to approach a number of institutions and a number of employers and being shot down because those institutions simply do not have the time, that is, the resources, to evaluate them in a proper way.

So I just state to the minister, I think there is a type of policy direction in which he could move in the way of such an evaluation centre rather than simply this fragmented system whereby the individual tends to get lost because the system is not geared to evaluate him in his own terms.

I think in other specific terms, Mr. Chairman, again referring to some of the wise statements Dr. Wright has made, that business in Ontario and in Canada has let go of the responsibility and turned it over to the state in terms of the credentials given to people to perform certain jobs, and that is the school system.

I think in this regard it is relevant to say—I think research has proved this correct—that if in Ontario alone, or in Canada, or in North America, we were to look at the ratio of the amount of money spent by private industry for educational programmes as a percentage of the total value added, or the total value of the sales, we would find that the percentage of their activities, or the percentage of their profits allocated into education, including the evaluation of people applying for jobs, has dropped rather drastically from the middle 1950s to the 1970s, that is to say, private industry has opted out of education for a number of reasons.

One, I think, is because the state opted in to a greater extent, but, secondly, because there was a profit squeeze on and they found an easy way to save money was to let the state say this person has Grade 12, this person has Grade 13, this person has a BA, an MA and so forth. So business has been less involved with the evaluation of what a person is worth to them and is simply accepting people in terms of the paper credentials and qualifications

Whenever there are 100 positions open, and their criteria is a BA and 500 people apply, the easiest thing for business to do is to say we will make an MA the requirement for this job as part of the rationing process to save us from hiring more people to evaluate what the individuals are worth who are applying for the job as opposed to what their paper qualifications are:

I will not belabour this point, except to say I think it is directly related to the problem of increasing numbers of people trying to get into the formal institutional framework of so-called education.

I think one reason—and it is an interesting point and I will get into this under the student awards system—there has been such an expansion of demand for university work by people who wish to pursue it on a part-time basis, is that the institutions which hire them have become lazy and have refused to evaluate them in terms of their own worth, and when they want promotion, they must get a couple of more pieces of paper to get up the ladder in terms of their employment.

The most guilty employer is the government itself in the form of The Department of Education, for example. I think that if we are trying to look searchingly at the question of the allocation of scarce resources in the field

of formal education, we must not forget to look at the demand side for that type of good in the marketplace. I think if we look at why there has been a shift in the demand curve for the services of the formal institutions in our society, we will see that it is like a push type of demand, a demand that is created by employers who are refusing more and more to evaluate what their employees and prospective employees must have to get certain types of jobs. I think we can reduce the demand for formal education provided we set up a proper means whereby we evaluate the ability of people to do certain types of jobs, and the employers must be involved in this.

In concluding this, Mr. Chairman, I think it is terribly important in terms of being fair to individuals. I think of all sorts of friends of mine who are now in their middle thirties who have been out of education and out in the world of work for 10 years or so. They want to get back in and they are cut off because no one will evaluate where they are at now, as opposed to where they were at 10 years ago when they got married and had the prime responsibility for bringing up young children.

Another reason it is important, Mr. Chairman—and I suppose it is an Illich type of thing, although I refuse to read any more of that man; I think he has got something to say but I think he is not a god—I think that we must realize that more and more of what people are learning in our society has less and less to do with formal systems of education, unless you are talking about a very segregated type of deep research in particular specialized subjects.

I think it is unfair to people who are learning from television—who are learning extracurricularly, if you like; who are learning by their involvement in their society; who are learning from talking to their friends who have had different experiences; and people who are learning from the public libraries—I think we are being very unfair to people who are learning, who are gaining a greater understanding of what is going on in our society which is of direct relevance for doing certain jobs in our society. I think we are doing disservice to those people if we force them to go into an institution to become certified.

I think we should create a process whereby, with the co-operation of private industry they can become certified without wasting the taxpayers' dollars by repeating certain things in an institution of higher learning which simply gives them a piece of paper. I guess I would like to show that I think it is important to discuss this type of thing even though I tend to focus on two or three isues. If you want to save money, you can do things like that.

Hon. Mr. White: This has been very interesting to me, in that I find myself in virtually full accord with the hon. member's elucidation of these related problems. I am not so sure I agree with the solution which was by way of preface to the value of his remarks, although it is just about as good as any I have heard. I think I would like to ask one of my advisory groups, probably those with university affairs, to give some thought to that suggestion. Of course, there are alternatives some of which might be deliberately undertaken and some of which might just happen upon us.

I had the feeling, without being able to substantiate it, that the dependence on pieces of paper we both lament and we both see as an outcropping of the rationing of employment during a period of high unemployment. Take two or three years ago; just a feeling I had. I personally seem to observe this trend omang the younger people and, if this is indeed the case, I think if all goes well this is the kind of thing that might just happen upon us without any governmental or non-governmental design. If so, that would perhaps be an appropriate solution to the problem.

Milton Friedman in his book, "Capitalism and Freedom," argues very persuasively that the state should not certify anybody and he says "If I can argue this out to the reader's satisfaction for the medical profession, I assume you will accept the proposition for barbers, plumbers and others." Then he describes—

Mr. Pitman: Friedman's associate, Reimer, suggests that we might make it illegal for an employer to ask for educational achievements. It would be against the Human Rights Code. The employer would be forced to discover the strengths of the employee.

Hon. Mr. White: At any rate, this can serve somewhat very briefly and imperfectly. Milton Friedman's idea is this. If a chap graduated from a medical school, however primitive, in 1910, he has an MD degree. He may never have looked at a learned journal since; he may never have made any effort whatsoever to bring himself up to date in this particular science, and he may be the

worst person in town to treat your illness, whatever it may be. The very fact that he has a certificate on his wall, issued by the state or an agency of the state, gives the people in the town the confidence to go to him. Friedman argues that in the absence of such a piece of paper if everyone were able to hang out a shingle with medical doctor on it, then the consumers of that service would be thrown back on the reputation of the person offering the service. Just as the housewife today inquires among her neighbours to find out who is the best butcher in the neighbourhood, so a prospective patient would inquire from every available source as to the best medical doctor in the neighbourhood.

That extreme is titillating, no doubt, and it does point the way to a less certificate-minded society in which I rather think this trend started two or three years ago—that is what my intuition tells me. In the meantime, we have to deal with the problem and the suggestion which preceded the delineation of the problem by the member for Scarborough East was as good a solution as I have heard, although I am not perfectly satisfied that that is the answer either. I will ask the committee on university affairs to explore it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: First of all, with respect to formula financing, I think there is little question that the whole notion of formula financing, as it particularly was formulated here in Ontario, is designed and deliberately sets out to encompass and to bring into the university the largest number of otherwise qualified people it possibly can. That I affirm.

Hon. Mr. White: Only if the cost is less than the BIU value because that incentive exists.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. In any event, the basic concept is not elitist except as any institution of education or, I suppose, any particular skill in this life has built into it some kind of perception of those who have not got that skill or are not desirous of acquiring it. But nevertheless, the university structure has gone on with the basic unit grants.

I think, as my friend from Peterborough says, it does make it mandatory upon the universities, or at least make it attractive to them, to bring in as many people as possible in order to sustain their grant. It must partly be because the unit itself must be substantially commensurate with the need of that particular area, particularly in undergraduate studies touching the humanities. We hear—I do not know how true it is, I am sure you have got an investigation going forward—that sometimes money is siphoned off from that particular area into the graduate schools, again because even the six points attributable there may not be adequate to completely sustain that school, particularly on the scientific side.

I would be most interested in knowing if you have heard some of the rumours that that is going on, and as to how you think you might rectify that particular situation. It did puzzle me and bother me a little, though, to hear the minister speak of Plato's golden man. That was an extremely elitist concept you know, and probably the most aristocratic ever envisaged, where human beings by way of birth—certainly if we were born slaves, we were excluded automatically—where the basic theory is that certain individuals were brass—and there were certain people who were silver. The silver people, by and large became soldiers, and the brass became merchants. Somehow by way of heredity and by way of the environmental situation, and by a kind of a biological notion that Plato had—you know about his theory of mimesis or remembering—that in our previous lives we knew everything and all we had to do was to be awakened in us by way of sense impressions in this life. In any event, I am just pointing out to the minister that perhaps the particular formulation of the non-elitist thing was badly chosen on his part.

The second thing I want to mention is the business of part-time students and the continuous process. Talking about breaking down those walls in the de-schooling—the minister touched upon it a few moments ago—it may have wider ramifications than one thinks and fall directly in line with what Illich talks about. He says that those people who are confident in a particular direction, who are kind of gurus in one way or another, who are in chemistry or horticulture, or in the way of making lacrosse sticks, or in the way of having a particular wisdom, say, in philosophy—they hold themselves out, go into a bank and soon, by way of reputation, not because the university is a set scene with its written scenario beforehand, here is where you go to be taught Icelandic literature, medieval studies or Plato.

But there are many men in the community without these qualifications or certificates who have penchants and traits of character and ability. They probably are far more

vital intellectually than what very often happens in the ossified, humdrum, cynical citadels of the university, and by way of a reputation, by putting their name in, people will come and test them. Obviously if the learning process then is communicated by those who have the particular skills in the community outside the walls of the university itself, if they attract a sufficient following, and if by pure reputation, by the ability to teach, a following is engendered, and the work of the peer group goes on at the same time, and it would be so strong, because the whole role of the university has a kind of prestigious, isolated role as a place set apart where, with concentration, the particular kinds of knowledge are gained and nowhere else, that whole concept is brought down and I think that is what he means. He thinks that is going to take place and is in the process of taking place.

Just how you compensate those individuals in the community who act in this way is a neat question and he has many proposals—by way of vouchers, by way of placement grants from childhood and what not. I think much of what he talks about on that particular score is limited to the Latin American civilization with its very deep poverty, where you do have to set—even as we, more tentatively, have to set—some kind of feeling on what precisely you are prepared to spend on education at all levels and say that is it for a lifetime Until you receive your grant. And, as you spend it, you try to maximize the benefits from that particular source. I think it is on its way; it is present here. Connected with this would be the part-time study bit, which is a crucially important thing for the interrupted education or for the on-going education, so that any one of us, while sitting in this House, could take particular courses in music or whatever we want, whether within the confines of the university or—

Hon. Mr. White: And why not? Why not?

Mr. Lawlor: The people who are probably well equipped to work in the field, say, of music are not necessarily located within the university but probably are playing instruments here and there and have thought a good deal about the medium in which they operate.

Since I promised my wife that I would not let it go without making some mention of it, I wanted to refer to the Royal Commission report on the status of women in Canada, which backs this up and which has about 75 pages dedicated to education and the role of women in education in area after area, as to what she thinks the requirements are. At 188 one of the chief requirements—and she goes on with it to some extent—is the continuous education section, in which she claims that women are particularly afflicted by the present status of part-time education and continuous education at the universities.

A whole revolution is going to have to take place in the minds of the professors at the universities with respect to this matter, and what you have done in the terms of your grant you are to be commended for. You have tied it in; you have made it mandatory, that if they are to get that one-fifth situation, it must be that there is immediate transferability into the regular course so that they do not downgrade it and send the young graduate student in there, fob it off, slough the part-time and the extension courses, which is precisely what they do.

But a great deal more than that has to be done because, as an older student, I went back a few years ago to the graduate school and have experienced the particular form of deportment. The professors are ingrainedly allied and tonsured to people under 25. They have dealt with the juvenile mentality, adolescence and coming out of adolescence, for an awful long time and when you as an older individual go back they just cannot fit you in. They find it extremely difficult. I do not know whether they think in some way that you are challenging them or placing them on the defensive because you have acquired a certain experience in life, but let me put it this way: they treat you precisely the way they treat other undergraduates.

You may say that that is perfectly fair but it is not perfectly fair, because the demands of your life, the numerous children you have to consort with, the business of earning a living, are all there while you are sitting there. For him to set the same rigorous, avuncular demands upon the older student who is doing undergraduate work implies a certain suavity as in everything must rule, a certain sense of the needs of that particular individual, but to set his time limitations as to submission of papers, to set the same rigorous criteria on and on, to stand like a martinet over the whole class and to make precisely the same demands on a man of 40 as he makes on a youth of 20—what are you going to do with him?

It seems to me to some extent that you are going to have to do something with the teaching of the teachers, the business of the uni-

versity professors not having particularly acclimatized themselves to good teaching methods, to a sense of communication with their students.

The best ones do and they do it naturally, but there is an awful horde of fellows there who are unable to convey, and could not care less after ten years whether they do convey or not the thing that was originally their chief inspiration. Again they have got off.

If you go back you will find that you are going into an alient environment and one which depreciates the talent and the quality of the older individual and somehow or other, through your department, you are going to have to get that notion through that there must be greater flexibility and a greater sense of maturity on the part of university professors vis-à-vis the mature individual.

This is a difficult thing, nevertheless it must be done or all this talk about a continuing education is going to be extremely empty. The report on women says the adults usually have multiple responsibilities—at home, at work, in the community; they must undertake their learning as marginal students. They need part-time programmes, flexible timetables and plenty of encouragement. In their childhood, school was often a formidable undertaking. These attitudes fortunately are now disappearing, as she goes on in that particular vein.

One thing I want to come back on is the treatment of graduate students. Again I cannot but be severe upon the minister and his categorical, arbitrary modes of thought in this particular matter. He makes no provision in his grant structure for financial needs.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes we do, and we call it OSAP.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, we do make provisions for need and we call it OSAP.

Mr. Lawlor: Leave aside your award structures for the time being. Let us take the straight situation with our certain basic criteria, certain necessities of a monetary kind that get a student into a university or into graduate studies. To take that as it stands, your OSAP existed prior to the new, rather overweaning, clauses that you introduced into the situation.

Do you or do you not, for instance, accept that there is an on-going need for graduate students which can be pretty shrewdly estimated at this time reaching into 1976? Do you not agree that the volume of graduate students that was going through the university was commensurate with that—not in excess, just about in balance? As a matter of fact, perhaps a little short of the total needs of the predicted university enrolment?

You make no attempt, when you issue these statements, to make any justification for the reason that in the University of Toronto alone, as you know, there will be 250 fewer individuals, not the ones who are presently in the courses but the new entries after January 1, 1971; 250 fewer Ontario graduate fellowships than there were the previous year.

True, your first proposals were far more draconian than those you actually brought in. You had to ameliorate the situation a little bit, but that was only to point out how bad was the previous business of limiting their income to $1,800. You wanted that limitation. Then, if they made anything over that, they were immediately wiped out of your unit situation and no longer participated as units in the university grant system.

Sure, you came back on that a bit by saying that those already in receipt of these stipends could continue to do so, but after a certain date, again, there would not be the benefits previously conferred under your legislation.

Previously you were going to—and you recommended or at least your commission did—that the fee structure raised be almost to $735 or some much larger sum. Now you are maintaining the average fee structure, somewhere in the region of $400 or $450, and that was because of considerable pressure brought to bear. It is just that you should do so. But even the moves that you have made, I dispute with you, have not been made in full cognizance of the full needs of the graduate enrolment and the on-going programme in graduate studies.

Even if I leave out what I spoke about earlier this afternoon—the business of the failure in selectivity insofar as the minister's rather rigorous demands are part—if the minister had selected them. I would not raise such a fuss. On the other hand, having gone straight across the board on the things—in the remarks I read of the Prime Minister when he was the Minister of University Affairs, just a year previously in his opening statement to this estimates committee, he said beware; let us go slow; grave caution is necessary in this context.

The minister goes in and bulldozes ahead. I would like to hear a thorough explanation as to why he brings this. You know, there are throughout the university structure any number of people who take grave umbrage at these particular mandates of the minister's that have been handed down.

I am sure Charles Hanly finds what the minister is seeking to do somewhat questionable. And, by the way, I would like to go back to Hanly and others. I commended the minister at the beginning of what I had to say, this little spiel about the minister's formula grant being designed not to exclude at least competent students—those who had basic qualifications on grounds other than family or money; on straight ability to learn —I will not say scholastic ability, either.

These people—and they are always against you and you must run into them all the time —the Hilda Neatbys, let us say, of this world. There are any number of them; they are all realists. They are perfectionists and they are always lisping excellence and saying, "This is the golden stuff again." They have very little democratic sense. They have very little sense that the average intelligence in the population is not that far beneath genius, that the grasp of an ordinary mind is pretty darn good and that it is equally to be exposed to university education to sharpen the wit and to amplify the knowledge, to give it scope and magnitude.

These people are only concerned with select individuals who happen to have a something called an IQ—God knows what that is—and they go around measuring with oscillographs and other weird instruments. And secondly, because these people have shown a particular penchant to attach to and very often toady to the peculiar intellectual interests of the professors in charge, therefore they have a very high intellectual capability, so they say.

How many of these prigs and pedants do we have to contend with as you enter into the university circles? Innumerable – they come out your ears. The wrong kind of human—there is no amplitude there. There is no well roundedness if they have been able to sycophant themselves into positions.

Sure they have a basic wit, the people of whom I am speaking, but their access to universities and the nonsense about excellence or something—sure there is excellence and it should be fed, it is a rare thing. It is extremely rare. You do not get poets hanging around doorways every time you turn around —they are extremely rare individuals.

Or a first-rate scientist obviously he will make his way in this world. He will make his way through the university community without all the foofaraw, with the backing.

It is the man who needs a general culture, who has to be—we are all barbarians beneath the skin—who has to be made somewhat less barbaric, somewhat wiser and more discerning as to the things that are worthwhile in this life, who should be exposed to this particular kind of education, if he so desires. If the tendency lies elsewhere, the community college is doing a wonderful job insofar as it is introducing the leavening; I spent an awful long time in speaking about the leavening of the liberal mind.

Earlier today you irritated me. You indictated that I was somehow exclusivist, seeking to keep people out of the university. That is true about liberal education in the past. It was exclusivist—it was aristocratic in tenor. It is no longer necessarily true, not coming into a leisure society, not coming into a society which is so complicated that people have to acquire the humanity to batter the things out.

Therefore, just to remain on the one concrete point that I made, I am very much suspect of what the minister is doing in the graduate programme.

Hon. Mr. White: To deal with first things first. I certainly think that women's lib is going to be very helpful to the female of the species in this particular culture, and I for one welcome it and I think we see evidence in this rather short space of time since women's lib took to burning bras and picketing. That we have a better appreciation of the capabilities of women, no doubt ties in with the new mores and new scientific developments and such like. So you can assure your wife that I will do what I can to remove the remaining discriminations against females in this society. Would you give her that message, with my love?

Now, turning to the graduate studies area. Not a single one of the less prosperous graduate students will lose a five cent piece by all of these changes. I am not going to apologize for the fact that the more affluent of the graduate students have a little less money, because that is not my concept of the society which you and I envisage in 1971 and following. If we cannot correct the tax side, if we cannot correct on the revenue side, we can correct on the expenditure side,

because we do not face the same constraints emanating from Ottawa to make the revenue-expenditure picture more progressive in this society.

When the hon. member for Lakeshore fights me on making the system more progressive on the expenditure side, as we have done in the series of changes concerning graduate financing, I can only conclude he does not understand what is happening.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister persists, Mr. Chairman, in refusing to justify the position of his department in this matter. He is cutting back substantially in the number of students and in the enrollment and he is doing it deliberately. I think he is doing it on the premise that the costs of graduate training is—well, it costs $10,000 a year for a graduate student in the usual run-of-the-mill things, and it costs a lot more for a physician, a doctor in training—$10,000 a year on the average, which for four years makes $40,000 for a student. One should stand in pause over that particular kind of figure. But if this is the prerequisite, if this is what is needed and this is what has been built in to the system by your predecessor, in order to meet the demanding needs particularly for university teachers of the years in the future, and to obviate what Tim Reid spends his time talking about, to obviate the on-going need to bring in professors from outside to supply our deficiencies, you are doing this with malice aforethought and that is precisely what you are doing. Why do you not admit that you are doing it?

You could stand up and you could say "Well, fine. We do not think we need the level of professional or the level of graduate training that we have had in the past few years. We think there will be a super-abundance. We think it will be in the order of 800 extra by the year 1975. Therefore we do have to move in on this area just to keep things in some equilibrium."

You do not say anything like that. I have not heard a word. If you do not know what you are doing, if you do not know precisely what your needs are, I am suggesting to you that the cutbacks at the present time are going to lead to a deficiency, not a gross deficiency but a substantial one, one that should be looked at, a significant one. If such is the case then in three years time we will regret what you are doing here today with respect to cutting back on graduate studies.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The macro considerations were dealt with very thoroughly last Thursday evening, and it may be that my hon. friend absented himself from the chamber during that half-an-hour interlude. At any rate, if he will read the Hansard for that evening, he will see the overall situation dealt with.

Let me deal specifically with the results as far as the individual is concerned, that is to say the micro consideration. If, and for the sake of this argument let me oversimplify and talk in terms of rich and poor students, if a poor student loses a dollar because of some decrease in the Ontario graduate programme he picks up a dollar from an increase in his OSAP award, and of course, beyond the $600 loan, all of that award is non-repayable grant. So this poor student is in no way disadvantaged by this series of changes.

The rich student does receive less income than he would otherwise have got. Now accepting—it is the only assumption necessary for this argument—the fact that we have a certain limited quantity of economic resources for the graduate programmes, and/or if you wish to take larger setting, the universities, the consequence of these changes is to charge the rich students, using the over-simplified terms, more for the services received, thereby benefiting larger numbers of poor students.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawlor: One final word, if I may, Mr. Chairman. If the minister's proposal is to cut by $1.5 million the Ontario graduate fellowships for 1971-1972, and there are ceilings, there must be some limitation on the situation to move in and deliberately cut the fellowships on this scale, it seems to me, it cannot help but be and it must be deliberately framed for a particular objective. A fellowship has about $2,250 a year in terms of its grant. Sure, it is only one area of your total awards situation, but it must be deliberately aimed at cutting back on graduate studies. To claim anything else would seem to me to defeat.

Hon. Mr. White: As Samuel Johnson said: "I have given you an explanation, but I cannot give you understanding."

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have not got—

Hon. Mr. White: The OSAP award programme was increased by about half of the

diminution in the Ontario graduate fellowship programme, so that—once again, using these oversimplified terms—the poor student would not have any decrease in his resources although, acknowledged, the rich student will pay more.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me we have strayed from item 1 of this vote to the student awards. Shall item 1 carry? Carried.

Item 2, support to related institutions and organizations. Will the item carry?

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Well—

Mr. T. Reid: ROM first.

Mr. Lawlor: —one of the areas in which I wanted to say a few words was with respect to the Art Gallery of Ontario. Again, I do not know how deeply the minister wishes to interfere, if he puts it that way, or to be suzerain over his own exchange, or over his own moneys, with respect to the art gallery. But I am told by artists in the city that very seldom does the art gallery exhibit indigenous people, contemporary artists.

Like most art galleries, it is in the form of a museum. And a museum means a place for the dead. That is what the word in Greek does mean.

We are expending $750,000 on the art gallery, is there not some function that it should take into cognizance contemporary artists, that exhibitions of their work should be placed on display? Are we not under some obligation in this way, this being within the educational grant, to stimulate an interest in art in its various phases and not just among the dead, but among the living that have to exist? They are the ones after all who need some money in their pocket and food in their belly, in order to continue on to produce pictures.

And have you had an opportunity to investigate the policies and procedures utilized by the Art Gallery of Ontario, either for sculpture, for painting, or for any other number of forms of the plastic arts? Because I tell you, the policy is restrictive and detrimental to the best interests of the community.

Mr. T. Reid: How about drag strips?

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Order! I must point out that the standing orders provide for continued debates until 10:30 only.

Hon. Mr. White: May I say one word only? It will not take a moment.

Mr. T. Reid: Lousy taste.

Hon. Mr. White: If the Minister of University Affairs is to choose what is to hang in the Art Gallery of Ontario, some member or members opposite will be among the exhibits.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I could not rest on that. I will ask for the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of this department, and hope to finish, and then we will follow with The Department of Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 31, 1971

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, continued 2163

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2190

No. 53

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon, we have as guests in the east gallery, students from Thornlea Secondary School in Thornhill, and in the west gallery from Erindale Secondary School in Clarkson and Northern Secondary School in Toronto.

Later today we will have students from Our Lady of Fatima School in Elliot Lake and from Base Borden Collegiate Institute in Borden. This evening, the 20th Agincourt Scout Troop of Scarborough will be with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I have not had the opportunity of discussing this matter with you. I would like to make a statement, which I trust you will permit me to make.

Mr. Speaker, I count Prime Minister Trudeau's visit to the USSR and his utterances both during and after the visit a great tragedy to befall those who are presently enslaved by the communist dictatorship of the Kremlin, including not only the Ukrainians but the Byelorussians, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians and those who are in the satellite nations.

Most of the events—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would you advise me whether the rules permit the minister to make a statement on his own behalf or is it just limited to matters of departmental importance?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Defending again!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is the Minister of Citizenship in this government and I am waiting to see whether he has something with respect to his department tied into the statements he has already made. As far as he has gone at the moment it is not a proper ministerial statement, but it could quite possibly be so.

Mr. Nixon: Further on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it should be made clear as to whether or not the minister is espousing government policy in this regard.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He is still handing out Valentines.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister would proceed until we find out if he is making a statement with respect to his department and his responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, we are developing a way of life in this Province of Ontario; this is a matter that affects very vitally many of the residents of this province and this is the proper forum in which someone can assume responsibility for speaking on their behalf, and I do so as the Minister of Citizenship charged with the responsibility of assisting in creating that particular way of life.

I wish to state on behalf of those citizens that most of the events the Prime Minister participated in have given a respectability to the communist system as it exists in the USSR. His partnership agreement—and I put these in quotes—will equate Canadian democracy with that of a communist dictatorship—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister has to be kidding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: His utterances will be selected to bolster the communist regime, his words will dismay and despair those who seek to be as we are—free men. I, as one Canadian citizen—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Who put the minister up to this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —strongly condemn Mr. Trudeau's actions and words and disavow that he acted or spoke on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister ended his statement by saying "as a citizen." Does he say "as the minister," because if he does, then of course it was quite proper; but as a citizen he was out of order with his statement.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He would not know. He still does not know.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to ask whether that kind of statement by the ministry can be responded to, whether we are permitted to make an observation and what is happening to the rules of this House generally?

Mr. Speaker: I think that as a matter of order one could do that—any member could—or one could deal with the matter in the question period which follows. As I say, after having heard the statement—and, as the minister said, he did not discuss it with me beforehand; in fact, members of the ministry do not—in my opinion it was not a proper ministerial statement, it was a personal statement; but Mr. Speaker could not tell until the statement had been given.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: What a lunatic—

Mr. Lewis: —if personal statements are permitted, or perhaps it is a point of privilege, as a member of this House I also would like to make this observation: I think that the remarks of the Prime Minister of this country discussing matters relating to the Ukraine and comparing them to matters of the FLQ, were inconsidered, gross and offensive.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: I also think, Mr. Speaker, that the trip was taken in the best interests of statecraft and that the minister should not impugn everything while grandstanding—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: —in the Legislature. It is a point of privilege from within the Legislature.

Mr. Yakabuski: What is the member doing right now?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a point of order?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Is the minister going to make personal statements every day from now on?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I am not going to try to emulate either the minister or the member for Scarborough West.

I do want to know if now it would appear to be in order, by reason of what has happened today, if by chance someone in another government says something that offends me or takes action that offends me, I have the right to rise in my place in this House and express my views? For instance, if the federal member for York South, I think his name is Lewis, should get up today in the House of Commons and say something that I find—

Mr. Lewis: He is not yet the Prime Minister. I respect the difference.

Mr. Singer: —particularly abhorrent, have I the right to get up here and be critical of him? Should the Premier of British Columbia say something that offends me? There are all sorts of examples. Frankly, sir, I deplore the precedent that I think has been established this afternoon by giving such leeway to the minister who, if he wants to go out and hire his own hall, can say whatever he wants. It is the same thing for the leader of the NDP. It is a democratic country but I do not think that should take place in this House when we are discussing Ontario business.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, if I may just add a brief word on the point of order. We are back to your cruel dilemma, sir, but it is one that you have got to resolve.

If a minister wants to make a statement and he is permitted to make the statement and only at the end you make up your mind whether or not it is in order—even then if you express it as being out of order—it becomes a bit futile because it is all over. I noted once again that halfway through the statement being made by the leader of this party, you were calling him to order.

Mr. Speaker: I was inquiring if it was a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: He got up and said it was a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: He had not made plain whether it was a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I did.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, you look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that he did make it clear. In other words, if there is going to be laxity in the application of the rules of this House, let the laxity be equally applied. I am not pleading for laxity, but if it exists, let it be equally applied.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, surely it is not within the rules of this House that a point of order is the vehicle for making a statement of any kind

other than to bring the Speaker's attention to something that is considered by the hon. member making the point that it is out of order?

The second thing that I would like to bring to your attention, sir, is that surely the order in this House and the rules in this House require ministerial statements to be matters of government policy or matters pertaining to the individual department concerned, and in this matter the hon. Provincial Secretary was clearly out of order?

The hon. member for Downsview suggested that he hire his own hall. That is one alternative, or he could get up and speak in the budget debate and make his views known on this matter. Surely very few would agree with the minister. I do not know of anybody in the House who would agree with him in this matter. Certainly not his colleagues in the government.

Mr. Speaker: Well, if I may say, I believe the member for York South has placed the matter on a very plain basis, and that is that Mr. Speaker does have a dilemma because the ministry does not apprise the Speaker very often even that a statement is being made, and certainly not as to what is in the statement.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is time they did.

Mr. Speaker: I have the difficulty with ministerial statements, the same way as with questions, that they can start out very political and not in order and by a very easy turn of a facile tongue can be made to fall within the rules as we interpret them. Therefore I have that dilemma which the member for York South has pointed out and I agree with him.

This particular statement, certainly in the end, turned out not to be in order and yet the statement was delivered. So far as the member for Scarborough West was concerned, in my recollection—and I will check the records—he started out by saying it might be a personal privilege, it might be a point of order, and I was merely ascertaining what it was when I was trying to find out to what he was speaking.

I would say to the member for Downsview of course, that the members of the opposition and the private members are in a little difficult position, because there is no period in our standing orders or no order for statements by the members and therefore the ministry of course have a head start so far as statements are concerned; and certainly the procedure that the member for Downsview suggested would be quite out of order even from the beginning.

I do not know the answer to it, if the ministry will not co-operate and make proper statements because we are always bound to have—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, may I? I would just like to speak in deference to your office. It had been my intent in this situation because I was not actually sure in my own mind that it was the proper time to make this statement. Regrettably, I could not arrive here until after prayers and, if I had wanted to make this statement, could not get this note down to you in time and I thought that the matter—

Mr. Deans: You could have made it tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am willing to let my record of abiding by the rules of this House stand up with those of the leaders of the opposition parties.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. Lewis: The minister could have written the note in the last five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA'S VISIT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. Nixon: A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Does he agree with the statement made by the Provincial Secretary under the order of ministerial statements completed a moment ago, the gist of which indicated that he felt, as a matter of government policy, that the visit of the Prime Minister of Canada to the Soviet Union was not in the best interests of the citizens of this country?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the statement of the Provincial Secretary and I have never made it—

Mr. Pitman: The Premier was lucky.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a practice since assuming this office of commenting on the travels, in any direction, of the Prime Minister of Canada. These are matters completely within his jurisdiction. I endeavour to look after my own travels and those of my colleagues, and

I do not believe that it is a matter of policy of this government to determine where the Prime Minister of Canada should travel. That is on his own head, his own decision and certainly the constitutional framework of this country, certainly his responsibility.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: As much as I agree with what the Premier has said, will he indicate whether or not he agrees with the statement made under the order of ministerial statements and for which he must have full responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was not the question I was asked. I was asked by the Leader of the Opposition whether or not I agreed this government has a policy as to the travels of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is exactly what I was asked and, Mr. Speaker, I answered the question.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Premier believe that his ministers have the right to make statements like this under ministerial statements for which the Prime Minister, the Premier of Ontario, takes no responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not —and neither does the Leader of the Opposition—limit my colleagues as to what they say in this Legislature.

Mr. Nixon: We are not ministers yet. That is going to happen.

Mr. Lewis: As of yesterday, that is a likelihood.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would advise the Leader of the Opposition not to hold his breath, as far as the latter is concerned. I would not want him to expire from that particular disease.

Mr. Lewis: Events in the last 24 hours will change his mind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What events are these?

Mr. Lewis: I forget.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier missed that too?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Really. Yes, I know about it. And Mr. Speaker, I just repeat that this government does not have a policy of support or non-support of the travels of the Prime Minister of Canada. It is as simple as that.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Prime Minister agree with the overt assertion of the Provincial Secretary that the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister to Russia was an open support for a communist regime and therefore deplorable—or words to that effect?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will have to read, in fact, what the Provincial Secretary said—

Mr. Singer: Just reach behind you. He has a copy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I did not hear it, and as I say, I have expressed no reservations about the Prime Minister of Canada's excursions, whether they be to the Bahamas, Russia or what have you.

Mr. Lewis: When the Prime Minister reads it he will shudder.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, not at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister put him in the portfolio.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not say what the hon. member said I said.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

POSSIBLE RACETRACK CLOSURE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further question of the Premier: Following the exchange in the House yesterday, has he looked into the possibility, as has been charged, that the racetracks in the province might close this July because of insufficient support at the betting windows?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised yesterday, although not in that context, and also at a very brief gathering of the communications media outside the assembly itself. I indicated on that occasion that there were two aspects.

First was the question of the legality of off-track betting and just where it stood, and I am delighted to report to the House today that the Attorney General of this province (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) and the federal Minister of Justice, in the past 24 hours have had some discussions on this issue among other considerations.

As to whether or not the tracks will, in fact, close—as to the implications of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment at this moment.

Mr. Nixon A supplementary: Following the discussions of the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice can the Premier indicate what the policy will be? Surely the Attorney General discussed it with him before he went to Ottawa? We would like to know Ontario's position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government will be enunciated in due course. That is right.

Mr. Nixon: As soon as the Prime Minister reviews it a little further.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Does the Premier have the sense that E. P. Taylor is again holding a gun to the head of government in making these threats, as he does from time to time, as a matter of course, to extract more money?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not sense that particular situation and I think it should be very obvious that "gun to the head" in that descriptive sense of the words does not impress this government in any event.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: How much money is the government giving in this year's estimates to the Ontario Jockey Club and which will find its way to the breeding of horses on the part of Mr. Taylor, having given more than $1 million of taxpayers' money in the last two years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, details of all the items being expended by the government are available and I am sure the hon. member has already perused the estimates. When we get to the estimates of that department, if he has not discovered this amount of money allocated for breeder awards, it will be made available to the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary; does the Premier feel that if off-track betting is to take place in Ontario, that it should be government supervised?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview is endeavouring to add to the question asked by his leader, and I told his leader—

Mr. Singer: That is the purpose of a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right. I told his leader that government policy in this regard would be enunciated in due course.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, does "due course" mean any time over the next 10 years, five years, or even one year; because it has already been considered for a year and a half with no answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As far as this government is concerned, if it were done over the next 10 years it would still be done by this government, so the hon. member for Downsview can relax.

HOSTEL ACCOMMODATION FOR TRANSIENT YOUTH

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Premier could indicate more extensively what the government policy is toward assisting so-called responsible groups in providing accommodation for young people who will be travelling through Ontario, particularly through Toronto and other major Ontario centres, during the coming summer months?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday on a matter of great importance that turned out to be somewhat frustrating, I guess—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): "Disastrous" was the word.

Mr. Lewis: We noticed the Tory candidate getting pulled out the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No; there is never a second prize in our profession, is there?

Mr. MacDonald: Not even a third prize.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No; quite right, there is not even a third prize, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I was asked a question by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) relating to the question of youth travel or youth hostels—I think this is the general term. I indicated then that there was no specific programme sponsored by this government as it relates to the provision of youth accommodation or youth hostels. I also observed, in my view, Mr. Speaker, that probably an increasing number of young people over the next few summers would, in fact, be travelling. I also stated there were certain programmes through the youth and recreation branch of The Department of Education for assistance to community organizations, for youth during the summer months. Whether they could or will include matters of

accommodation, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was not able to state, and I am not able to state.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the Premier aware, whether we like it or not, that there will probably be places for 5,000 travelling young people required in Toronto alone? Evidently hostels will provide only about 500 places. Has he got a suggestion as to what the alternatives will be for these young people? Would he suggest that one is to stay at home—and, if so, how are we going to persuade them to do that, if, in fact, they want to travel through Toronto, through Ontario and through Canada?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any alternatives and I know the inability of some parents to persuade their children not to travel or stay at home. I know this.

Mr. Singer: Some day we are going to get an answer from the government, but not from this government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier said that with a sort of pained expression on his face, as a parent with knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I expect there to be more in the future than in the present.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary of the Premier? More specifically, will the government, through The Department of Public Works or any other agency, give to the Board of Education of Toronto the right to oversee with Grassroots the grounds of the latter-day Mercer Reformatory for the purpose of a tent city, as it were?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) dealt with this question yesterday. I am only going by memory, and that is that this government would be prepared to discuss it with responsible municipal authorities.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the Minister of Public Works, being on the record as willing to grant that right to a responsible authority and the Board of Education having approved it 18 to 1 in a vote, will the Premier now reaffirm, as did his minister, that the government will turn over Mercer Reformatory grounds to this responsible authority and the organization Grassroots for the summer programme? Surely, this Premier, of all Premiers, would see that as an appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked his question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Minister of Public Works is quite prepared to discuss this with the Metro or Toronto boards.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

FUNDS FOR YOUTH RECREATION LEADERSHIP

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Would the Prime Minister not agree that he misled the people of this province on CBC television last night when he implied that a portion of the almost $4 million allocation in the current budget for youth recreation leadership training would go into youth hostels?

Secondly, is it not a fact that not one bloody penny of that is going into hostels?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much of the film was shown over CBC as I did not see it myself. I thought I made it quite clear that funds were being allocated to various municipal organizations. Whether a portion of these would find their way into the provision of accommodation I quite frankly did not know. I also went on to state that these were matters for local municipal decisions and that I was not being critical of decisions that municipalities had made, because I personally do not know all the facts that related to either an affirmative or a negative decision in some areas.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell the House and the people of this province whether even one dollar of that $3.8 million allocated in The Department of Education budget for youth and recreation leadership training is going into the provision of shelter and protection for travelling young people in the Province of Ontario? Is, or is not, the money going into youth hostels?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question. I really cannot add any more than I just said about 30 seconds ago.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): So the Premier has washed his hands of the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Is the Premier in favour of encouraging municipalities to take the responsibility by offering to them some specific subsidies on a per-night basis, or some other form, to back up their work in this direction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government is concerned about young people, their travels and provision of accommodation. It is the feeling of this government that some municipalities can, without the involvement of the province, resolve this problem, without any question.

Mr. Deacon: Answer the question.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): That is a non-answer.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Singer: He does not answer any question at any time.

Interjections by hon. members.

LEGISLATION REGARDING LICENSING OF LOTTERIES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. With the proliferation of lottery—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Nixon: With the proliferation of lottery licences, plus municipal bylaws excluding lottery sales from certain areas, is the minister satisfied with present legislation or is there some review or study being given to its improvement, particularly with the possibility of a single provincial lottery replacing the large numbers of smaller lotteries—and some of them not so small—presently in operation?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I should begin by saying I am not ever satisfied with the present state of affairs, and particularly in the matter of the lotteries. I think there is room for improvement in the legislation. We have it under consideration.

I think perhaps my thinking runs in the opposite direction, if I understood the Leader of the Opposition correctly. Rather than having one large provincial lottery, perhaps the better way to go, to my present thinking at least, is that municialities should exercise control of those small lotteries within their own communities. They know the situation; they know the charities to benefit—and all lotteries must be for charitable or religious objects—they know the persons who are running them. The local police are acquainted with the situation.

I think there is a better control in the municipalities for those small lotteries. We have had one or two, a very small number, of large provincial lotteries and they have caused us some problems.

There is a suggestion now, for instance, that service clubs—and most of them have clubs in municipalities across the province—could run a provincial lottery by using the services of their various clubs throughout the province. I do not think this is a good way to do it. I think it would be far better to let the service club in a particular municipality—with the licence of the municipality, if its prizes do not exceed $3,500—be governed by the municipality. I feel that if you let this proliferate, you give it to one, you would have a great number. That is my view.

There is one further thought. It seems to me that with some of the lotteries we have licensed, the proceeds have been going to what are not really charitable or religious, but to educational matters. They may be very commendable objects, but this is a field in which the province is engaged in which the province gives money. We do not allow it at present, we do not have any law—that is any provincial law—permitting a provincial lottery. But if we are going to be pressed to allow authorities to run a provincial lottery for educational purposes, I think we have to think about whether the province should either allow that lottery or run the lottery itself, or not allow it at all. I think we are verging on the territory where subjects of the provincial government's responsibility are being trespassed upon by lotteries.

We are thinking about the whole matter. I take some time to answer this question which gives us concern and we will be dealing with it—not only considering it—but, I think, framing some very definite rules with respect to lotteries.

Mr. Nixon: Two supplementaries, briefly, to make it clear. The minister is saying that the government policy, as he would express it, would not favour the expansion of lottery licensing procedures to make the lotteries larger?

Second, does he not think that it is ridiculous that under present licensing arrangements, certain municipalities are moved to pass either bylaws or regulations specifically keeping the sale of certain lottery tickets—I think a good case is the one on sale in Hamilton—out of other municipalities? Surely this is getting to the ridiculous stage?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not really considered that, Mr. Speaker, but if you are going to allow any municipality to license a lottery, as we do where the prizes do not exceed $3,500, if that municipality, the persons organizing and running that lottery, may sell their tickets throughout the province, every other municipality could do likewise, and in effect you would have a province-wide lottery. So I would not at the moment think that perhaps there is anything seriously wrong with the municipality saying, "This is a lottery for this municipality."

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister advise as to the truth of this press statement that last year there were 30,000 lotteries in Ontario with prizes exceeding $22 million? Would he advise if this is going to continue at this rate and if he is going to set a limit? If $3,500 is the limit, the Premier is shown here today in the paper pulling a draw for $5,000.

Second, if we cannot get our highways fixed up in Owen Sound, can we have a $1 million lottery to pay for them? Now what are the limits?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will report the full details of the lotteries in my estimates, but I think I can say to the hon. member at this time that from my knowledge the number of events which were of a lottery nature—I have included bingos, I believe—all across the province last year was in the neighbourhood of 30,000. I will have the exact figures in my estimates, but I am quite certain that is very close to the mark, because I have looked at the matter.

Mr. Sargent: Twenty-two million dollars was the total prize, was it not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not sure of that figure, but I will have that. I do not know that there is much I can add. I went to some length to answer the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition as to whether the—

Mr. Sargent: Could there be a $1 million prize?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The province, under this section of the Criminal Code, has the right if it wishes to have a lottery, to run a lottery and games of chance.

The Province of Quebec immediately acted on that legislation last year to establish such lotteries. We did not in this province. We gave the municipalities the right to license certain small lotteries and where the prize exceeds $3,500, they are licensed by the province. Into that licensing goes a very thorough study of the object of the lottery, the persons who manage the lottery, the amount that is taken for management or advertising, and all the details.

So at the moment this is the way we are doing it. We have had a year's experience, and if I may just close the matter by saying, as I did earlier in answer to the question, we are looking at this whole situation. It does pose problems.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Windsor-Walkerville have a supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): No, I have been answered.

Mr. Speaker: If the Leader of the Opposition has completed his questions, then the member for Scarborough West.

HOSTEL ACCOMMODATION FOR TRANSIENT YOUTH

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. What is the minister's decision on the granting of the use of the Mercer Reformatory grounds, as a tent city under the supervision of the Toronto Board of Education and the organization Grassroots?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the decision is the same approach that I outlined to the House, I guess, last Thursday.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, what game are the minister and the government playing? The government have been given an official body, elected as you requested, and a specific request from Grassroots for the grounds. They have met all the minister's requirements. Why does he not simply accede to the request?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, this is a report which I received yesterday from the city of Toronto committee on parks, recreation, city property.

Mr. Trotter: It does not look very interesting, the way the minister turned the pages over.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is a lot of it but the operative part is at the end.

Mr. Lewis: The operative part is the last paragraph, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It says: "It is recommended that city council advise the Minister of Public Works of Ontario that it does not approve the use of the Mercer site as a campsite for transient use."

Subsequently, my office called the city clerk's office to find out what had transpired at last Thursday night's council meeting. Apparently, the report of the committee that I just read—

Mr. Lewis: That is evident.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —was discussed by the committee of council for which there are no minutes. The motion was lost in the committee of the whole, and therefore it was never taken to council and therefore it is not recorded in any minutes or accounts of the meeting.

Mr. Sargent: What is wrong with the cocktail lounge downstairs? They can have that. It is not being used.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have had a letter from the administrator of The Department of Education, which is not too clear because I think it was written about the time before the meeting of city council. I have indicated that I would be delighted to discuss this with the board of education. However, I am still a little puzzled to have read in the paper that the solicitor to the board of education indicated that the board did not have authority to do this sort of thing, and I would like to have that clarified.

Mr. MacDonald: Still back on the fence.

Hon. Mr. Auld: However, for the information of the hon. members, I had a telephone call today—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is certainly muddying the water.

Mr. Sargent: He has the matter well in hand there, you can see that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —from Mayor Dennison of the city of Toronto who advised that he had earlier today received a call from The Department of The Secretary of State in Ottawa advising him that they would be supplying $14,000 to Devonshire House, at the University of Toronto, for the use of short-term housing for transient use this summer. Apparently Devonshire House will accommodate 200 to 300 people.

Mr. Lewis: That is five per cent.

Hon. Mr. Auld: He also said that the federal government would be supporting, along the same lines, St. Paul's Church, which accommodates 500—

Mr. Pitman: What support is that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and St. Basil's Church, which will accommodate 75. He wanted me to have this information. I thought it would be of interest to the hon. members.

An. hon. member: One thousand people.

Mr. Lewis: By way of one or two supplementaries gathered together: Why is the minister so anxious to support the professional anti-youth faction of the metropolitan council when he himself indicated that a responsible elected body, namely the board of education, was sufficient to supervise the proposed tent city in conjunction with Grassroots and that his department would approve it on that basis. Why is the minister now skirting that?

Mr. Singer: The city of Toronto council.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, city of Toronto council.

Mr. Singer: Quite a difference.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think we have thrashed around with this a bit.

Mr. Lewis: There is, too—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It was suggested to me that the study of dialectics is a fascinating one and that we have been having an interesting go at this for the last few days. As far as I am concerned, as the landlord, as the Minister of Public Works, it is my job to look after the province's property on the one hand and not as an individual to overrule the wishes apparently clearly stated by the council of the city of Toronto. I have said on several occasions when I was asked—

Mr. Lewis: Similarly overruling the board of education.

Hon. Mr. Auld: May I finish, Mr. Speaker? When the board of education apparently is reported as not having authority to do the kind of thing they are proposing to do, I would like to be very sure what is happening before I give any approval. However, as I say, it seems to me in a question like this, where the city is the responsible body to deal with all the services which will be required for this kind of a project, if they say in their judgement this is not the place to do it, as far as I am concerned I am not going to lightly overrule their wishes.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, well, that answers the question.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question: Would the minister be much more favourably disposed toward a request from a board of education in Ontario, such as a city board, to use school facilities to create shelter and protection for travelling young people passing through Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for school quarters.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

PRESERVATION OF NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Since the Premier must necessarily be aware that 27 individual permits have been granted by his government to companies quarrying in the Niagara Escarpment since the passage of the Act to provide for the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment and its vicinity, how does the Premier justify the alleged interest of his government in the escarpment preservation and the delay in bringing in legislation to preserve it?

Mr. Singer: He is impressed with all they have done.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) answered this question just a few days ago. I do not know whether it was a question from the same member or not.

Mr. Singer: He did not answer it a few days ago and he did not answer it yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes Mr. Speaker, he said—and said it very clearly—that he was in the process of assessing the implications of the report, the question of quarrying operations on the escarpment and the government policy in this regard would be detailed to this House in the fullness of time, which is a very short time.

Mr. Singer: What could be more definitive than that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well that is fine, and that is exactly what he said.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, since the Premier has such an overriding interest in this matter, is he aware how many of these 27 permits are new or are continuations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No Mr. Speaker, I am not aware as to how many of the 27 are new permits or continuations, but if the hon. member would like me to find out for him I shall do so.

Mr. Lewis: Fine!

Mr. Singer: Maybe that is what impressed the Premier about what has been done.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps by way of supplementary I can ask the Premier just how much destruction of the escarpment he is going to allow and to grant permits for without bringing in legislation? What is this fetish he has to destroy the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no fetish on the part of the government to destroy the escarpment.

Mr. MacDonald: Just procrastination!

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, can I ask the minister whether the bill that was drafted by the previous Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) ever reached the cabinet for discussion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, what reaches the cabinet for discussion and what is discussed in cabinet and what results from those discussions is a matter for members of this cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: Well a final supplementary: Is the Premier saying to the House that the granting of all these permits—and the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs was kind enough to give me the full list—subsequent to this emergency legislation can possibly be consonant with the preservation of the escarpment? Is the Premier pretending that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not pretending anything. The licences which have been issued as a result of a determination by the municipalities and the department are in the view of the department not inconsistent with the desire on the part of this government to preserve the escarpment.

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Despite the site plans being—

All right. Mr. Speaker, I will wait for the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs.

ONTARIO PLACE JANITORIAL CONTRACT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one final question of the Minister of Public Works: Can the Minister of Public Works detail for the House the proceedings by way of application and tender for the granting of the large janitorial contract to service Ontario Place; what the bids were and how it was ultimately extended?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give some general information. I do not have the details with me, Mr. Speaker.

We advertised for bids in the Daily Commercial News, and I assume other papers. We received, I think, in the order of 15 bids which ranged, interestingly enough, from a low of something over $200,000 to a high of something like $1.3 million. In the request we asked for the member of personnel which the bidder was proposing to employ for the job and we selected one—I cannot remember the name of the company at the moment but I will file a return on it—which was about the fifth or sixth lowest and which came closest to supplying the number of people which my own maintenance staff had estimated would be necessary to do the job. It was in the order of about 50.

I think the low bidder, if memory serves me correctly, had suggested that he could clean that whole operation with 16 people, which as a non-professional I would say was unlikely. Of course, when it was not the low bid and when there was such a tremendous variation, I made it my business to inquire pretty closely into the recommendation of my staff as to the award.

As I say, I will get the total detail and put it in the orders.

Just one other thing, I think I should say that the high bidder had miscalculated and wrote in subsequently and I think his bid instead of $1.3 million became $1.1 million or $1 million or something like that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South has a question?

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—

Mr. Sargent: Why does the member not walk down and have a talk with him?

CLEANUP OF OTTAWA RIVER

Mr. Yakabuski: All right; the member had his turn.

During the latter part of last week, the Hon. Victor C. Goldbloom, Minister of State for the Province of Quebec and responsible for the quality of the environment in that province, made a statement to the effect that the governments of Ontario and Quebec and the government of Canada would be moving with speed—something to that effect—to clean up the Ottawa River. I am wondering whether that statement was made after consultation with, or after arrangements had been worked out, with this province.

Mr. Singer: And what is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this report was undertaken jointly and now has been released by both provincial governments; it deals with the Ottawa River and makes certain recommendations as to proper treatment of wastes from various municipalities and industries on both sides of the river.

I have had an opportunity to discuss this report with Dr. Goldbloom. Also our technical people in both respective departments have met to discuss the report. It is now our hope that we will meet with the federal minister with the idea of carrying out the recommendations outlined in the report.

Mr. Yakabuski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that over the years the government of Ontario and the various municipalities on the Ontario side of the river have done a great deal of work to clean up the Ottawa in the way of sewage treatment plants, etc.; and because virtually nothing has taken place in the way of cleanup on the other side of the river, I am wondering

to what degree this government will be involved in the cleanup that Dr. Goldbloom mentioned and how the cost sharing will be worked out.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, of course this is something that will have to be arrived at—

Mr. Singer: Government policy will be announced in the fullness of time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —between the parties involved in this study and any financial expenditures involved in carrying out the report's recommendations. I do not expect, for example, if the cost of cleaning up on the Quebec side is two or three times the cost of the work to be done in Ontario, that this province would necessarily be making an expenditure or sharing in the cost that has to be paid in Quebec. However, in the event the federal government is willing, as it has indicated, to make a substantial financial input in the restoration of the Ottawa River, on that basis it could be on a total cost-sharing basis.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Lands and Forests has the reply to a question asked by the member for Downsview.

SYDENHAM RIVER FISHING RESTRICTIONS

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Downsview asked me a question about the posting on the Sydenham River in the Owen Sound area.

The problem of posted property on the Sydenham River is mainly confined to a two- or three-mile stretch above and below Sullivan Mills. The Department of Lands and Forests has recently acquired the property immediately below the Chatsworth fish hatchery and has thus provided an additional two miles of stream for public fishing. The Sydenham River, from a point due west of Chatsworth to Owen Sound, is comparably free of posted property and a good 80 per cent of the entire stream is open to public fishing.

This spring, for the first time, a sanctuary area was established on the Sydenham between the northerly boundary of Harrison Park and Inglis Falls. The purpose was to protect spawning rainbow trout and the period of closure was from March 1 to May 7. Our stocking programme on the Sydenham involves the planting of brook trout on several occasions each year in the waters of Harrison Park on a put-and-take basis and the carrying out of several minor plantings in sections of stream that are open to the public.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. Singer: No, I have a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Then the Minister of Tourism and Information has the answer to a question asked.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, if the member has a supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the Minister of Lands and Forests what provisions are made to provide public access to these areas that have been stocked with public funds?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we do not stock with fish unless there is public access.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Tourism and Information.

TOURIST RECEPTION CENTRE

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have here a reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville in connection with the Huron Line information centre at Windsor. My department has investigated the feasibility of opening the centre on a year-round basis. We propose to do this on an experimental basis, Saturdays and Sundays only, commencing September 11 for 35 weekends to May 1, 1972.

We estimate this can be accomplished with a part-time staff of two who will give travel counsel to an estimated 200 parties each weekend. Funds for personnel and maintenance are available in the current estimates. If the volume warrants, a request for full-time personnel and maintenance will be made for the 1972-1973 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should now go back to the question period. The member for Downsview has the floor.

RUMOURED MERGER OF CANADAIR AND DE HAVILLAND

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Development. In light of the discussions that have been taking place between Canadair and de Havilland, which the press suggests might lead to

a merger and the moving of de Havilland from Ontario and Downsview, perhaps to the Province of Quebec, and thereby the loss of many thousands of jobs to Ontario citizens—

Mr. Speaker: Question please!

Mr. Singer: —what steps, if any, is the minister taking to protect the rights of those Ontario citizens presently employed at de Havilland in Downsview?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to note that the hon. member is concerned with some of these actions, taken with the federal government's blessing, which are making life difficult, more and more every day, for Ontarians, particularly Ontario businessmen.

We are very deeply concerned about this and our staff are studying the matter with the view in mind of taking it up with the federal minister who incidentally I saw last night. But until we are prepared to present a really well-briefed case, I did not want to discuss that aspect of it yesterday.

We are certainly concerned and we will do everything we can to protect Ontario citizens against the depredations of the federal government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary—and quite apart from all the depredations—has the minister entered into any discussions with the management of de Havilland, with the labour force at de Havilland or with any of the local representatives in order to attempt to solicit help for this very worthy objective that I am sure the minister must have in mind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would care to add anything further to the statement that I have already made.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, through you, if he is aware whether federal money is being used to subsidize the proposed move to Montreal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think that I had better give the hon. member the same answer; that this matter is under careful consideration now. At this particular moment I could not honestly say whether the federal government is actually using any cash, but it appears it may.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary; the member for Peel South.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, since Hawker Siddeley controls de Havilland and General Dynamics has control of Canadair; and Canadair is substantially supplemented with generous federal loans, a semi-socialist operation; and de Havilland is private enterprise and has flourished—

Mr. Lewis: The member means like the socialism of the EIO?

Mr. Yakabuski: Let him ask his question.

Mr. Kennedy: The NDP would not understand that. De Havilland has flourished under the free or competitive enterprise system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Did you hear what he said about the board of directors at General Dynamics?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Let us hear the question.

Mr. Kennedy: I must have hit a tender nerve there because this is an important question, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to hear the true story.

Mr. Speaker, would this investigation include a study of which company has control over the situation as it presently exists and what the proposal for control might be?

Mr. Lewis: Why does the government not hold a conference on foreign control?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member win the vote in his caucus?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Singer: The Premier never has any votes in his caucus; nothing is ever decided.

Mr. Nixon: How about the editorial comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the opposition's time!

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister is going to say nothing anyway.

Mr. Ruston: We are not really missing anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peel South has already discussed this matter with me. I do not know whether I mentioned to him at the time he brought it to my attention that we are going into this whole matter—

Mr. Stokes: About the socialist board of General Dynamics?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —in very great depth so as to present the best possible case for Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary Mr. Speaker, has the minister considered giving one of his semi-socialist performance loans to de Havilland for the purpose of building STOL aircraft in Ontario? Has that been part of his policy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, all of this will be part of the review that is being made on this matter at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

INCREASE IN CAR PRICES

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Prime Minister following up my question of May 27. In view of the fact that Ford of Canada has now announced an increase of up to $500 per car and since the bulk of the motor cars in Canada are made in Ontario, will the Prime Minister now negotiate with Ford Motor Company to open its books to justify what in the light of existing information must be called excessive and inflationary markups on power steering and automatic transmissions which are now being incorporated as standard equipment in the cars concerned, and which the company is giving as an excuse for the markup?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Young: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will the Prime Minister negotiate with the car companies with a view to eliminating the costly annual model changes and so abolish the need of price increases, which will be announced not only by Ford but certainly by the other companies in Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I read much of the material today as it relates to the automotive industry, I think some of the automobile manufacturers themselves recognize the growing feeling on the part of consumers as it relates to model change.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not intend to negotiate with the automobile manufacturers to restrict them in model design or change. This is something that the marketplace itself, I am sure, will determine. If the hon. member is concerned there are several cars on the market which I know traditionally over the years have not experienced model change.

I anticipate he is probably driving one of them, I am not sure. These are available to the consuming public if they so desire. In fact, Mr. Speaker—well I would get very parochial if I decided to mention my own riding, I shall not go any further.

Mr. Lewis: What about administered prices?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Sargent: Would you like a few statements from the opposition?

Mr. Speaker: I do not find that in the orders, the routine orders.

Mr. Nixon: Pretty interesting.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Grossman presented the following reports:

The annual report of the Ontario Research Foundation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1969.

The annual report of the Ontario Housing Corporation, The Ontario Student Housing Corporation, The Housing Corporation Limited, for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1969.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by—it was the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). I will get another name, Mr. Speaker; by the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps)—now he has disappeared.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister forget all the names?

Mr. Nixon: He is not in his place.

Mr. Lewis: It is the member to his left.

THE BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, 1970

Hon Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Business Corporations Act, 1970.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, The Business Corporations Act, 1970, was proclaimed on January 1, this year. It has been found very acceptable, I think, by public and by business, but in that five-month experience we found a few errors, a few changes, some of which have been recommended by department officials and some by the public as a result of that experience. The purpose of this bill is to give effect to those necessary changes.

Mr. Lewis: Is the government ever going to introduce any important legislation this session? Any significant legislation this session?

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, as members of this House know this is the time of year when our institutions of higher learning have their convocations and award degrees to those students who have met the qualifications. In addition they recognize certain of our citizens who have contributed outstandingly through the years in some way. Last Sunday the University of Ottawa, one of our great universities in Ontario, recognized the outstanding work done by one of the members of this House. I refer, of course, to the hon. Dr. Allan Grossman—

An hon. member: Doctor?

An hon. member: Oh, doctor!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacKenzie: —who was duly awarded an honorary doctorate in criminology for his outstanding work when he was Minister of Correctional Services.

Mr. Singer: Criminology? I see. Most fitting!

Mr. MacKenzie: I am sure that all the members of this House join with me in congratulating one of our colleagues, Dr. Grossman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Dear doctor!

Mr. Stokes: All he needs is his QC now.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Stokes: When does he get his QC?

Mr. Lewis: That should be good for the ministerial statements.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(concluded)

On vote 2602.

Mr. Chairman: We are in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, vote 2602, item 2. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with a number of areas that come under—well we seem to be jumping between items 1 and 2. I wonder if we can just pick up a point that I would like to clarify.

Mr. Chairman: I have item 1 marked as carried.

Mr. Pitman: Which one was that?

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, support for universities and colleges.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps I might just ask the minister a question on the one section of that vote in relation to compensation for municipal taxes.

I wonder if the minister has considered the possibility of changing this particular method of providing municipal compensation, because I think the minister would agree that under normal circumstances the number of students might relate very well to the size of the university and the value of the buildings and therefore the assessment that might well be expected to be received by the municipality. In other cases the numbers do not relate to the value of the buildings, as the minister will well realize, particularly in an emerging university where the buildings are always ahead of the students

—well, they have to be ahead of the students. In other words a building for 50 students is not that much less than a building for 500 students.

I just wonder if the minister is moving toward any more sophisticated method of providing greater compensation for municipalities based on the real value of the property and the buildings, rather than on what could be called the very simple counting of heads inside the university community.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Chairman, this is one of a number of ad hoc measures undertaken by the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the previous Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) to shift the burden of taxation off privately owned real estate, and especially privately owned home real estate, onto the more broadly based provincial levels of taxation. It would be my hope and expectation that there would be full grants in lieu of taxes paid on behalf of all these postsecondary institutions when this tax system is eventually rationalized; which happy day, as the hon. member will know, was delayed for a very long time by the federal government's white paper.

Mr. Pitman: So this will change once again in terms of the context of the entire rationalization of municipal taxes.

Mr. Chairman, if I might get right on, with the Chairman's admonition that we are no longer on item 1, I would like to say a word or two about the Royal Ontario Museum. I notice that there has been a generous rise in support for the Royal Ontario Museum. Over the last few days I have been reading some comments the minister has been making in the public press about difficulties at the Royal Ontario Museum. Perhaps the minister might like to clarify exactly what is happening in that institution.

I think there has been some very real difficulties which have really carried over from the old relationship of that institution with the University of Toronto, and perhaps the lack of imagination, the lack of vision, the lack of grasp that certain members of the board had in terms of what the real potential of that institution might be if it became a truly provincial institution.

I would like to say too that I support very strongly the position the minister has taken with regard to the activities, the hopes and the aspirations of the director of that institution, Mr. Peter Swann. He is not a close friend of mine; I have just read everything I could that he writes and I have tried to understand what he is doing with that institution and I think he is dead on.

One of the things I think that institution can do, which I think he realizes, is it can give this province a realization of pride in its past, and I would hope that the emphasis in the ROM over the coming years would be toward Canadian studies, Canadian artifacts, the explorations they have begun—certainly in the area of rocks, for example, in exposing what you might say is the geological history of this country.

Over the past number of years—perhaps the minister has not recognized this—I have been particularly critical of the very limited degree of interest that the ROM has shown toward the Canadian past. It always seemed to me the worst exhibits were in the basement and they looked pretty down at the heel and pretty flea-bitten, dusty and worn. In fact they were the same exhibits I remember seeing when I used to visit that institution when I was eight or nine years old. They have been around for a long time and in some cases are pretty inaccurate.

I would hope that the minister might well continue expanding the grant to this institution, because I think that here we have an institution that is reaching out in a way I have seen take place in the last few years.

I would hope we might be able to find ways to bring down young people from all over Ontario, for two or three days. I would hope we might even find—and I hate to use this term at this point in time—hostelling arrangements for bringing young people from other parts of this province.

Once again I think this is an institution that is not to be found anywhere else in Ontario. Perhaps we do need some kind of committee or council on museums to support the activities of this particular museum and to secure it far greater precedence. Perhaps we need some way of sending this museum out in trucks and trains, by some means, to other parts of Ontario. I know that has been begun, but perhaps it has only begun in a very small way. I do suggest to the minister that this is something he should give a great deal more attention to, that he should consider with all of his acumen, that this can indeed be responsible for arousing the interests of the people of this province in a way that Ontario Place perhaps can never do.

Ontario Place is in one sector—it is off the shore in the harbour of Toronto. The Royal Ontario Museum virtually can be put on wheels and youngsters can be brought from

all over Ontario to that museum and we can really make it, I think, something worthwhile in the culture of this province. I do suggest the minister take that course.

Hon. Mr. White: Thank you for these suggestions and comments. I see myself as a friend of Peter Swann, and I think he deserves a great deal of the credit for the success the institution has enjoyed in the last five years.

I think it is a great mistake to aver, as I think the hon. member did, that the trustees do not likewise deserve a great deal of credit, because the board of trustees consists of able and dedicated men, some of whom the hon. member knows, and including the Hon. Leslie Frost. These men, without any compensation, and I have to say without any glory, expend their energies and their talents selflessly on behalf of the museum which they love.

All of these men are vigorous, aggressive and able, and I think it is not surprising that the director and the board of trustees do not always find themselves in complete unanimity on every issue that comes before them. Because they had the wisdom to recognize that the existing organization likely contributes to some degree of misunderstanding, they commissioned a management consultants' study last November, I think. It is hoped that the management consultants' study will enable the museum to delineate the areas of responsibility for the board itself and for the director in such a way that these uncertainties and perhaps overlapping duties will be eliminated.

At any rate while I did not offer a statement on this subject at the end of last week, I was called by the Toronto newspapers about a letter which had been circularized to the staff of the museum and which informed the staff that Mr. Peter Swann was continuing as the director in the absence of a contract, since his contract expires on June 30, 1971, but with the terms and conditions under which he has been working extended to the end of the year.

The management consultant report will likely be received either late in June or sometime in July, and the persons responsible will have some number of months to peruse that and discuss it and decide upon the appropriate course of action. The fact that the parties to the agreement were willing to extend the existing terms and conditions of employment—and I am talking now of the trustees and of the director—I think evidences the good faith which they bring to this particular matter.

It is my hope that by taking the deadline off the contract the long-term interests of the museum can be carefully and dispassionately considered and wise decisions taken. Now that is, I think, a summary of the situation. I think unless the member has some further questions—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I wonder if I could—

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to comment on the other points but this was on point one.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, right. I wonder if I might ask the minister in regard to this $4.2 million, will any of this money be expended in terms of either acquiring land or property or planning architectural services in terms of the very large expansion of the museum, which is I think in the plans of Mr. Swann?

The reason I asked this is that every museum, and I think particularly the Royal Ontario Museum, can only exhibit a very small amount of its acquisitions. But I think this is particularly unfortunate in relation to the ROM. I think there is a tremendous amount of material to be found in the backrooms and the basement of that particular institution which should be on display. Fortunately, I have some views on what the priority should be in terms of what should be on display, but I will not go into that now.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, do not ask any more questions, until I answer the previous series.

Mr. Pitman: Oh I am sorry. I thought that you wanted to talk with the ROM.

Hon. Mr. White: No, no. That is what I said. I dealt with the first point—

Mr. Pitman: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. White: —the director and the board of trustees.

Now then, insofar as expanding the ROM is concerned, I quite agree, and by the way I think this ties in very directly with the philosophical discussions we have been having the last week or so.

Mr. Pitman: Exactly, exactly!

Hon. Mr. White: I see the ROM and the AGO and the Science Centre and Ontario Place, and perhaps the libraries of Ontario, fulfilling a much more important role—

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: —for people of every age.

Mr. Pitman: Informal adult learning; right.

Hon. Mr. White: I am most hopeful that we can allocate ever increasing resources to these institutions which serve the community very, very broadly.

This is somewhat indiscreet, no doubt, but I spoke to the regional librarians meeting in London two weeks ago Saturday, at which time they were urging that there be established a minister of culture. I do not know if that was to be spelled with a "K" or not.

Do you remember the story? I think it was Bismarck who said, "When anybody mentions—

Mr. Pitman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: —culture to me I reach for my gun." I introduced my particular talk to this group in London by saying, "When anybody mentions culture to us politicians we reach for our pocketbook."

I certainly hope that the government can consider establishing an Ontario library which, it seems to me, is the same idea in a somewhat different field as the implementation of the government's policy to make the Art Gallery of Toronto a provincial institution as we have done. The ROM has become a provincial institution in a way, I think, that may not have been the case some years ago. So generally speaking I am in full accord with the member for Peterborough when he makes these recommendations for expansion of these particular educational institutions.

The grant in 1971-1972 in support of the operations of the ROM will be $4 million. In addition to this regular operating grant, a sum of $130,000 has been provided for gallery renovations and $70,000 for the purchase and equipment of Museummobiles, which is one of the—

Mr. Pitman: Very good!

Hon. Mr. White: —points the member touched on. These latter two special funds are to be provided only if the money is expended for the purposes stated.

The idea of specializing in Canadian antiquities, I think, is an interesting one and it may be that that field has been neglected. At the same time, I would not want to see, quite frankly, a narrow nationalistic point of view.

Mr. Pitman: Let us not throw away the Chinese collection. I agree.

Hon. Mr. White: But I would like to look into that matter. Quite frankly, while I have been in the museum two or three times in the last three months to see the exhibits and the flower show, I have not fully informed myself—

Mr. Pitman: The minister wants to look at the North American Indian section.

Hon. Mr. White: —about its holdings and I am glad to have that suggestion. Insofar as student visits are concerned, which I think the member for Peterborough mentioned, I did have a summary of activity from the director not very long ago in which the number of visitors was shown. While I cannot bring the number to mind—

Mr. Pitman: I think that they cannot get any more in. They are overexpanded now; they are turning them away.

Hon. Mr. White: Right. Let me tell you what has happened recently anyway, because the numbers using the facility have been accelerating very rapidly. In 1969-1970 about a million and a half children and adults visited the ROM complex—326,000 inside the planetarium during the first year of operation. Of the museum's total attendance, 274,543 were students who came to study and receive instructions from the members of the museum education department. The number of members in the ROM has increased to 3,500 from the 900 in 1966.

We are providing a substantial sum of money for capital purposes in the next 10 years. We are providing $25 million during the next 10 years, equally between the ROM and the AGO. The ROM has ambitious building plans being prepared now to enlarge its quarters.

Mr. Pitman: I might just ask one further question on the ROM. One of the things which has bothered me for some time is the fact—and I think this goes back to development in Canadian archaeology—that in Ontario I felt that we have no such thing as an Ontario archaeologist, that is an individual who is responsible for archaeology in the Province of Ontario.

I know the minister will say this area is under The Department of Tourism and essentially he has got nothing to do with archaeology. May I suggest that he consider the possibility of transferring the activity of

archaeology into his department, and indeed the public archives as well? I cannot imagine a more inappropriate place for archaeology than in the area of tourism. Canadian archaeology is not dealing with temples, gold bowls, all of the kind of exotic activities which we find in Mexico and in warm climes where the level of civilization, in terms of goods, was much higher. I suggest to you that this would be far more appropriate for the minister; to have a provincial archaeologist associated with the Royal Ontario Museum who would in a sense direct this whole area.

Now I am not going to go into all the other areas; we need a new archaeology Act as well because we are shipping Canadian archaeological artifacts out of here by the thousands, I understand, every year. Just consider it—it is a massive movement outside. In fact there are now those who would say if you really want to study Canadian archaeology you have to go to New York state and to various institutions in the United States.

As well as that, of course, there is no real protection for so much of the archaeology; particularly in southern Ontario where highways are going through and where cities are expanding, this is a very real problem. Somebody told me there are something like 8,000 sites that are completely unprotected. There is really no way you can protect an archaeological site. You have to put a policeman on virtually every plot and that would be impossible.

But I think if you had a provincial archaeologist, if you then divided the province into sections where the universities would have some responsibility in different parts of Ontario for at least doing initial exploration of these sites, at least deciding how important they are, where they stand in priority and getting in a sense a plan of archaeology for the Province of Ontario, we might very well be able to save many of the artifacts. We may very well be able to make something really unique about the ROM in terms of its extension, I would hope, of Canadian nationality.

I just put that forward. I think it will be far more relevant in this minister's department than it is in The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I have some interest in this field. My wife, for two years, was Girl Friday to Dr. Wilfred Jury at the—

Mr. Pitman: Ste. Marie-among-the-Hurons.

Hon. Mr. White: Well it was, but I am trying to remember the name of the actual site. It was the first prehistoric site—the first and the last I guess—that Dr. Jury excavated, and was located slightly to the east of Penetang. Interestingly enough, it had a triple palisade wall which he had not encountered before the Forget site. I myself received an honorary diploma from that summer school, which was made even more noteworthy by the fact that I was courting my wife at the time, so you see I have a very soft spot in my heart for archaeological digs and environments.

Mr. Pitman: So do I.

Hon. Mr. White: Now dealing more specifically with your suggestions: Some thought is being given, some study is being given at the present time, internally, not in my department but in the government as a whole, as to combining these institutions under one minister. There are different points of view as to who that minister should be.

I cannot be objective about it of course because I know something about our department and something about my own inclinations and if those institutions came under my jurisdiction I would certainly accede to the government's direction, my hon. friend will understand. At the same time there are those who think another minister might be better and this will no doubt at some point be resolved.

Mr. Pitman: I hope I have not wrecked the minister's chances.

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps that would be the time for us to consider a provincial archaeologist. It is an idea that has not occurred to me before. I did receive rather a lengthy letter from the director of the ROM, expressing concern about the archaeological sites, some of which are being perhaps misused by well-meaning but untutored students.

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: I think some part of that letter became the basis for a column in the Globe and Mail a week or two afterward. There being quite a large number of sites, some of which are no doubt tremendously important and some of which are not very important at all, I wondered at the time if some of these sites could not be set aside for more expert scholars and if some of the less interesting sites could not be made available

to the students. I would not want to see them excluded entirely.

Mr. Pitman: Once you have initially explored, I think you can make that determination.

Hon. Mr. White: Because I think it would be quite a good thing actually if they were given the opportunity to get into a dig and be shown the techniques and perhaps stumble upon a few seeds or a few pieces of flint or whatever, thereby whetting their interest in not only archaeology but the interesting and very different culture which preceded the European civilization of this part of the continent.

At any rate, this was my thinking at that time and I have not pursued it further; but I am not in disagreement with the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, these will be my last remarks on these estimates. I cannot help but feel that—yes I can hear the great accolades—when one runs out of Americanization and has nothing to say about Canadianization, it becomes a kind of running in the sand too, does it not?

I have other sets of estimates to do, Mr. Chairman, which are coming up immediately, and I can comment on this in the lines of Hilaire Belloc: "Things are arranged most damnably in hell." I have to head out to Financial and Commercial Affairs now.

There are a couple of little points. I think that it has been most fruitful so far as I am concerned. As my colleague said to me last evening, it was the first time in the course of these estimates that we got our teeth into the problems of education and what education is supposed to be all about. I think it is perfectly true. Those who are so concrete-minded and so unimaginative that they cannot see what the real purposes of these estimates are, perhaps they should withdraw from them. In a general way the level of discussion of debate is at the highest level that this House has been able to acquire and achieve. It is still woefully low, admittedly.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): And very elitist.

Mr. Lawlor: At the same time, the beginning of the scratching of the surface has taken place here in the past few days, because the minister at least is sufficiently informed to be able to sit over here and ask the proper questions in the future. He will know what it is all about and we will be prepared, graciously, to receive those questions, even as he does.

A couple of detailed points or problems in the grants here, particularly the miscellaneous grants. This department acquired the responsibility for the grants to the bar admission course at Osgoode Hall. I would like to know when you acquired those because in the budget book for the last full budget period, 1969-1970, no mention whatsoever is made of those grants. Secondly, I would like to know how much you are contributing to that course.

Hon. Mr. White: The grant for 1971-1972, toward the bar admission course, is only $250,000. In addition to this sum, a special grant of $75,000 per year for four years, subject to annual legislative approval, has been appropriated to assist the bar admission course in meeting the costs incurred in renovating the premises for academic purposes.

Mr. Lawlor: Where does the $250,000 appear in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. White: It appears under grants for university operating costs.

Mr. Lawlor: I see. It is all picked up in that.

Hon. Mr. White: While I am on my feet, could I say that likewise I have felt this debate in the last week or so, however imperfect, has been something rather special, at least so far as I was concerned. I am cognizant of the fact that the four or five opposition members who have entered into it—the member for Scarborough East, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon), the member for Peterborough, the member for Lakeshore and perhaps others—have brought a very serious and thoughtful point of view to the matters under discussion.

It has had a relatively high philosophical content and this may have seemed somewhat time-consuming, even time-wasting, to some of those who were only able to hear a portion of the exchange, those members whose other duties made it impossible for them to be in here continuously. I share the feeling expressed by the member for Lakeshore that this has been a very valuable start to what is a most difficult, complex and continuing concern on the part of those of us who have the responsibility for allocating public resources.

All of our ideas are somewhat tentative. Certainly, I would not want it thought that the philosophy expressed by the opposition members who have spoken coincides by any means with my own. Without attempting to recapitulate the two sides of the argument, I would like to say that I think the secret lies in having a heterogeneous and autonomous system of institutions—whether we are now talking about universities, community colleges, institutions like the ROM and so on. In this way public needs will be made known to those responsible for governing the institutions with some indirect inducement and encouragement from those of us who have the broader responsibility.

I am very hopeful that important changes and improvements can be made and that the system here—you do not like the word system—that the educational opportunities available here to men and women of every age will be the glory of our society, as I believe it can be.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, yes, the debate on this particular kind of subject matter must reflect, within the contour lines of that debate, the nature of the institutions we are envisaging. Those who are followers of Bentham, the utilitarians among us, let them go their way. They have not visited the holy places.

The final question, as far as I am concerned, is on the grants being given to the University of Glasgow and to the University of Edinburgh. They appear to be continuing grants for the maintenance of the Canadiana collections that you gave them—Macdonald and George Brown and others. Is this in perpetuity, the grant that you give for the maintenance of these collections?

Hon. Mr. White: It is a very small amount —$100 or $200 or something like that.

Mr. Lawlor: It is $300 apiece.

Hon. Mr. White: Is that $300 apiece? And is that in perpetuity? It has been voted annually, but of course there is no guarantee so far as future allocations are concerned.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a small sum. Nevertheless tell me: If you abandon doing so, would the thing be put into mothballs and disappear with the dinosaurs into the basement?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think we anticipate abandoning it. It would be presumptuous of me to guarantee it in perpetuity because that is the responsibility of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask a question on one or two other items on this second vote.

It concerns the Ontario historical series which the minister announced earlier in this session: Since I have been here I have been complaining about the fact that really there is such a meagre amount of Ontario history—that is, in a sense, we fall between two stools. We tend to think of Ontario history as the history of Canada. Yet when we come to talk about Ontario per se there is really very little. There are very few books, very few pamphlets, very few articles which can be brought to bear upon anyone wishing to understand this province per se. I was very delighted to see this development. I would like to get some details from the minister as to how this series will proceed.

Obviously, Dr. Murray Ross will be heading this editorial board. Will there be several people on the board, which would be usual; and then will the board go out and seek the logical historians for the various figures that will be examined? Perhaps the minister might just indicate exactly how this $50,000 is going to be used up in the first year of this project.

Hon. Mr. White: This $50,000, which the Legislature is being asked to vote now, is to fund a biographical series. It is my hope that the net cost to the province will be very small indeed, not because the project is not worthwhile but because it should be well enough done that the return on sales will generate a substantial portion of the total costs involved.

As a matter of interest I inquired about that by telephoning the chief librarian in London and asking him for the number of libraries in Canada. The figures are imprecise, because the definition of library of course has most to do with the number of libraries shown for various categories. There would seem to be 1,700 public libraries in this country and several thousand school libraries, some of which are not very ambitious. I would not be surprised if there would not be 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 volumes required by the libraries in Canada, which almost automatically makes the book a best seller in this country. Am I not correct?

Mr. T. Reid: Five thousand could be financially in the black, yes.

Hon. Mr. White: Five thousand. So this should generate a very substantial proportion of the total costs.

The board has been established by order-in-council under the chairmanship of Dr. Murray Ross, and the names of the board members initially appointed were in the statement which I made in the House a month or so ago. There will be additional appointments made to that. The board is selecting an editor-in-chief who will have, I think, a couple of sub-editors. These plans are, no doubt, subject to change as the board comes to grips with its responsibilities and organizes a plan of attack. I think that it is going to assign each biography to an author. But so there will be a continuity in the series, it will also have some kind of resources dealing, let me say with constitutional matters affecting Ontario and Canada. In this way the series of volumes which are at the first level, simply a history of a Premier and his times will become, I think, a continuing story of the development of Ontario within the context of Canada. Does that answer the member's questions?

Mr. Pitman: Yes; I think I got the general drift. Just on the last grant, services and admissions to colleges and universities, my understanding is that in the next academic year the minister intends to change the admission procedures, from one which essentially has been revolving around a common application form which goes to all universities and on which students decide their first, second and third choice, to some kind of a central clearing house whereby this whole matter will be computerized. Is that the case?

Hon. Mr. White: This is a grant for testing; this is a grant for SACU.

Mr. Pitman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: We have had a number of special grants all of which we are trying to decrease or eliminate, because this is the idea, of course, as the overall BIU operating grants formula. We have informed the universities within the last couple of months that we will be eliminating this particular grant and that the cost of the SACU test will in future have to be borne either by the universities in their BIU based operating grants, or if they wish they can pass that fee on to the applicant.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps this then does not tie in with the subject that I am trying to explore here. I understand there has been a change in the admissions policies of the universities or of The Department of University Affairs in relation to universities.

What I am trying to get at is whether this is coming in for the next academic year. There will be a central clearing house and it will be computerized. Is that the case?

Hon. Mr. White: The Department of University Affairs asked the Council of Ontario Universities not very long ago to establish a central clearing-house, as had been recommended by the committee on university affairs. Not very long afterward the Council of Ontario Universities received a report, which it had itself commissioned some months previously, dealing with this very subject. This report has now been scrutinized by the Council of Ontario Universities and perused by officials in my department. I think the Council of Ontario Universities thought that this might be fully operative in the fall of 1973.

But we have pointed out that The Department of Education has computer tapes dealing with the grade 13 applicants who constitute 75 per cent of the admissions to universities in Ontario and we have asked them to consider the possibility of implementing this 75 per cent of the overall clearing-house function in the fall of 1972, which of course would involve their starting this sometime before the end of this year. I do not think we have had an answer from the Council of Ontario Universities as to whether or not that is feasible or considered by them to be feasible.

Mr. Pitman: I would just like to make a minor comment. Has there been any study undertaken by The Department of University Affairs to indicate whether in fact this will create a saving, that in fact there may be smaller universities that are not using computers and are using other methods of securing admission, and that it may well be an extra cost in terms of the total cost of education at the postsecondary level?

Has the minister done any surveys to determine whether in fact the whole computerization of the admissions programme might have a dangerous and perhaps self-defeating spinoff? We talked last night about the whole business of the heterogeneity of our institutions having a single admissions procedure. Is that relevant to that heterogeneity? Does it provide greater opportunity for universities to select people not just on

the basis of their grade 13 results going through a computer, but on the basis of sitting down and talking to these young people?

It comes down again to the whole business of values and priorities, because it takes a lot of time to admit young people who may not fit well into that computer programming; but who might very well be the ones we should be bringing into university, who may have been turned off by the secondary school. What I am trying to probe here is the degree to which The Department of University Affairs thought through the full implications of the total computerization of admissions in Ontario. Have we left any openings, any gaps for young pople who perhaps have a different pattern of development at the secondary level which can be identified and can be improved at the postsecondary level? Have we made it possible for them to get in easily?

In other words, may it not well be that this computerization is against the very philosophy that the minister has expressed here over the last couple of days?

Hon. Mr. White: This does not remove any of the rights of the student. This does not alter the fact that he makes all the decisions, to oversimplify it. It simply provides a carbon copy to a central place, and in this way they determine the number of total applicants, which of course is quite different from the number of total applications.

This system has been in operation for some number of years for the nursing schools in this province, and being somewhat familiar with their practices and policies, I am perfectly confident that this does not in any way impede the student's choice or in any way imperil his prospects of entering whatever course he himself decides upon.

Mr. Pitman: I hope the minister will give this an opportunity to sort out.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I want to revert back to the Royal Ontario Museum. There were a couple of what we will consider mundane points that were not raised in relation to this expenditure of funds, and they relate to two things that I see as an average citizen. One is the problem of parking and second is the problem of expansion of the building in order to extend their showing of exhibits and so forth.

Firstly, I might ask the minister if it is strictly a responsibility of the management and advisory committee of the museum to look after these details? Or does The Department of University Affairs, in its wisdom, look ahead with thoughts of acquiring the old political science building on Bloor Street, which I spent many hours in a few years ago. Are they going to acquire that to allow for further expansion of the museum, or what exactly is going to happen?

I note that the Sigmund Samuel collection is located in fairly close proximity to this building. I somehow feel this is neglected since it is not right exactly contiguous to the museum, and I wonder how the attendance figures compare. I am sure there is no comparison in the total volume of people utilizing this very fine facility just because of the fact that it is not contiguous with the main buildings at the museum.

Could the minister possibly comment on these two aspects?

Hon. Mr. White: I have not seen myself as directly responsible for the parking over there, although that might be a way to spend my Wednesday evenings. These matters are the responsibility for the board of trustees and the responsibility is clearly set out in the Act passed by this Legislature in 1966.

Of course, they are dependent on the government for these resources.

Mr. Paterson: Have they not lost a lot of their access to parking which they had when they were under the university aegis? Was that not taken away from them?

Hon. Mr. White: They lost some parking lots, but they gained the subway.

Insofar as the expansion is concerned, there are discussions taking place—I do not know how formal they are—between the trustees of the museum and the University of Toronto. The museum is hoping to acquire land immediately west of the present museum site. I think the university is quite prepared to dispose of it, although they may be asking for a larger amount of money from the museum than the museum trustees think is appropriate in this particular set of circumstances.

Mr. Paterson: Have they requested of the minister's department funds for the acquisition of this property and the erection of the new building?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, we have undertaken to give them $12.5 million over a 10-year period for this expansion programme.

Mr. Paterson: That is not a loan. It is an outright grant.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this item? Item 2 is carried then.

Item 3. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to return to a question we have discussed at some extent, but I think only marginally. That question is who benefits from university education in the Province of Ontario? I have two groups of people who, I would like to make quite clear, are not benefiting from the university system in Ontario.

The first has to do with the part-time undergraduate student. The minister has made it clear that he has brought in a very important change in the area of grants to the institution, that is to say the universities will get more money from the provincial government for each part-time student. I think the minister is right in saying that this is a very significant change, a change of 20 per cent, I believe in terms of what the universities get for full-time equivalent of part-time students.

I must point out to the minister that one of the things he must do, and do it very quickly, is to find out the extent to which people who want to be part-time undergraduate students respond to that.

I suggest to him that there will be very, very little response from people wishing to pursue part-time undergraduate studies because of the minister's change. I think the minister's change will result in the institutions being more sensitive to the express desires of people wishing to pursue part-time studies, but I do not think it will affect the attitudes of people wishing to pursue part-time studies.

I can give a number of illustrations there but I am sure the minister is aware of the type of thing I mean. I think there will be a better range of courses. I think there will be better quality teaching, perhaps smaller classes and so forth—unless the institutions use that increased money they get for part-time students to subsidize programmes for full-time students internally, which is always a danger.

Hon. Mr. White: On that point, if I may—

Mr. T. Reid: Right. I feel that I have given the minister credit where credit is due. Now, I turn to the question of—

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think that this is going to be a problem. With the incentive provided to the university by increasing these financial grants, plus the fact of the condition of the increased grants, the quality and variety is likely to improve and will make the courses more attractive to a wide variety of people.

The figures which we are trying to find now are quite revealing. The increase in full-time enrolment has gone up one-third in the past few years; the increase in part-time has gone up more than one-half—and these figures are increasing at a significantly more rapid rate than the full-time enrolment. This will no doubt continue and perhaps accelerate when, as the hon. member said, the variety increases and the quality is improved upon.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, there is no argument with what the minister has stated, but I am about to get into the whole question of student awards to part-time students. The implications of my remarks will be that the same socio-economic—let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman: There is a problem about what are the socio-economic characteristics of part-time students, which is equivalent to the issue that I have been raising here for about four years now, concerning the socio-economic background of full-time university students.

I would like to get into the question of student awards. If we want to help people in our society who have left the formal education system and wish to go into part-time university studies, I am suggesting that until this government, either on its own—which it has the power to do—or in conjunction with the federal government, changes the awards—the financial awards, the loans and the grants—available for part-time students, we are going to have a situation in which we have financial barriers to people wishing to pursue part-time studies. I am going to be quite hard on the minister, but—

Hon. Mr. White: Before you leave that point, if I may; a month or two ago I met with Mrs. Joyce Denyer who is a member of the OSAP advisory committee—I think she is a member of the student administrative council. She has been a member of the search committee for the new president, and she is a part-time student at the University of Toronto.

She made the same recommendation to me as has the hon. member for Scarborough East. At that time, I directed the officials of my department to establish a model which could be tested to see what the financial and other

implications would be of making OSAP available in some form to part-time students. This has no doubt been commenced, but I have not, as yet, had the report back.

Mr. T. Reid: I am pleased the minister has stated that he is doing something about it. I must say a lot of this is very refreshing to me. I have been fairly quiet this year because I am listening, and it is quite refreshing.

I am going to put this on the record because this government, particularly the former Minister of University Affairs, refused consistently over a six-year period to move on that very issue. I would like to quote, Mr. Chairman, from a brochure which I received on my desk today, entitled "Student Awards; Financial Assistance for Students attending University, College or other Postsecondary Institutions." It was put out by the minister's department.

Interestingly enough, it does not say who put it out which must have been an oversight. I would have expected a picture of the Premier (Mr. Davis) or the present minister on it. What it should have said on that outside cover was: "Financial Assistance for Full-time Students," because in this brochure on three occasions—let me quote directly for the record:

> On the average, two out of every five full-time postsecondary students in Ontario receive some financial assistance from the provincial government.

Full-time—nothing for the part-time student. Later on it says this:

> Full-time students whose personal resources and family income are assessed as inadequate to meet the directly related costs of postsecondary education may receive a combination award loan and grant to make up the difference.

Again, Mr. Chairman, full-time. It says again:

> In order to qualify for OSAP assistance a student must be accepted at an eligible postsecondary institution in a full-time programme of students of at least 26 weeks in duration—

And so on.

I am stating that here we have again this year an awards system that excludes and discriminates against those students who are pursuing undergraduate studies on a part-time basis. I think I should make it clear that this government has had a very great deal of warning on this. I say this government, because I am talking about the Conservative Party which forms the government of this province, that party, Mr. Chairman, which has been in power, or has had the responsibility of making decisions in this area for 28 years, and still it excludes the part-time undergraduate student from financial assistance.

In particular, this government received a memorandum addressed to all members of Parliament in Ottawa, and which was distributed, I believe, to all members here from the association of part-time undergraduate degree students. This is dated January 28, 1970. That is a year and a half ago, almost. Yet this government in particular has not provided either grants or awards to part-time undergraduate students. One of the questions that I asked the minister to remember when he responds is what approach has this government made to the federal government to change the legislation concerning The Student Loans Act of which the Ontario student awards programme is an integral part.

I would like to quote a few things from this memorandum, Mr. Chairman, just so the members here and the minister will have these facts very clearly in their mind. I quote:

> In 1968, 52,583 part-time and 92,625 full-time degree students attended Ontario's provincially assisted universities. In that year more than 54,000 full-time students received financial assistance from the government. Part-time degree students, on the other hand, had no access to government assistance.

The memorandum goes to to state, Mr. Chairman:

> Obviously, the financial needs of part-time degree students are as great, if not greater, than the needs of full-time students considering that the majority of part-time students are married and raising their families on their low income.

It goes on to state, Mr. Chairman:

> Tuition fees and necessary expenses for book purchases and transportation are prohibitive for many of our students.

I would point out there that expenses like that are prohibitive for many people who would like to take part-time degree work, but who cannot afford to do so because they cannot get a low interest loan plus grant from this government. The memo continues:

> Because most private bursaries are donated for full-time students and no

> government aid is available many part-time degree students have to resort to loans from banks and from finance companies, often at exorbitant interest rates.

Of course, I should add again that there is a financial barrier based on income to many people who would like to pursue part-time undergraduate work, but who cannot do so because of that barrier.

The final quote from the memo, Mr. Chairman is this:

> If student loans were available to part-time degree students many young adults could improve their educational level while still continuing to support themselves, their families, and through their taxes, their government.

I find it interesting that that group of students, which is working in the labour force and earning an income—albeit low—are still paying income taxes to support government programmes.

And I find it strange that those taxpayers cannot get a student award, either a loan or a mixture of a loan and a grant, whereas students who are studying full-time and who are not contributing as taxpayers can get these awards.

So I would ask the minister two specific questions. One question I can think of right away. What steps has he taken to get changes in the federal legislation relating to the federal portion of the Ontario Student Awards Programme—that is the loan proportion—to make part-time degree students eligible for that?

Secondly, is he—I do not want to make it too hard—would he consider making possible the allocation of funds to students in Ontario who would like to become engaged in part-time degree studies, even if the federal government does not come along with him right away?

Hon. Mr. White: The memorandum which the hon. member read to the House was prepared by Mrs. Joyce Denyer for the federal government. It refers explicitly to the federal loans.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I made that clear.

Hon. Mr. White: We have, every year, for at least four years to our certain knowledge, asked the federal government to extend its loan programme to part-time students. This would enable us to place a broader interpretation on the non-repayable grants because OSAP is tied into the Canada student loan criteria. And I draw your attention to page 17 of the report of the Minister of University Affairs of Ontario 1969-1970, where it says:

> A proposal for Canadian student assistance programme has been presented to the federal officials for consideration. Essentially it would provide funds for both full-time and part-time students on the basis of need.

So I think we have not been delinquent in asking the federal government to change its criteria to include part-time students.

Mr. T. Reid: Can you not proceed—

Hon. Mr. White: As I said a few minutes ago, I have asked the officials in my department to establish a model to test the consequences of our embarking on a broadening of OSAP, that is to say, the grant portion for part-time students, although the hon. member will be fair-minded enough to realize that this should be done in conjunction with the changes in the federal criteria for loans.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I believe that aspect; I state that there is a pressing need. I think as the minister has noted in the discussion we have had in this place concerning the purpose of university education and higher education generally, there is a fundamental change taking place in the institutions. It is a fundamental change in many respects, one of which is the consumer demand for the students who are less and less desiring three or four straight years of university, even though it might be broken in the summer. More and more young people, indeed high school students, wish to work and study at the same time because this seems to be much more relevant.

I simply state that I accept the minister's statement at face value but I would point out to him that if he wishes and if it is a matter of policy for him to have some financial assistance—whether it is loans or grants or a mixture of those available for part-time students or people wishing to become part-time students next September—it is a matter of urgency. I hope that if he decides to set up a test model of the consequences of this, the really important thing is the extent to which people would respond to such a programme.

I suspect—and I see what the minister is worried about—if he did bring in such a programme there could be an overwhelming response for places, although they are part-time, at the university level. I suspect that

this is going to be the real problem. That might well be the direction we must take in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the second aspect—this really represents my concluding comments on these estimates—is the question who benefits from the university education system in this province? It has to do with the subject which I have brought up in this Legislature and in the standing committees now for four years.

A friend of mine in the press gallery told me about a year ago: "Look, we know where you stand on getting the children of the poor their fair share of university places. Why do you have to keep saying it?" The reason I keep saying it is I think it is highly relevant and I think it is very important. I think the key question in university education is who is benefiting from it and who is paying for it.

Again, I would like to speak for about 15 minutes on this because there is a new minister and I think he is listening. I would like to start by quoting an article briefly in a book which I edited with a person called Julyan Reid a few years ago. It is called "Student Power on the Canadian Campus," put out by Peter Martin Associates, a wholly-owned Canadian company—

Hon. Mr. White: Do not worry! I was tempted to ask the publisher's name but I decided not to.

Mr. T. Reid: This was after the last book came out; it was published on October 1, 1969. Julyan Reid is my wife; she is also a trained social anthropologist, and her article is the introductory article for the book.

I would like to quote briefly from it because it summarizes the direction, I think, that public policy must take in the future. I would like to point out that this book is on Circular 14; and it is used across Canada at the university level for various courses. Unfortunately, I am in the position of quoting from a book that I make money from, but I feel that this article is an exceptional one.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think it contravenes The Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. T. Reid: Anyhow, I have not collected a penny from it. Peter Martin is needing a government loan from the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman).

Here is what this anthropologist says in her article which has to do with the question of education. I quote:

> The universities traditionally have prided themselves publicly on their objective criteria for admission and for granting degrees. In the past, negative ethnic quota systems have almost certainly existed but they have been surrounded with such secrecy that one could assume that even the university administrations did not consider the tactics publicly honourable.

This is in a Canadian context; particularly French-Canadian context; particularly certain ethnic groups context also in Ontario. From that statement, the next statement is made, I am skipping through this.

> The gaining of the key occupational positions in society is largely determined by graduation from university—and therefore the admission rate of various ethnic groups to different faculties and professional schools is of prime importance to those groups.

The third sequence in this thought process is this.

> It may well be that a system of selecting students and faculty, which takes ethnic balance into account, will reduce the academic level of the institution, but this would be a short-term loss. In the long run, such action would have the social effect of liberating much talent that is now constrained by the legacy of past discrimination. Over a period of time the net social effect would be a raising or at least a maintenance, of the academic standards of the university, as well as a greater social justice within the society. This would be, in effect, inverse discrimination in the interests of long-term justice and a gamble for a renaissance of new talent in greater excellence in the future.

The final part of this thought process, Mr. Chairman, is this—again quoting:

> The universities have little excuse to avoid examining their role in relation to the oppressed groups in society. If the university is to collaborate with our social goals in terms of government contracts and stress on manpower needs, how can it avoid the stated aims of the just society? If the university sets itself up as an objective critic of society, independent of specific ideologies but searching for truth and ideal social goals, how can it avoid the most pressing and most immediate soluble problems of the access-to-education gap?

With those comments in mind, I would like to document again the question of who is

benefiting from university education in this province; in terms of the socio-economic groups in our society, which I think conceptually can be considered an ethnic group. In terms of the analysis of who is benefiting from our university education it certainly is a cultural group in a very real sense.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out, as I did at some length last year, that I consider the document entitled, "Study Paper Accessibility, 1970," dated October 1, 1970, put out by the research branch of The Department of University Affairs, to be a pernicious document. I said last year, in very harsh terms, I thought it was an abuse of the research branch of the minister's department, because it is clearly a political document and should have been written by the Conservative Party's so-called propagandists rather than by the research branch of the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Are we on student awards?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes we are; by the minister's department. In that document, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, in relation to the whole of who is going to be there, whether the poor or well-to-do.

Mr. Chairman: I was not sure if we were on it or not.

Mr. T. Reid: We are right on it. In this document which manipulates about five sets of statistics from five different sources, which means the statistics are not comparable, the conclusion is made—and I will put this one sentence on to the record:

> The under $5,000 income group comprises 8.5 per cent of the Ontario families, and 17.5 per cent of postsecondary students.

That reference is made to total postsecondary education in the province and not just university. But even that statistic is based on a fallacious comparison between various income statistics.

I discussed this last year, and to my regret the then Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) used that document to state that we had overcome the opportunity gap, in socio-economic terms, as to who was benefiting from university education, and I think the record will show that very clearly.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn to student awards and who is benefiting from student awards and who is not benefiting from student awards. I have documented this fairly carefully in a written form.

Today, 10 per cent of Ontario's university students come from economically poor homes, yet economically poor homes account for closer to 20 per cent of the homes in Ontario. In 1957, 14 years ago, this gross under-representation story was very much the same. That is hardly a 14-year success story for the Tory rhetoric of equality of educational opportunity as judged by the university performance.

Mr. Chairman, last year, 1969-1970, there were 102,000 full-time students in Ontario's universities. About 50 per cent received Ontario student awards, including 2,500 Ontario graduate fellowships, and of these approximately 51,000 students, only about 21 per cent had parents whose gross annual income was $4,000 a year or less. I think I should point out to the minister that the Economic Council of Canada defines material poverty for urban families at this level. A definition that verges on destitution in areas like Toronto, and perhaps even London.

Assuming, and this is an assumption, that virtually all university students whose parents had incomes of $4,000 a year or less received student awards, the conclusion is that 10 per cent of Ontario's university students come from economically poor homes.

Since close to 20 per cent, about 18.5, per cent, of the families in Ontario exist on incomes of $4,000 a year or less, the sons and daughters of the poor are badly under-represented in our universities compared to all the rest of the families in the province and grossly under-represented compared to the wealthiest 20 per cent of Ontario's families, whose children, I believe, take up close to 35 or 40 per cent of the available university places, particularly in the professional schools.

To put the participation gap in rough numbers, Mr. Chairman, the children of the poorest families in Ontario should account for over 20,000 of the 102,000 university students, instead of only 10,000. I repeat again my statistics are for 1969-1970.

In terms of the professed goal of equality of educational opportunity this index records a public policy failure rate of 50 per cent in this province. The story told by last year's Ontario student award programme—the OSAP programme—data will come as no surprise to those who have studied this issue in depth for the Sixties.

It is entirely consistent, unfortunately, with the evidence which has accumulated over the

last 14 years concerning who benefits and who does not benefit from public expenditures on our universities in this province.

The conclusion is rather simple. Only the very brightest and highly motivated lower class young person gets to the stage where he is even eligible to apply for an OSAP loan award to attend university, for to be eligible he first has to get through high school.

The OSAP programme does not even attempt to scratch the surface of that problem. Mr. Chairman, there is a new danger. With the tightening up of public funds for our universities, it could well be that the impact will hit the lower-income potential university student much harder than the well-to-do student.

Principal John J. Deutsch is so concerned that Ontario's universities could become even less accessible in the Seventies to the poor than they are at present that he has set up a committee to examine the issue.

I think that the general overall approach of OSAP, which is really a sort of trickle-down approach to accessibility, must be strategically supplemented by specific, selective programmes geared to the poorest one-fifth of our people who are so largely educationally disenfranchised, particularly at the university level.

I think, secondly, because OSAP at the university level is basically a financial assistance scheme for those who are neither poor nor rich, a student award programme for the poor should be undertaken at the secondary and elementary school level.

Mr. Chairman, one of the questions I would like the minister to consider, if he wants to reply to this analysis, is that in last year's estimates I noticed a sum of money—whether it was $2,000 or $10,000, I cannot recall—which was labelled as financial assistance, I think, to high school students. I would like to know where that is this year?

I would suggest it would be quite proper for the Minister of University Affairs to be concerned with the question of accessibility—that is, who benefits from university education—by becoming involved in financial programmes at the high school and elementary school level.

Let me return to the concept of what I call selective accessibility programmes which must be promoted and financed by either The Department of University Affairs or that department in conjunction with The Department of Education.

Here is a specific case history of the kind of programme I mean. It is a very interesting case history. I know the minister is aware of it and I know that it is receiving some financial assistance from The Department of University Affairs already, but I think it is an area in which the minister must move. And I think it is an area where, if he is looking for a change in direction to make his mark on the question of accessibility at the university level, he must move even more quickly and strongly into.

The following case history, Mr. Chairman, is most important and is tied in with my opening remarks concerning accessibility for black ethnic groups.

In the programme that Professor Charles Hanly of the University of Toronto initiated two years ago to help the educationally disadvantaged, he limited the programme to young blacks from various areas in the city of Toronto. All of these young blacks had been forced to leave school at an early age, although most of them had completed at least part of grade 12 in the four-year stream at high school. They had been forced to leave because of family pressures to get jobs or because school officials had advised them because of their economic status, and perhaps their colour, to enter the non-academic stream in the high school system.

Most of them found themselves in deadend jobs. When they decided to return to school, they found that they would have to return to high school and take the academic course. And their economic positions would not allow this, let alone the difficulty of being an older person in a high school setting and being treated very much as a young adolescent.

The programme that Charles Hanly set up in conjunction with some people from York began in the summer of 1969. A special summer education programme was set up. They were given basic readings of a first-year university level in economics, political science, literature, history and one special mathematics tutorial for two of the students who wished to go into science and engineering.

All the students were in the 19-to-22 year age group except for one woman in her early thirties who is a deserted mother with young children living on welfare in Regent Park. The common factors among them were colour and economic education disadvantages. None of them were judged, at that point in their education, as being academically acceptable to the university.

At the end of the summer, Mr. Chairman, their progress was evaluated by a review

committee of different members of the York and University of Toronto faculties. This was on a volunteer basis. All but one of the students were found suitable for admission to first-year university in the fall of 1969. Four of the students went to York and two to the University of Toronto. The six students were thus placed in a position whereby they were eligible to apply and to receive OSAP grant loans. The project was financed in the first year on a shoestring by small grants from York and University of Toronto. The tutorial work in the summer, and some during the term, was on a volunteer basis. The second year there was a small grant, I believe, from the minister's department.

The students attended university over the full academic year and all continued into their second year. Most of these people had very positive reactions to their year at university and they felt that they had received very fair consideration indeed.

I find it interesting that the programme is based on a moral understanding that the students will not use this education to opt out of helping the educationally disadvantaged in their own communities. It is not to be used as a means of escaping from their environment. The students understand this. Some of them have already become involved in volunteer work in their own communities. Most of them intend to return as teachers and social workers. One girl entered York with the intention of becoming a physical education teacher. After studying a first year social science course, she now wants to become a social worker.

The secondary gains, Mr. Chairman, from such a programme cannot be underestimated. Not only will the students benefit from this experience but their communities will also benefit. Professor Hanly states that he believes other suggested alternatives to helping the educationally disadvantaged will not work, particularly suggestions that these disadvantaged pupils can be reached by television. The individual human contact is needed and he feels that the two years in this programme has proved beyond doubt, as a case study, as a research project, that this type of approach can work and will work.

A small investment has produced astonishing results and great human benefit as well to those directly and indirectly involved in the programme. Professor Hanly said that before he started this programme he was sceptical about the extent to which environment could affect attitudes and goals. He knows now that the influences of the environment can be redirected and changed.

The woman on welfare is an example of what can happen in the short period of one year. Before she started, she was bitter and angry and had been forced into a state of passivity and reliance upon others by her environment. She felt trapped by her environment. These feelings have almost been completely removed, according to Professor Hanly. She still lives in Regent Park but she does not feel trapped there and she intends to help her neighbours who still feel trapped and she has done very well academically, I understand, in the programme.

The point in making this statement is that I think the minister and I know that Dr. Wright in his speech, that I will not quote from—his speech made in Kingston in June 1970 where he deals at length with this very question; and by the way refutes, I think, the so-called statistical work by the research branch of the Minister of University Affairs' department—I think the minister and Dr. Wright are very much aware of this question, and I am really asking them and the minister, because he is the publicly-elected official responsible, to really focus in on this very question about who is benefiting.

I think that he could, by formulating certain policies, perhaps by getting in touch with some of the researchers who are still left with the Senate committee on poverty in Ottawa; or harnessing some of the people who left that research group. They could tell him a great deal and suggest many lines of action again on a small test basis whereby people who have been left out, or people who really have been discriminated against in the elementary and secondary school system—who are now by the way perhaps 20 or 21—can jump from that low level of recorded attainment in the school system into university work.

There is a programme at the University of Chicago called "The Grits Kids Programme," and it receives support I believe from the US federal government, if not the state government involved. "The Grits Kids Programme" again makes it quite clear that it is possible to reach deeper into the community for students that could benefit from university education. The way students are selected there, for example, is through mathematical tests as opposed to linguistic tests. They have found that if students do well in the mathematical testing they are capable or there is a high probability that they will be able to achieve university work if they

can be in a university and have a special status in terms of extra work along with them.

One of the most important things about "The Grits Kids Programme" at the University of Chicago is that the students are guaranteed four years of university, and what they have found out is that the first year is very tough. Most of them failed, in the very real sense, their first year of university. But because they were not treated like failures and because they were guaranteed a place in the community and had their own hostel, the second year they came up. They were still below average, but they came up.

In their third year they came up to average and in their fourth year they accelerated where everybody else levelled off. Some of those kids are now into PhD programmes, whatever that might be worth.

I think the minister would be well advised to look at a project at Dalhousie University—perhaps he has already done so—in which the same type of programme of leap-frogging through the secondary school system right into university work has taken place. Again I suggest that a very fruitful area for the minister to get information about these programmes of selected accessibility programmes is from the Senate committee on poverty. The reason I know a little something about that is that I did one of the reports last summer myself for Senator Croll.

Mr. Chairman, I wind up these remarks by underlining the fact that I think still it may be breaking down, but I think still through the 1970s, and certainly well into the 1980s, the question of who is going to be influential in our society will be determined by who gets into university and who gets into various professional schools within the university.

Now John Porter documented this—his statistics end primarily in 1961, but I think basically his conclusions remain the same. I think when the minister gets back results about the socio-economic background of people in medicine and people in law in the province he will find a very great distortion in terms of a balance, in terms of the reflection of the socio-economic mix in our society. I would hope Mr. Chairman—I sound like a broken record after four years—that this minister will take this issue seriously.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Sure do, sure do.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Speaking of broken records.

Hon. Mr. White: The member and I are in substantial agreement in this matter. It is a problem which cannot be solved, I think, by a department or indeed by a level of government and is a source of very deep regret to me, that we have not, in 1971, initiated some form of guaranteed annual income—

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. White: —secondly, that we have not reformed the tax system which now bears too heavily on the less prosperous class. Thirdly, that we have not made available such things as "Head Start" programmes and those other aids which are needed by—what is the word we use now, deprived children?

Mr. T. Reid: Culturally disadvantaged!

Hon. Mr. White: Disadvantaged children! We have made some progress without doubt in making post-secondary education more available for the children of less prosperous parents and this is quite dramatically the case when it comes to the non-university post-secondary institution.

It was mentioned, I think a week ago, that there is a direct correlation between a parent's wealth holdings or the socio-economic status of the family and the probability of that young man or woman going to university.

That correlation does not please me at all. I am interested that there is an inverse correlation in the non-university postsecondary institution, and when added together there is an almost perfect fit between the school population—18 to 23 or whatever it is—and the population as a whole, or so I am informed. I have not done the research in this area personally, of course.

The programmes which have been established within The Department of University Affairs—and I think we have acknowledged that this is only one facet of the total society's influence in this matter—are of particular value to the children of less prosperous families as they follow in statistical evidence. This deals with universities only.

This is the distribution of OSAP awards to group A students, according to parents' discretionary income in 1969-1970. Under $3,000 there were 18,991 awards; $3,000 to $4,000—4,393 awards; $4,000 to $5,000—3,485; $5,000 to $6,000—1,889; $6,000 to $7,000—950 awards; $7,000 to $8,000—275 awards; $8,000 to $9,000—145 awards; $9,000 to $10,000—52 awards; over $10,000—23 awards.

The point is that this is a very progressive programme in and of itself. It does not recognize the limitations placed in the way of a student from a less prosperous household with respect to his total environment, which probably has not got the scholarly inclination one so often finds among the more prosperous professional families and business leaders and such like.

This is remedial to a certain extent at any rate, but there is a point beyond which The Department of University Affairs and the provincial government cannot go. It is a deep-seated social malaise, the remedies for which are available at the federal level.

And without going into a debate on the guaranteed annual income, let me make reference very briefly to the federal white paper—on welfare, was it?

Mr. Pitman: Income maintenance!

Hon. Mr. White: On income maintenance security!

I read that, and the officials set forth all kinds of reasons why a guaranteed annual income was complex; in fact one was pushed into the conclusion that it was so complex it was impossible.

By chance I had lunch that same day—I think it was that same day—with Jane Jacobs, and she said: "Do not forget there are two kinds of people on welfare. There are the people who get the welfare cheques and there are the people—

Mr. Pitman: Handing them out!

Hon. Mr. White: —who get salaries for working in the welfare department. It is these people who are living on welfare, getting their salaries, who impede progress in improving the system." I have been interested in this, so I called Jack Cahill at the press gallery in Ottawa. He had been assigned by the Toronto Daily Star to the experiment in Newark, New Jersey, I think it is, where they have a rather large control group receiving conventional welfare payments and quite a large group receiving a form of guaranteed annual income. I said: Listen, do we not in fact have a guaranteed annual income in Canada now for people 65 years and over?"

Mr. Pitman: We have one anyway.

Hon. Mr. White: We have not, though; that is the point. Anyway, there are a lot of things that can be done and are not being done—

Mr. Pitman: You have a combination of a great many grants, and pensions and insurance.

Hon. Mr. White: —and many of these responsibilities rest at the foot of the throne of the prince in Ottawa. And I must say that there are a lot more poor around in my part of Canada than there were in June, 1968.

So you might use the very great influence you have to bring the federal government into a more modern—

Mr. T. Reid: Let the minister tell us what he can do.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, well I have told you what we have done. As further evidence of what we have done I point out that 48 per cent of the students at Brock receive financial aid; 56.5 per cent of the student body at Lakehead receives financial aid; 52 per cent of the student body at Guelph receives financial aid; 65.7 per cent of the student body at Laurentian receives financial aid. So the assistance available to these students—

Mr. T. Reid: What is the average?

Hon. Mr. White: —is in inverse relationship —naturally enough, based on need—to the economic status of their parents.

The member for Scarborough East mentioned remarks made by Dr. Deutsch when he established a committee to look into this problem, but I think in fairness it should be pointed out that Queen's has limited the study to its enrolment because the problem exists at Queen's and not in Ontario. Dr. Deutsch's comments were confined to Queen's and they were not intended to be applicable to all of the universities in Ontario, as the figures just quoted might indicate.

The hon. member asked about the bursaries available for high school students. We are, as previously, providing them in the "other awards" at the bottom of the lefthand column of page 343—$100,000 of that $158,000 is for these high school awards.

Mr. T. Reid: Could the minister explain that to me? Under what conditions?

Hon. Mr. White: The intention of this is to reach down below the postsecondary educational level to assist students in their senior years who have the capability and the desire to go to university but who would not be able to do so in the absence of one of these high school awards.

It may be that thought should be given to expanding this programme. I am informed that this is a maximum of $100 per student. There are no fees if the child lives at home. But even so, perhaps this is the way in which we might attempt to deal with the problem from the point of view which we have in the department.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have some very specific questions because I want to make my position very clear. My statistics stand, because the minister has just proved them right. My three questions are these.

How many students from families, in which the discretionary income is $3,000 or less receive the student award? That is question number one. Question number two—this is at the university level only—what is the total number of university students receiving the awards? Thirdly, what percentage of the total student body received awards?

Hon. Mr. White: The number of university students receiving awards, whose parents' discretionary income was less than $3,000, totalled 18,991. The total number of awards was 30,203. The percentage of students in the Ontario universities in receipt of awards was 43 per cent.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I very respectfully suggest that the minister's first figure related not only to universities but to all institutions.

Mr. Pitman: Postsecondary.

Mr. T. Reid: Postsecondary. I have here—

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am sorry. It did not. It is on page 15 and it deals with universities only, although I have the numbers for the community colleges and teachers' colleges and others.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I just want to leave this. I will have to check it out. I think the important point is—and I will just give the minister my own figures here, 40 per cent—

Hon. Mr. White: We will provide whatever statistics my hon. friend needs for himself.

Mr. T. Reid: Okay, I will have these checked out. These are my statistics and I am quite prepared to admit I might be in error, but I do not think I am on this issue.

Hon. Mr. White: We are not as devious as the member might think. We will give him everything we have.

Mr. T. Reid: I am still looking for a complete breakdown on the minister's budget.

Mr. Chairman, for the year 1969-1970, this is what I believe to be the correct situation. About 41 per cent of the full-time university students in the Province of Ontario received awards, and of these only about 20 per cent had parents whose gross annual income was $4,000 a year or less.

One of the problems the minister is going to run into is that his department uses something called discretionary income and DBS uses gross family income. I just suggest to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that my statement that fewer, that approximately 10 per cent of the students in university today are from low-income families, by which I mean gross family incomes under $4,000, is correct.

Hon. Mr. White: What I said was that the percentage was one per cent, so we are making progress.

Mr. T. Reid: I would say that in the population at large such families represent between 18 and 19 per cent of the total families in Ontario. Perhaps we are going to have to have someone check this out very carefully. I state that the gap—and there is evidence for this, I think I could quote Dr. Wright very easily—

Hon. Mr. White: Nobody is arguing with the member.

Mr. T. Reid: That gap is there and has not disappeared as the minister implies in his statistics.

Hon. Mr. White: I did not imply it at all. I said we are going quite a long way. There are much broader and deeper problems which Trudeau and company should be attending to.

Mr. T. Reid: If I had the minister's power I would do a lot more about it than he is doing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have had a couple of calls over the weekend from students who intended to enter Althouse College in London. They have been informed, or at least it has been suggested to them, that the $500 bursary will not be payable to those who are entering the teaching profession. Is this for certain?

Hon. Mr. White: No; that is not correct. Some thought was given to that by the committee on university affairs, I think in an effort to rationalize the entire system, but because some of these colleges to prepare teachers were in a university setting and some were not, no change has been made this year.

Mr. Worton: But it is still in effect?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes it is.

Mr. Worton: Fine. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry on the discussion on student awards which has been going on for the last few moments. I think the minister would agree that, using the analysis that we discussed last night of the services at the postsecondary level as not being a ladder or appearing to be, but rather as a series of spectrum, what we would like to see, surely, is a system in which there would be the same percentage as there was in the total population in each sector of that spectrum. So there would be the same number of parents of those we call the poor, the same percentage as in the population at university, the same in the colleges of applied arts and technology and the same in any other institutional or non-institutional formats which we may be devising.

Hon. Mr. White: That would suit me perfectly.

Mr. Pitman: The minister would agree with this? So really what we are talking about then is the means by which we achieve that aim. I want to talk a little bit about student awards, because with all of its failings OSAP represents far more likelihood of achieving that aim than some of the other things that I see coming over the horizon, and which I am afraid the council of ministers are toying with at the present time, which really do bother me very greatly. This refers of course to the educational opportunity bank, or the contingency repayment loan scheme, however you want to refer to them; but I know there are many variations of this sort of thing.

I would like to comment just for a moment on what the minister said a few moments ago about the whole question of how we do something about the family situation, because this I think is the centre of the whole question. There are two things; the family situation and income. I would agree with the minister again and again that in any analysis I have seen of the problem that the member for Scarborough East has discussed this afternoon, income becomes the basic problem.

Again and again in the analysis, the way to deal with this problem is to do something sensible about the problem of income distribution in your society. I was very pleased to hear the minister say he was in favour of a guaranteed annual income, and of course now that is like being in favour of motherhood. Mr. Stanfield has said that he thinks it is a good thing. In fact everybody but the present government seems to think it is a good thing. I think that is true.

I think the figure we would have to turn to is the full question of what the minister, as representative of the educational status in Ontario, can turn to at the present time. I have stated that if I had that minister's responsibility, or his colleague's responsibility, there are two areas to which I would put my attention. One we have already discussed; that is continuing education. How do we provide educational services to people throughout their lives to make their lives more meaningful, more rational and more decent?

The second area the minister has alluded to is the whole question of early education. Now I think that we are realizing that this is not a simple thing at all. The "Head Start" programme is not working in many parts of the United States. The "Bootstrap" programmes are shown to be of very limited value because I think, as the minister has pointed out, you have the kid in a family. You have to reach the entire family. You have to reach that child's environment, especially in the family and the community, before you can really do anything.

What you really have to do is develop the concept of a community school, in which the family, the mother and the father, become a part of the school setting in which the school serves the family. In which, indeed, the school becomes the place where human development can take place for all ages in that routine. Where the child no longer goes to school and receives a whole series of concepts and values which are completely out of context with the family that he goes back to every night, and which create conflict and tension. I would say that that is the second area I would certainly put my attention to. But I want to turn specifically to the OSAP arrangements as they stand today, because I think we have to define, to give a far greater degree of attention to the detail of these arrangements. They have to be made more flexible. There is a

very real problem of determining independence and I think the minister realizes this.

The strange thing is that we actually encourage kids to get married when they are very young simply because once they have attained that connubial bliss they are independent, according to the Province of Ontario Student Aid Programme, and I think that is a very real problem in determining this situation.

I think we have to read into it the problem of the costs of getting employment in the summer time. I think here again we have a very rough unsophisticated kind of measuring stick that we have to turn to for far more than we have in the past. We have to agree that the comments which were, I think, presented to the Council of Ontario Universities, the committee on student awards or student aid of the Council of Ontario Universities, made some very good points.

I think the allowance for dependent children is too small in terms of the family income. I think you would have to agree that the basic allowance of $1,800 for parents themselves once again is too small. I always get the feeling that they are just a few yards behind, they never really catch up to reality; a very real problem for parents with that very limited kind of income.

I think the parents' rental contribution table, especially for families in the $6,000 to $10,000 bracket, is unrealistic. I have heard many student awards officers indicate to me the difficulties they have in explaining this kind of thing; and the fact that there are no cost of living differentials for different areas. It does cost more to live in certain parts of Ontario, and in many cases this means northern Ontario; and that is the very area we have been talking about in the last couple of days. I think it is true to say that the income assessment of self employed graduates is not realistic.

These are the areas that I think should be examined by the minister, as I say for one main reason, because I think the OSAP arrangements are going in the right direction towards the goal we both agree is the proper goal. I would think the best arrangement of all would be if we could get rid of the cost of education entirely.

Now that may seem like an unrealistic pie-in-the-sky kind of situation. Whereas really the cost to the student now is what—15 per cent; 17 per cent of the total cost of education?

Hon. Mr. White: Well do not decide that until you see the COPSE report.

Mr. Pitman: I think that is approximately the part that is picked up now by the student and his parents. I suggest to the minister that this probably is the area we should be looking at, and wondering about, as to why we should make a hurdle for 15 per cent of the total costs; whether there might be another way of dealing with that situation.

Hon. Mr. White: My interjection was applied to the wrong assertion. I am not predicting what COPSE is going to say in its report because at this point in time nobody knows. But there are certainly some who think that the entire $4,000 cost should be charged to the student—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I want to deal with that.

Hon. Mr. White: —and then the resources made available to those students who themselves, or their families, have not got all or part of the tuition; so you would be paying $4,000 to the less prosperous student and nothing to the rich student. So I would not try to eliminate the 15 per cent. In fact it will be more progressive as the 15 per cent moves up to something higher than that, offsetting of course the additional cost for the less prosperous students.

Mr. Pitman: I want to discuss that very concept because this is the educational opportunity bank or the contingency repayment loan scheme. My understanding is that the council of ministers for Canada are dealing with this subject and are coming up with some recommendations in this area. I want to suggest to the minister that that simply is not the direction we should be turning to at this point in time.

At the very time when he is attempting to conceive of education in as wide a sense as services to all people, why does he want to fragment the university group and say at the university this is what you have to pay? Because you get educational advantages at university level, therefore you will have a higher income, therefore you can pay back this money.

On the basis of that logic what are you going to do about the colleges of applied arts and technology? Are they going to be faced with that same payment too? Are you going to raise the cost and let them all pay this?

Could you not take it back to grade school? Why not have parents pay for their students

in high school? Why not have them pay for them in public school?

The logic of this, it seems to me, is tying education to the marketplace and it seems to me this is just the point in time, just the point in our history, when we should be getting rid of that concept. I think it has many spinoffs.

Some of them will be very obvious to the minister. For example, I would like to see the time reached when our young people who are in these schools, in these universities, in these campuses, recognized that they are accepting a tremendous responsibility as well as accepting, you might say, the gratuity of our society in allowing them to have this kind of educational opportunity.

In other words, I would like to think that every young person going to university realizes the total public cost and realizes that he is not paying for his education. I am afraid many of the students today still think they do pay for their education—very stupidly; as you say they are paying for 15 per cent of it.

The point is this. I am quite prepared to have them pay for it on the basis of their income tax, I am quite prepared to have them pay for it on the basis of the most progressive tax system that this minister or any other minister can find, but I do think it is most inappropriate at this point in time, when we are trying to provide against variety, the greatest heterogeneity of patterns of education, to tie us down to this kind of, I think, particularly unresponsive kind of cash-for-education concept.

On top of that, I think it has another spinoff. If the student does have a nice $16,000 loan that he has to pay off in the first few years of working—perhaps his wife has another $16,000 loan, that is $32,000—where is this money going to come from? It is going to come, surely, from the services that that person is going to demand of that society. What is going to happen to your doctors' fees, and your OHSIP payments? What is going to happen to your architectural fees and your educational costs? What is going to happen to your teachers' salaries and your education costs? In other words, unless you are prepared to put virtual wage constraints on doctors, lawyers—anybody who goes through university—I do not see how you can possibly control that kind of a situation.

Finally, I do think that it will be a bulwark against the very thing the minister is wanting to do. I think it will have a psychological effect on children of the poor and parents of the poor. As the minister said, "Sure, we are going to give $16,000 to the poor kid, we give nothing to the rich kid." But the poor kid then has a $16,000 loan that he has to deal with sometime in his life. It is going to have, I think, unfortunate spinoffs in terms of what careers people turn to. I know that if he has a low salary he will not have to pay at all, or he will pay it off over a longer period of time.

Hon. Mr. White: We are talking about two different things.

Mr. Pitman: Okay, maybe the minister can clarify what he is talking about when he answers me. I just have the greatest feelings of concern about this kind of arrangement whereby this minister, or ministers of education across the country, are trying to seek a politically advantageous concept of: "By golly, we can get rid of the total costs, even lower the total costs of education to the taxpayer by loading more of the cost on to individual students."

I do not think we should be tying educational services to money. I think we have been going in the opposite direction for the last 25 years, bringing down, step by step, the percentage of the cost of education to the individual student. I suggest to the minister that we refine, that we continue in that direction. I have a great many feelings that we can make our arrangements much more realistic.

For example, much of the cost of education is not the cost of education at all at the post-secondary level. It is the cost of food and lodging, which really should be in the hands of the Minister of Social and Family Services, it really should be in some other department altogether. I am quite prepared to see the minister's guaranteed annual income system comprehend the need for people to be in educational context and therefore to be looked after in that sense. Assuming that you are going to have, as the minister well knows, a large percentage of the people of this province and any other province in Canada who are not going to have employment in a sense of what we call employment today.

I agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) when he rails against Mr. Trudeau's comment that, in a sense, we are prepared to use economic, financial, monetary and fiscal policies to create unemployment. I do not think that is conscionable in a society. But I do think that in spite of the Prime Minister of Canada, or the Prime Minister of Ontario, there is going to be a continually rising proportion of the people of this province for

whom there will not be work in the area of production and goods and services.

One would hope that this leisure society would be rather a leisured-learning society, that we can provide educational services to take the place of what today we call work. I suggest to the minister, in this kind of a society the kind of scrambled educational patterns which we have talked about the last two or three days to tie education to money, to income, to future income—to tie it to a loan system which has to be paid back, I think is going to constrain it, to restrain it and I think it is going to fragment a whole concept of universal education. I just do not think that this form of educational financing is really relevant to the kind of society we are moving into.

Surely the minister will want to answer me at some future time. It is attractive to the universities too.

Hon. Mr. White: Why do we not do this one now before we go on to another?

Mr. Pitman: Well okay. I was going to say something more.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we are mixing two things. The contingent repayment plan, which is being considered in co-operation with the federal authorities, has to do with the incremental lifetime earnings resulting from additional education. We are making a mistake if we confuse that with the appropriateness of linking university costs in some way to the present wealth holders and present incomes of households. Dealing with the latter of these two—

Mr. Pitman: That is the possible arrangement.

Hon. Mr. White: —I think my hon. friend will concede that if we shift the cost from fees paid by the student to the consolidated revenue fund there will be a shift in costs from the more prosperous of our citizens to the less prosperous citizens if there is (a) regressivity on the revenue side—

Mr. Pitman: I made that point.

Hon. Mr. White: —or (b) if there is greater consumption of these university services among the more prosperous families, as indeed there is, and as the member for Scarborough East has pointed out, or if there is a combination of these two—

Mr. Pitman: The minister deals with that.

Hon. Mr. White: —which in fact there is in Canada now.

Mr. Pitman: Right, but you do not deal with it.

Hon. Mr. White: So when you urge that we decrease fees further and load that cost into the general tax system, you are urging that the poor pay more and that the rich pay less. Of course, we can have the best of both worlds here by charging fees at the present level or at a higher level and offsetting the fees through the OSAP system, which is based on the needs of the student and his family.

Mr. Pitman: I think I tried to be—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): May I ask one question?

Mr. Pitman: Could I give this—

Hon. Mr. White: Fine.

Mr. Pitman: I want to deal with this point the minister made. I tried to deal with both cases. I said one would assume the most progressive tax system possible. I admit the point the minister has made now; as things stand at the present time the minister is right, the rich do get the best deal.

But the point is that I tied in what I saw as the future necessity in terms of financing postsecondary education: Firstly, the most progressive tax system; and secondly, a rehabilitative education system at the elementary level. I was setting the stage when I talked about the fact we had need far more of this pre-school and early-school family education.

In that way you are quite right; it has to be a part of the scheme, because unless you do that your rights in the socio-economic problems will be undercut.

Hon. Mr. White: No. Unlike the socialists we have to take the world as we find it.

Mr. Pitman: Well, one hopes that like the socialists we might have a man of vision who would see that these problems can be dealt with.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why do you not try to change it?

Mr. Pitman: In a sense that one does not undermine the whole system by raising fees, that one deals with the problem directly.

You rehabilitate those who, for socio-economic reasons, are not securing the opportunities of postsecondary level education and you deal with the problem of taxation directly. And one hopes the federal government by some magic is somehow listening to what is going on in this chamber.

I would like to deal with the other problem, because I think this is a major one as well. The universities of course do find this attractive—and you will find the university presidents and the faculty associations become very excited about this idea of raising student fees. I suggest to the minister that they have a different purpose in regard to this matter, and it is one which I think also has to be dealt with directly.

Their concern once again is with what they see as the strictures of formula financing. They would like to believe that there were ways by which they can open up the system of financing universities which would provide them with greater opportunities to be experimental and do different things. We talked about that last night. I do not want to rehash that whole subject.

As well as that I think they would suggest that they have certain concerns about the fact that if this continues, eventually they will be completely dependant upon government money.

Quite frankly, I have said this to many of those in universities. I have not noticed any undue influence in terms of the government of Ontario telling universities what they should do or telling them to fire professors because of what they have said or written or the views they expressed. That has not been—

Hon. Mr. White: Well, that is a very nice vote of confidence! Thank you.

Mr. Pitman: God help you if you did! I think we have some tradition in this province. This is why I cannot understand who ever went absolutely berserk over on that side and brought down Bill 217 in relation to the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Somebody must either have really gone on a massive drunk or have been let loose out of an institution to have brought in a piece of legislation like that in this chamber. We have not seen it since. I suspect that, possibly, you might say the degree of feeling expressed across the province may have meant that that piece of legislation will not see the light of day in this chamber again.

To return, I think you deal with these problems directly, if you deal with the problem of tax, the problem of rehabilitation, the problems of providing the university with a greater degree of flexibility. The only thing I think the university can say with some degree of validity, in spite of what the minister says, is that they feel they have been forced or pushed in terms of accepting, in some cases, too many students that they can deal with in the way they feel a university can, in particular areas. I know we are going to get back to this whole thing again, and I do not really want to involve myself in this numbers game.

We rehashed this last night. But the point is that I think, with a greater degree of flexibility in the financing arrangements that we talked about—the formula financing arrangements talked about—it gets rid of the argument that the universities will be so totally dependent upon every cent coming from the government that they feel their academic freedom is going to be undermined. It seems to me that with all of these safeguards, I see no reason that you have to turn to any form of raising student fees as an answer to the problems of the public cost of education.

Mr. Chairman: On item No. 3, the hon. member for Waterloo South.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one question relating to the percentage of costs of university education covered by tuition fees. My understanding about the last five years—and I am only speaking of the statistics I have looked at from the University of Waterloo—is that the cost covered has dropped from about 35 per cent to 15 per cent this current year. Is this solely an inverse proportion as to the rise in cost? Is this a static level of tuition fees, or is this some overall design on the part of government policy that this is gradually being lowered?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, as a matter of government policy, we have limited increases in tuition and as a consequence, with the increasing costs of education the portion borne by the taxpayer through the consolidated revenue fund has increased year by year.

Mr. Good: But there has been relatively no change in the various universities in the actual dollar tuition fee in these past five years? It has all been taken care of in increased costs?

Hon. Mr. White: I think there have been a couple of small increases; but no they certainly have not increased in proportion to the costs.

Mr. Good: Do you envisage this reduction continuing as costs increase? It has gone from 35 down to 15 per cent and there are two schools of thought. A lot of people think, as you have suggested on one hand, that the taxpayer is paying an unduly large proportion of the costs for postsecondary education. On the other hand, there is the concept that this should be available to all citizens capable of taking the education and is a good trend. Do you envisage this percentage being reduced considerably below 15 per cent?

Hon. Mr. White: Lord Alfred Marshall said: "No short statement is ever perfectly correct with the possible exception of this one." I made the remark by way of interjection that we have to take the world as we find it and my hon. friend the member for Thunder Bay took exception to that. Now we have an application of this particular idea. We have to live in a world where Mr. Benson is the minister of finance and where his point of view is incorporated in the government policies of Prime Minister Trudeau.

Mr. Stokes: Well we are trying to change that.

Hon. Mr. White: Given this particular set of externalities, the system could be made very much more progressive by charging a larger proportion of the total cost to the user of the service, reimbursing the user when he did not have the resources personally within his family to pay those costs. I do not know whether tuitions will go up in the future or down in the future, but I feel perfectly sure that the Committee on Postsecondary Education will offer some commentary on this interesting subject.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I have one other question now in regard to the student awards programme before this vote is passed. This has to do with the method that is used to ascertain the eligibility of sons and daughters of people engaged in farming or agriculture. The net taxable income of people engaged in farming is not used as the measure for judging eligibility of these children. It is an entirely different method that is used than just a straight income tax figure as the income. There are added to the basic income tax figure many other things. In fact, they take the opposite viewpoint and they start with the farmer's gross income and to the taxable income they add a certain portion of what they consider would be benefits to the family.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the minister would look at this system. He is a new minister in the department.

First I feel it is rather discriminatory in that, while a farmer is allowed for taxable purposes certain items of depreciation, the students awards programme allows only $3,000 depreciation, as I understand it, that the farmer may claim as non-taxable income and, then, just a certain percentage of that above $3,000, with the result that in some instances where the farmer is living on a taxable income of $4,000 or $5,000 by the time the student awards programme is finished with his income they have it somewhere around $11,000 or $12,000.

Maybe there are circumstances where the farmer does have really personal benefits on some of the gross income for which he does not pay taxes and this, I think, is the theory or the philosophy that is used by the student awards programme.

As I say, the minister is new but I would like to have his undertaking that he would look at the present method that is used to ascertain the eligibility of children of farm families whose income is derived from farming.

Hon. Mr. White: I would be very glad to have the OSAP advisory committee take a look at the problem described by the hon. member. I will direct my officials to see that that is dealt with at the next meeting. In the meantime, if the hon. member has any particular difficulties, any particular application which he thinks has not been handled equitably, I will be glad to have him send it to me and I will ensure that it is reviewed.

Mr. Good: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not that. It is handled according to existing regulations. But I am asking you to look at the philosophy behind those regulations of treating a farm family for student awards, because, personally, I do not think the philosophy behind it is correct. I would like the minister to have a look at it.

Hon. Mr. White: I said I will do that.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to talk about the teacher education awards. This is on item 3, I understand it is under student awards.

Are the teacher education awards attributed $660,000? Are these awards directly to the institutions which are involved in teachers' education in place of the formula financing system which eventually will be instituted?

Hon. Mr. White: No. This money is given to the student in those cases where there is a

fee charged for that teacher education. If the student, on the other hand, goes to a teacher's college not affiliated with a university and where no fees are charged, he does not get this award. This is an attempt to rationalize the fact that some of these institutions are now part of universities with tuitions applicable, while other of the institutions are not part of the universities.

Mr. Pitman: Could I ask the minister whether in essence he will be responsible for teachers' colleges when they are in university, or will they remain in some weird way in the purview of the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. White: I think that it would have to be said when these become faculties of education, they will be in and of the university and, in fact, may be the largest faculty at some universities. To that extent they will be the responsibility of the Minister of University Affairs.

I suppose the Minister of Education will either establish certain standards unilaterally, or in co-operation with the institutions concerned, since he is going to employ the product of these faculties of education. In this respect I suppose, he may find himself somewhat in the position of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada, by which I mean an external set of standards may in some way be imposed on the institutions where these particular professionals are taught.

Mr. Pitman: I am a little at a loss to know whether I should make any observations on teacher education at the university level. I do not think I should at this point.

Hon. Mr. White: No, if you do not mind.

Mr. Pitman: I think probably this would be more appropriate under the Minister of Education, where the whole thing hangs up.

Hon. Mr. White: Right!

Mr. Pitman: In spite of the levity with which this is greeted on the other side of the House, I think perhaps I will let my remarks remain on the record.

I would like to ask you a question which is bothering me. What is going to happen when Ontario sends a representative to the council of ministers and you are dealing with all of the ministers of education across the country? Are you going together, arm in arm? Because it seems to me that most of the problems they talked about are involved with your department; and yet strangely enough there will be a minister of university affairs there, representing Ontario, instead of a minister of education. Does that bother you at all?

Hon. Mr. White: Well there was a meeting of the council of ministers on May 8, I think it was, and the Minister of Education and I went hand in hand, speaking figuratively, and on that occasion I did most of the talking because we were, in fact, talking about the financing of postsecondary institutions.

Mr. T. Reid. You have a lot more to say.

Hon. Mr. White: I am wondering about starting my own council of ministers of university affairs, thereby enabling me to have rather decent conventions all over the world, several times a year.

No we are going together and we deal with the matters as they relate to our respective spheres of influence.

Mr. Pitman: Just on this point, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister can tell us how in heaven's name he is going to co-ordinate what is going on between him and the Minister of Education? I get a terrible feeling that things are moving between one and the other, and there is a good possibility that, particularly with the Commission on Post Secondary Education bringing down a report, presumably next fall, it is going to have tremendous implications for The Department of Education.

I would like to know, in some real way, how you are going to co-ordinate what is becoming a very much larger empire under the new Minister of University Affairs than it ever was under the old Minister of University Affairs, as he then was, and also the Minister of Education. Just how do you intend to ensure that what becomes obvious and necessary at the postsecondary level is going to have the kind of response at the secondary elementary level to make some meaning? I am trying to rationalize, really, what you are all about.

Hon. Mr. White: That calls for a lengthy psychiatric analysis which I think we cannot undertake right now.

Vote 2602 agreed to.

On vote 2603:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2603 I think we can consider as a unit.

The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: I would just ask a few questions on that. Could the minister let me know the names of the members of the Commission on Post Secondary Education, something about their background, and, if possible, could he note any people who may have left that commission and the new people replacing them?

Hon. Mr. White: We are trying to find the list.

Here is the information you asked for:

The chairman is Dr. Douglas Wright, who was also chairman of the committee on university affairs. The 12 members of the commission are: David Black, graduate student at the University of Waterloo, previously on the secretariat of the Canadian Union of Students; Professor J. M. E. Careless, professor of history at the University of Toronto and biographer of George Brown; William Cherry, Mohawk College, executive secretary of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Students' Association of Ontario; Theo Davis, vice president of engineering at Dominion Foundries and Steel, Hamilton, and a member of the Council of Regents of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology; Dr. John J. Deutsch, president of Queen's University at Kingston, and former chairman of the Economic Council of Canada; Dr. Riva Gerstein, a Toronto psychologist, member of the Committee on University Affairs, and member of the Hall-Dennis committee; John V. O. Kelly, a Toronto lawyer, continuing an interest in student affairs developed as a former president of the Students' Administrative Council of the University of Toronto—Mr. Kelly as acted on behalf of a number of students organizations and faculty groups in the field of education; Professor John S. Kirkaldy, a past-chairman of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations—Dr. Kirkaldy occupies the Steel Company of Canada's chair of metallurgical engineering at McMaster University; William Ladyman, international vice-president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and a member of the Council of Regents; Hugh L. Macauley, past-chairman of the board of governors, Ryerson Polytechnic Institute, was a member but resigned a month or so ago because he was busy in other directions, serving the public of Ontario; William Newnham, president of Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology; Mrs. Edna Tietze, Master of English literature at Conestoga College of Applied Arts and Technology; and Professor Isabel from Ottawa University, who has been appointed very recently.

Mr. Stokes: Nobody from the north again.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for that; I should have had it in front of me.

When will this commission be preparing a report of some sort which will be public? Can the minister give us some idea when there will be some report; and is the report being published in sections dealing with specific issues, such as the question of how we should pay for postsecondary education?

Hon. Mr. White: The committee on postsecondary education issued an interim report of sorts in the statement of issues. They will, as they are required to do by the terms of reference of the order-in-council establishing the study, be publishing a draft final report in September or October. The terms of reference then require there be a further series of public meetings to provide an opportunity for all interested members of the public to give a commentary on the recommendations. That having been accomplished, there will be a final report published some time early next year.

Mr. T. Reid: If I remember correctly the former Minister of University Affairs and Education instructed the commission to look into the question of the alleged duplication of educational television facilities in Thunder Bay. I was wondering if my recollection is correct, and if so if there has been a report made to the minister and could we have it?

Hon. Mr. White: I think this matter was introduced in the debate last week.

Mr. T. Reid: It was a year ago.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it was mentioned by somebody here a week ago, was it not?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I mentioned it.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, the member for Scarborough East. I am not aware of my predecessor having given any such direction to the Committee on Post Secondary Education. Is that the question the member asked?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I think it was.

Mr. Pitman: I think they were studying the Lakehead and Confederation College and the amalgamation of those two. That was essentially the committee's responsibility I think.

Hon. Mr. White: I will have to get this information for you.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else on vote 2603?

Vote 2603 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. White: Thank you, gentlemen.

ESTIMATES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, since my appointment as Minister of Correctional Services some three months ago I have endeavoured to visit as many of our institutions as possible in order to acquaint myself with the department's overall operation. Although in this short period I have not been able to visit all of them, it is certainly my intention to do so as quickly as possible. However, I have already met all of the superintendents at recent conferences held in Toronto and have had an opportunity to study reports on various programmes.

I am pleased to inform the hon. members that I am generally very impressed by the department's staff, facilities and programmes. At the same time, I am fully aware that there is still much to be done.

One of the shortcomings of the present correctional system is the outdated local county jail. As you are aware, these old buildings were operated by the local municipalities until 1968 when responsibility for their operation was taken over by the province. Today the department's programme for replacement of these old facilities with modern new regional detention centres is well under way. On May 15 the Quinte regional detention centre was officially opened and it replaces four old jails. Five others are slated for replacement by new regional detention centres which are either under construction, out to tender or in the planning stages. Other old jails are on a priority list for replacement. The department's programme to build one new regional detention centre each year until all the outdated jails in the province are replaced is on schedule.

While there are other areas requiring attention in the present correctional system, there are also many programmes of which the people of Ontario can be very proud. I am particularly impressed by the staff whom I have met at all levels within the department. They are dedicated, humane and concerned individuals and they are working in a complex and demanding field and, from my observations, are doing an excellent job.

One aspect of the programmes which I am particularly pleased to see is the degree to which meaningful links have been established with local communities, particularly at the training school level and at such adult institutions as the Vanier Centre for Women. Our training schools have become an integral part of the communities in which they are located. Not only do your students use community facilities, but local youth and citizens make use of such school facilities as playing fields and swimming pools.

Our students also take part in activities which benefit local areas. For example, girls at one school assist the staff of a children's hospital on a part-time basis, and others are teachers' aides at a school for retarded children. Boys at another school recently participated in a pollution drive, collecting 12,000 items from the countryside, including glass bottles, tin cans, and so forth. Students at this school also raised $575 for the United Appeal at a booth they operated at a county fair.

During a recent visit to one of our training schools I was very impressed to observe a mother from the neighbouring community working with one of our wards who had reading and speech problems. Eight women from this area are working as volunteers in this particular programme, and we are indebted to them for the very meaningful contribution they are making to many of our students. A host of similar examples of valuable community involvement in our programmes are to be found throughout the pages of the annual report.

This idea of involving the citizens in our work is one which I wholeheartedly support, and which I intend to see extended throughout the Ontario correctional system. As most of you will be aware, the department appointed a co-ordinator of community programmes in January of this year. At the present time, plans are well under way to increase the involvement of citizen volunteers in our work. One example of expansion in this direction involves the establishment of a citizens' committee of volunteers who will co-operate with staff when the new Ottawa-Carleton Regional Detention Centre is opened early next year.

This pilot project will involve a committee of carefully selected men and women from the community. We visualize their role as one of helping the staff in developing programmes and activities to involve local citizens in the rehabilitation of those in our care. We look forward to receiving suggestions and proposals from them. Some examples of the types of activities in which citizens may become involved are: Counselling regarding employment, consumer education in matters such as credit buying, volunteer teacher assistants and aftercare help, to mention only a few.

These volunteers will receive some training regarding the methods employed in institutions and the nature of the offender and his culture. We are convinced that this will be a very worthwhile extension of our work and one which has considerable rehabilitative potential.

The department is most appreciative of the response of communities throughout the province to the temporary absence programme which was launched on August 26, 1969. In this connection I am especially pleased to pay tribute to the many employers and education and training authorities who have provided opportunities for employment and academic and vocational training to participants in this programme.

In the first 20 months of its operation 2,767 men and women have taken part in this programme. The fact that in only 36 instances was it necessary to revoke temporary absence privileges is an indication of the desire and willingness on the part of participants to accept the responsibilities and trust implicit in this programme. It is also a credit to all the staff involved in reviewing applications and making selections for participation.

It is not my intention today to review activities of the department in the past year, as copies of the department's annual report were recently distributed to all members. I would, however, like to mention two programmes, one of which is already underway and another which will be launched this summer. As the hon. members will be aware, the department has for many years operated a clinic for the treatment of alcoholism, drug addiction and sexual deviation. A new, enlarged clinical complex is now being planned to assist individuals in these categories. It will be located in the Brampton area and construction will begin within a few weeks.

In order to deal with the increase in alcohol and drug abuse, liaison has been or is being established with community agencies such as the Addiction Research Foundation and other treatment facilities. In northern Ontario our temporary absence programme has permitted our institutions at Monteith to make excellent use of community resources. Groups of eight to 12 inmates from the Monteith Correctional Centre have been involved in group counseling sessions at the Northeastern Mental Health Centre in South Porcupine. In addition, two social workers from this mental health centre lead group counseling sessions for students at the Monteith Adult Training Centre. This is an excellent example of the optimum use of existing government facilities and personnel, as well as of interdepartment co-operation.

Conferences and training seminars involving staff at all levels in the department are held from time to time to familiarize them with the best methods of dealing with problems related to alcohol and drug abuse. In this connection, I would again mention that this department has benefited greatly from the valuable assistance provided by the Addiction Research Foundation.

The experience of the department is that alcohol and drug abuse are often symptoms of an underlying personality and behavioural problem, and therefore treatment intervention, at whatever level, must try to deal with the basic problem. In other words, we must deal with the whole person. This is what we are attempting to do in the programmes at all our institutions, whether they are aimed at meeting the needs of young people or adults. However, the increase in alcohol and drug abuse has made it necessary to expand our efforts in this direction.

The department already has a number of highly skilled professionals who are not only engaged in treatment but also assist in the training of staff at all levels. In order to bolster their efforts and to augment existing programmes to provide balanced, full-scale educational, counseling and treatment programmes on drug-related problems, we are in the process of hiring additional personnel. A total of 50 new staff members are being recruited, composed of professional and supportive staff, of whom a number have already been hired.

We are well aware of the need to acquire workers who have special knowledge and experience concerning the current drug scene, and who can communicate easily and openly with young people. Therefore, in addition to utilizing consultant assistance from our own clinical and professional staff, the Addiction

Research Foundation, and community agencies, we intend to utilize representatives of those services who are already working directly with persons with drug problems in the community.

Hon. members were provided details of pilot projects operated by several training schools in recent years, which involved outdoor programmes utilizing some of the principles of the Outward Bound type of school. The department was very pleased with the results of these pilot projects and this summer we will launch Project DARE, a new year-round outdoor programme for boys admitted to our training schools.

DARE stands for Development through Adventure, Responsibility and Education. Project DARE will be established at a forestry camp located at Portage Lake, near Grundy Provincial Park. This programme will be divided into three phases consisting of: (a) outdoor education; (b) work projects; and (c) vigorous outdoor adventure—or what might be described as action-orientated education.

Each student will spend approximately four to five weeks in each phase of the programme. The facilities at the camp may also be utilized by other training schools during July and August for summer camping programmes.

In the first phase of the programme, the young person would be introduced into an outdoor education programme which will provide him with a better understanding of his natural environment. In the second phase, he will make use of his skills by putting them to work in a practical way through involvement in special work projects which are directed towards providing services to others.

In the third and final phase, he will become involved in the vigorous, physical experience of various outdoor activities. These will consist of a series of carefully-planned challenges designed to help him discover basically two things: Firstly, the fact that his own potential is much greater than he believes it to be thereby increasing his confidence in and his respect for himself. Secondly, the fact that to perform well, and even to ensure his own safety, he must learn to co-operate with others.

It is not without significance, nor is it incidental to the success of this type of programme, that lack of feeling of self-worth and an inability to form meaningful relationships with others are two common characteristics of those in our care.

Project DARE then, will provide a series of carefully constructed challenges, each more demanding than the last. Each phase of the programme will require the youth to reach out for a goal he may have previously considered to be beyond his capacity, thus enabling him to discover his own qualities by pitting himself against the challenges of nature.

These are some of the directions in which the department is moving in an effort to meet the special and individual needs of those in our care.

As a new minister, I am not as yet as familiar as I would like to be with all aspects of the department's operations. I shall, however, attempt to answer all questions honestly and frankly. I can assure all hon. members also that I intend to dedicate myself to the continuing development of a modern and progressive correctional system.

In opening debate on my department's estimates, I do so with a very open mind. It is my sincere conviction that there is much to be proud of in Ontario's correctional system. We are making tremendous progress. At the same time, I am fully aware that if we are to continue to make progress, we must continue to innovate and experiment.

We must constantly re-evaluate and research existing programmes to determine how we can improve their effectiveness. That which serves no meaningful purpose must be discarded and replaced by other programmes and facilities which offer potential for effective rehabilitation.

As I said earlier, I approach these debates with an open mind. The department is involved in an essential area of social concern—the fight against crime. This is a fight in which each and every one of us has an important stake. As such, it is not an area for partisan politics.

I wish to assure all hon. members that The Department of Correctional Services welcomes constructive criticism and suggestions. As minister of this department, I am both anxious and willing to co-operate with all hon. members and to discuss with them matters of interest or concern relating to any aspect of the department's work.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to my deputy minister, Mr. Leo Hackl, and the other dedicated and hard-working staff of my department. We are particularly indebted to the many individuals who serve with distinction on the

various advisory boards and committees associated with the department.

I also wish to express our appreciation of the assistance provided by Ontario government departments and members of various aftercare agencies and volunteer groups who have contributed toward the success of our programmes.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the work of my department is earning the support of all hon. members of this House. I look forward with confidence to receiving their unanimous support of my request for the funds to continue this important work.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, before presenting the views of the caucus on the operation of The Department of Correctional Services, I would like to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the members of our caucus for the co-operation that we received from the deputy minister and his staff here on University Avenue.

I would also like to pay tribute to the staff of the Guelph correctional centre. I can recall a few weeks ago, when I attended a meeting of a group of custodial officers of that institution, how they expressed concern about the five per cent limitation that the Treasurer had suggested should be put on the salaries of the civil service. Even though they were disturbed, they certainly expressed at all times their deep loyalty and conscientious manner in which they wanted to maintain the operation of the institution. So Mr. Chairman, I think this augurs well for the people the minister has working in his department.

I should also like to pay tribute to the work of the former minister, now the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), in the corrections field. I felt that he made significant advances, particularly in the day-release programme, in which he obviously believes sincerely. This progress in the department will always be associated with his tenure of office.

I should also like to extend my congratulations to the new minister and trust that his time in office also will be productive. He no doubt will have noted what his predecessor had to say about the federal Young Offenders Act, which it seems to me needs to be improved and clarified.

The present minister has had the advantage of working closely with his honour, Judge Little, when the minister was chairman and the judge was secretary of the youth committee. I have taken the trouble to read through the relevant sections of that report again in the light of The Young Offenders Act and intend to make some observations along those lines.

First of all, however Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the new minister to be more liberal in his interpretation of the visiting arrangements for MPPs and their staff to the various institutions of the department. I think it is a quite reasonable request to make, that a member be accompanied by a staff member on a tour of an institution and that this members' privileges be maintained.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Worton: I had hoped to study the Burwash complex for this debate, including the Outward Bound school development, but as a layman I felt I should have professional assistance. It is essential if members of this Legislature are to have an ombudsman role, as of course they have traditionally had, that they be allowed free access to the institutions of this province, even at inconvenient times, and preferably that they be accompanied by those who translate their concern into a form appropriate for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the record some of the sentiments that the present minister shared with Judge Little, when he was chairman of the youth committee and Judge Little was the secretary. I should also like members to listen to these words in the context of the federal Young Offenders Act, which Judge Little and Dr. Hansmohr of Osgoode Hall law school, among others, suggest punitive and custodial overtones, such as are said by some to be in the ascendancy in the provincial departments since the new minister took over.

On page 251, following the youth committee, he had this to say about delinquency—and though the figures have changed, the sentiment is even more urgent.

> When considering the adult figures, the results are strikingly similar to the juvenile pattern—a steady increase in the number of committals to penal institutions. It is important to realize that in Canada we simply do not have the number of people who form what we might call the hardcore recidivist group. Is it 20,000, or 30,000, or more? If the 45.37 per cent penitentiary and 80.36 general recidivism is, in fact, representative of a very small number going through the revolving jailhouse door,

we have no cause for satisfaction. It is more disconcerting that 80.36 per cent general repeater figures indicates a steady progression from jail or reformatory to the federal institutions and the prison population is steadily increasing.

Of these inmates, 45.3 per cent fall within the terms of reference of this committee—young people aged 16 to 24 inclusive. Recent trends toward differential treatment of delinquents in training schools—

and this Mr. Chairman, would have been my starting point for the Outward Bound inspection at Sudbury—

—will have more positive results, providing overcrowding can be avoided and higher level of qualified staff maintained.

Now I want to suggest to the minister that it is only by his maintaining this positive stance, which he took as chairman of the committee on youth, that he will be able, during his term of office, to build on the foundation of reform that his predecessor left for him.

It is completely up to the minister to set the tone of his department. He can imbue his staff with the spirit of excitement and challenge, or he can emphasize the custodial function once more at the expense of the reform function; and while winning applause from the community, at the same time set back the chances for the individual in society by many years.

Of course, property must be protected and people must feel safe in walking the streets. But we must not submit to fear and repression just because it happens to be the popular thing to do at any particular time. The minister must aim his sights higher than that.

That is why I think it is important that the minister should begin at page 255 of his report, with a review to making a few public speeches about The Young Offenders Act, the effect of which would put new heart into his reform-minded staff. The report says this:

The Juvenile Delinquents Act, section 38, defines the philosophy of the juvenile courts in this way. "This Act shall be liberally construed to the end that its purpose may be carried out mainly that the care and custody and discipline of juvenile delinquents shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by its parents, and that as far as practicable, every juvenile delinquent shall be treated, not as a criminal, but as a misdirected and misguided child, and one needing aid, encouragement, help and assistance."

The youth committee goes on to say in this report:

In many cases, young offenders are misguided. They do need aid, encouragement and assistance. This has never been the design, intent or philosophy of our laws respecting adults, probations to the contrary.

Their primary aim has been deterrence through punishment and protection of society through incarceration of those found guilty before the law. For such reasons, the committee is vitally interested in those young people who seem to be caught in the adult criminal law process while still exhibiting the needs of juveniles.

Setting up special courts for this group is a highly debatable question and one not met with general acceptance—

There follows discussions with quotations from many sources as to what the upper-age limits for juvenile delinquency ought to be.

One quote observes:

It must be remembered that an upper-age limit is fixed to enable the application of special measures to juveniles below this limit, and by raising this level there would consequently be a greater number of juveniles who would be eligible for special treatment.

In the light of this, Mr. Chairman, it is important that the minister make a positive response to the editorial in the Globe and Mail of January 13 of this year. I quote:

"The conviction is growing that The Young Offenders' Act in many key areas would be a retrogressive piece of legislation insofar as Ontario is concerned. . . . The most damning criticism of the Act, from the Canadian Mental Health Association, is that it is . . . "in fact, a criminal code for children, distasteful in its terminology, legalistic in its approach, and punitive in its effect."

Others that have said the same thing include Judge William T. Little, chairman of the Ontario juvenile court judges' committee on delinquency.

As I have already observed, his Honour Judge William Little was secretary of the committee on youth, but I am assuming that the report is not Judge Little speaking alone, and that all members of the committee and especially the chairman, the present minister (Mr. Apps), stood by and still stand by the sentiments that Judge Little so ably captured on their behalf.

To go on further with the editorial, Mr. Chairman, it says:

> The critics offer persuasive evidence for their criticism: The Act would require definite instead of indefinite sentences...

To comment there, Mr. Chairman, apart from "definite" having federal connotations, and "indefinite" having provincial overtones, apart from that technicality, you will recall that last year I spoke at length in favour of the sentence coinciding with the treatment, so that, in fact, it should only logically be of the same length as the treatment, that is, indefinite in every sense of the word, with the doctors and the social workers in effect, setting the terms and deciding when the young person ought to re-enter society and by what progressive stages, not a judge concerned only with the legalities of the situation and the deterrent aspects of the case.

To continue further with the editorial:

> It would require minors to be charged with a specific offence and eliminate the general offence of juvenile delinquency. In the most extreme cases—where a sentence of death or life imprisonment could be placed on an adult—when a person was released from training school, he could then be brought before a superior court and sentenced as if he had just committed the offence as an adult. The approach of the bill is legalistic with a lot of space devoted to informations, warrants, procedures and legal language.
>
> Perhaps most revealing is a comparison of wrongdoing in the proposed Act, which speaks continuously of offences, and Ontario's Training Schools Act, which never uses the word offence or anything like it.
>
> Both Acts allow sentencing where federal or provincial statutes are contravened, but only the Ontario Act adds that a judge can send a child to a training school, "if the parent or guardian of the child is unable to control the child or to provide for his social, emotional or educational needs," and if a training school is the only suitable place to send him. In this aspect, there does seem to be a much more sympathetic approach divorced from what seems to be a federal obsession with the concept of guilt.

My proposal, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister ought to set the climate of the ministry here in Ontario. I admit there is still too little evidence on which to judge the minister's performance to date, in a forthright manner which will bring aid and comfort to the progressive elements in the department that his predecessor nurtured.

In the end, we are dealing with human beings and if we cannot make them better human beings, then we have failed, regardless of how many fire sales we have nipped in the bud. Respect for property must always be high on our scale of values, but concern for people must always have a prior place.

Mr. Chairman, it is 6 o'clock—

Mr. Chairman: Do you have a few more moments to go?

Mr. Worton: I can, yes.

Mr. Chairman: I mean, can the hon. member finish it in a minute? I think we should come back at eight.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Visit of Prime Minister of Canada to Soviet Union, statement by Mr. Yaremko 2195

Visit of Prime Minister of Canada to Soviet Union, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 2197

Racetrack possibly closing because of insufficient support at betting windows, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 2198

Accommodation for transient youth this summer, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 2199

Portion of budget for youth recreation leadership training to go into hostels, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Deacon 2200

Study to improve legislation re lottery sales, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sargent 2201

Granting use of Mercer Reformatory grounds for tent city, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Lewis, Mr. T. Reid 2202

Permits issued to companies quarrying in Niagara Escarpment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deans 2204

Granting of janitorial contract to service Ontario Place, question to Mr. Auld, Mr. Lewis 2205

Ontario-Quebec co-operation to clean up Ottawa River, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Yakabuski 2205

Posting against fishing on Sydenham River near Owen Sound, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Singer, Mr. Stokes 2206

Huron Line tourist information centre at Windsor, question to Mr. Guindon, Mr. B. Newman 2206

Possible merger of Canadair and de Havilland, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Singer, Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lewis 2206

Justifying with Ford Motor Company their announced price increases, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Young 2208

Presenting annual reports, Research Foundation, Housing Corporation, Student Housing Corporation, and Housing Corporation Limited, Mr. Grossman 2208

Business Corporations Act, 1970, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2209

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. White, concluded 2209

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Apps 2236

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2241

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 54

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, at the adjournment hour I was in the last stages of my remarks and I had proposed to put them in the way of questions to the minister, of which I will send him copies so that he and his staff can answer them at a later time. I have put them in the order of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

1. Is there a long-range plan for the department for the next five-, 10- and 20-year periods, and if so, can the minister outline the goals and direction that Corrections is taking in Ontario?

2. To this end, does a planning department, as such, exist within the Corrections? If so, has it prepared the commentary on Bill C-192? Is the minister prepared to release that commentary to this committee?

3. Perhaps in association with his reply to my main remarks, will the minister comment on Mr. Justice Gale's observation that we have sent more people to jail in 1969 than has Britain, which has close to 60 million inhabitants? Has the minister examined the alternatives and the costs the community is prepared to accept to keep people out of jail? What is the exact increase in the prison population in the last 10 years—updating the figures in the report of the committee on youth—and what is the trend over the next period, five, 10 and 20 years?

4. Compared with the percentage spent on training and other aspects of our lives, is a sufficient amount of the Corrections budget going into training, particularly in in-service training? What value has the deputy minister found in his membership of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority in this regard? Has he moved them at all to produce professional development programmes for Corrections staffs?

5. In a recent announcement, is the minister satisfied that 50 counsellors are sufficient to cope with the drug problem?

6. What is the case for probation officers coming under the Corrections rather than as it is now under the guidance of the courts?

Those, Mr. Chairman, are my opening remarks. I will be pleased to have the minister's comments after the next speaker but in relation to the items covered, if such a procedure would permit of his staff being more fully consulted so that fuller and more definitive answers might emerge. I think the time has come when we must take a definite stand in regard to correction policies in Ontario in the light of the focus that the federal Young Offenders' Act and the recent Kingston occurrence has placed on two distinct philosophies. I know that a good many people would like to know, during the regime of the new minister, just where Ontario now stands in terms of this fundamental outlook. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Well, Mr. Chairman, like the minister I am somewhat new to The Department of Corrections and I do not have his panel of experts and maybe the expertise that he has gained over the number of years that he has been here, and the number of committees he has sat on. However I am going to do my very best to give him something to think about over the next few minutes.

Over the past several weeks I have read innumerable books, innumerable pamphlets, letters, pieces of literature, clippings from newspapers and I am sure I do not have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, of the many reams of paper that have been used up in criticism of The Department of Correctional Services. And not only in criticism of The Department of Correctional Services, but by The Department of Correctional Services itself to show its different programmes, to show its philosophy.

And yet, after reading all of this, and all of this that I have on the desk here at the moment, and many, many more pamphlets and books, I find that there is really no clear path for us to follow in Corrections, that day by day we make our plans as we go through the periods.

Let me sort of puzzle then what I should say as I stand up here tonight, because when I go back through Hansard, I find that most of what can be said has been said, if we are going to stick to the basic philosophy of this department, unless we veer away from that somewhat, unless we just take a sidetrack and try to come up with something new. I find it somewhat difficult, as I say, unless I wander a little away from the present philosophy of the department.

One of the things that hit me very hard was that while we talk about The Department of Correctional Services, we should be talking about the Attorney General at the same time. Because I can see no way that we can separate them, that we can take one apart from the other and still come up with a reasonable rehabilitation programme and with a system of sentencing that makes good common sense. Therefore, for the next few minutes I am going to wander from one department to the other, while at the same time relating to The Department of Correctional Services.

In all of these booklets, where we talk of rehabilitation and corrections, in fact, we are talking more of the punitive system of custodial care than we are of rehabilitation. Almost everywhere we look we see a reference to a new jail, to a new detention system, to a new system of assessment that has nothing to do with rehabilitation. What we are really saying is that we assess these people not on their ability to become rehabilitated and work into the community again but on how easily we can control them within our institutions in Ontario.

If we are going to continue to do that, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to continue to assess these people not on their rehabilitative prospects but on how easily we can control them, then what we are really saying is that rehabilitation in Ontario is only a by-word, such as the word that we have become so accustomed to use when we talk of the inmate in an institution—we call him an offender; we do not call him a prisoner. He is an offender. We do not call him a prisoner; we call him an inmate. The person who is accused is not accused any more, he is known by any dozens of names, if you go through all of this literature.

As long as we think in that vein and really do not try to bring the sentencing, judgement and rehabilitation and the correction processes all together, then what we have is four different and distinct steps in the process of corrections in this province. First we have the judgement; then we have the sentence; then we have the so-called assessment programme; and in most cases what follows is the custodial process.

First of all, one of the first moves I think we have to make—and I am sure I am not the first one to say this—is removal of a lot of people from the whole process. And I speak of the so-called common drunk that we have seen on every street corner in Toronto over the years. Anyone who goes downtown on Saturday night is sure to see 10 of them. Yet we still treat them like criminals. It is not uncommon to go into a home in any place in Ontario and see a person who has had too much to drink; yet we still treat them as criminals.

So we get them out of the correctional system and into the proper system that will look after their needs. And we are going to have a real problem in rehabilitation and in corrections. But it is not only with the alcoholics in this province, Mr. Chairman, it also applies to a certain extent to the drug addicts.

Surely the man who is taking a drug is in the same position as the alcoholic who drinks too much, and should be treated in the same way. We admit the man is sick, that he needs treatment and yet we haul him before a judge, treat him as a criminal and he ends up in one of our correctional institutes. And while we say we are going to treat him, it is a fact that the treatment given at this moment to most drug addicts in Ontario is five or six weeks in Mimico after they have served a longer term in one of the institutions. So really the treatment process is only a tokenism. It is only a small part.

If we are going to really do something for these people in respect of rehabilitation, then surely it has to be done from the moment we pick them up. From the moment they come into the system something has to be started, and we cannot do that as long as we have the sentencing procedures we have in this province. I realize that we are tied by a lot of tradition. We are tied by the constitution to a certain extent because the federal government has jurisdiction. By tradition the judge hands down the sentencing. By tradition certain things have been done

by The Department of Correctional Services and certain things have been done by the federal penitentiary system. But surely we can start and, maybe, one of the first places we should start is at the very moment the offender is picked up.

I know, Mr. Chairman, and you know that many of the younger offenders that are picked up and are taken into jail, if you go back into our day, they would not have been bothered by the police. I can remember, not too long ago when a youngster of 15 or 16 who had one drink too many would have ended up with a kick in the seat of the pants and been sent on his way home, or he would have been taken home by the policeman. Now he is taken to the nearest lockup and he is charged with being drunk under age.

I can remember when the kind who is now smoking pot would have been doing something else equally as bad in the opinion of adults. Even smoking cigarettes not too many years ago was almost a crime to a lot of adults. Today he is treated like a criminal.

I do not say we should just ignore him. I think we should treat him if there is a treatment available then we should have that treatment available for him. At the same time, I do not think we should excuse those persons who make a living selling it. I think there is a place in the correctional system for those people. But the person who becomes the innocent dupe of what is happening, the person who drinks too much because it is available, the person who uses marijuana because it is available, surely should not be treated like a criminal when in actual fact he is more of a victim of the system than he is anything else, and he should be treated that way. So we should be spending more time educating our policemen to use a little discretion. I am sure that does not go with all of the police force. I know there is a lot of discretion used. I can name policemen I am personally acquainted with who use their discretion day in and day out and do a very good job of it.

But I can also show you policemen who do not use discretion, who feel that to make an arrest is a feather in their cap and they will make an arrest at all costs. Unlike a crime where we have evidence, and we have a person who complains about it, it is not very often we have someone who complains about illegal possession of drugs. Usually when we catch a drug offender, the kid with the marijuana cigarette, it is because we have watched and beset. It is because we have put him in a position where he obtained that cigarette, sometimes at the insistence of the police. Surely for that to happen in Ontario puts our rehabilitation and correctional system back many, many years.

But there is also the point of the means of arrest. Several months ago I wrote to the then Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) complaining about a person who had his home searched. It happened on Sunday morning at 8 o'clock when everyone else was going to church. Two police cars drove up in front of the house. One drove up into the back lane. Seven policemen jumped out of those three cars, ran up to the house and found nothing. What they were looking for was a 700-pound article that I am sure no one was going to carry over the back fence. The policemen should have used their good common sense.

But they convicted that man in the eyes of his neighbours who were going to church. How does he explain to his neighbour that he had nothing to do with it even though he was found innocent, because there was definitely nothing found. How does he explain to his neighbours that he was not guilty, because they looked down their nose at him for a long time afterward? It was very difficult to forget.

I do not blame the policemen because I think they were doing what they thought was right, but I do blame someone who should have explained to the policemen how to do their jobs without putting a person—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am no great defender of the minister of this department, but I do not think he should have to answer for the Attorney General's responsibility and I just wonder if—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why does the hon member not let the Chairman be the judge of that?

Mr. Singer: Just let me talk. I think this is out of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that the minister is answerable for anything that comes under his aegis, but certainly his control does not extend to functioning in the police department.

Mr. Stokes: We have a chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I think probably—

Mr. Singer: I wish the loudmouth from Thunder Bay would just mind his own business. If he disagrees with me he can get up in the normal proper way and make his point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. Now that he has made his point, I would agree that some of this goes in with the Attorney General, but I would ask the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, how do you really separate them, because there are very many things—

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps the hon. member should let the Chair deal with the point of order.

Mr. Jackson: I will.

Mr. Chairman: I agree to some extent with the hon. member for Downsview, that the remarks of the member for Timiskaming do have to do with the Attorney General's department.

I would point out, however, that the member for Timiskaming did indicate to the Chair and to the committee, in fact, that in his opinion some of the matters that were under The Department of Correctional Services and the Attorney General's department are correlated. I can see his philosophy in this connection, and on that basis he is expressing his opinion that some of the matters dealt with by the Attorney General's department should properly be dealt with, philosophically, under the department of the Minister of Correctional Services.

Therefore, in this context I cannot really rule him out of order.

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member for Downsview never having dealt with the Attorney General!

Mr. Jackson: Let me go on to this: After the person is arrested I feel the arrest has something to do with whether he is going to be rehabilitated. But after the person is arrested he is taken to jail and then he goes to trial. Surely the trial itself for the first offender is a great punishment.

And here again we do something that can stop the rehabilitation process before it starts. We put many of them into a jail and we put them in with third, fourth and fifth offenders. We do not segregate them because in many communities we cannot segregate them. So we have immediately done something that is going to make rehabilitation more difficult if he is found guilty.

I am sure the member for Downsview will agree with me that here the bail system comes into it—that we should get the first offender out of that atmosphere as quickly as possible, unless we agree—and I am sure that that is up to the judge—that he is too dangerous to turn loose in society and in that case we keep him in custody.

Mr. Singer: The point is well made, but still the man is declared a criminal.

Mr. Lewis: Only because of the absurd system of justice in this province.

Mr. Jackson: To go on, we then run into a situation where—the member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman, will have his chance, as he has every time. If he wishes to tear apart what I say later on, fine, but right at the moment I would appreciate it if he would just listen.

Mr. Singer: I am listening carefully, that is why I intend to follow the order.

Mr. Jackson: We then convict the man, if he is guilty, and at that moment we get into the correctional system. But at that moment, and as the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) who spoke for the Liberal Party pointed out, at that moment we put him into a system of correction, trying to fit him into the system rather than fitting the system to him.

We have taken him and convicted him. The judge has sentenced him to a term, either definite or indefinite; or definite and indefinite; and then we say we will find a place for him in the correctional system. I do not know how it is done. In all of this paper, and I am sure in all of the paper that you have read, you do not really know how it is done. I know we can find a place for him; we can assess his abilities; we can assess his attitudes; but then we try to rehabilitate him by teaching him a trade. If he is in there for six months we try to give him enough knowledge that in six months he is going to come out as a better citizen.

In most cases in six months he has not even learned the real ropes of the institution. He has not found his way around. What I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that before we pass sentence on that person, instead of this pre-sentence report that now exists and is never used except in very isolated instances, we do as the member for Wellington South said. We do have the assessment before sentence. I do not agree with a committee, because I am sure that the minister has read Jessica Mitford's paper, "Kind and Usual Punishment" in California. It points out very good

reasons why the committee system does not work.

I believe the judge should pass a definite sentence, but it should be a sentence based on good judgement on knowledge, and full knowledge of all of the facts in the situation. When he does, as he does now, in one in 25 or one in 30 situations, ask for a pre-sentence report, the person who does it many times is the parole officer or a local social worker. In my humble opinion I do not think any parole officer or any social worker has the expertise or has the time, and is just not competent to write a report that will give the judge enough knowledge that he can make an accurate assessment of the man's needs.

Unless we have that accurate assessment of his needs the judge cannot make an intelligent assessment of his needs, and cannot make an intelligent sentence, or cannot pass an intelligent sentence. It might seem that I am saying that the judges are not intelligent. I would not want that to be thought, because I think they are. But all you have to do is to go to the city hall in the city of Toronto, or into any courthouse in this province, and see the workload that the judge has.

You realize that he does not have the time; he just does not have the time to assess each individual case.

Even with a pre-sentence report, unless some very serious recommendations are made in that pre-sentence report, the judge does not have the time to assess it himself. I am sure when he does, he goes through it and he sees that the man has not had too many convictions; he is good to his wife. We will make the judgement on that basis alone. Well that is not an accurate assessment of the man's needs.

How do you fit him into a so-called correctional system? Unless you are saying that rehabilitation comes second and the punitive system comes first. I do not think it should and I do not think the minister really intends it that way. I am sure most of his officials do not intend it that way.

They want, as I do and everyone else in this province, people out of jail; they want them as working, responsible citizens. Under the present system, I do not see how it can possibly be. If we look and see what is happening, we find Ontario, in fact, we find Canada, jailing more people than any other country in the western world, other than certain American states.

At the same time that we are jailing, who are we jailing? We are jailing people who should never be near a jail. The alcoholics, the drug addicts, those persons who, because of mental defects, cannot help themselves; but they all end up within the correctional system. Any effort that we are making right now to assist those people, in my opinion, can only be classed as tokenism.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabour the point. I think I have made that point and I have got quite a bit more to add.

What I am saying to the minister at this point is that if we are going to have a correctional system that works, that will rehabilitate people and put them back into the work force to make responsible citizens of them, we have to forget tradition—and we have to forget what the member for Downsview said, "that it is in the Attorney General's department," because this government claims to be built on co-operation between departments.

Let us see the co-operation here. Let us get out and co-operate. We have the facilities —or we will have the facilities. The department is now building a new facility for assessing the needs of these young offenders. Let us get a report from them that can guide the judge in his sentencing.

If a person does not show the ability to come back as a responsible citizen, then we have no choice but to sentence him to a punitive term. But if he shows the slightest ability, the slightest inclination, then he should have the opportunity. Not only should the offender have the opportunity, but the people of this province who are paying the bills should have the opportunity to see him back out earning his own keep so that we do not have to keep him in there at great cost to us—if we want to put money ahead of people, and I do not. I am sure that it will appeal to a great number of people in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to leave it at that because I think I can say what I want to say later on. The only thing I do say is that surely the government can co-operate within itself. Surely the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) can sit down with the Minister of Correctional Services and work out a system that will honestly put a rehabilitation system into our correctional services, so that we can put some of these people back on the street as good, responsible citizens.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon minister wish to reply?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the member for Wellington South, first of all

I would like to thank him for his best wishes and also for the good words he said about my predecessor.

He was concerned about my reaction to The Young Offenders Act and I would like to assure him that I have gone into this very carefully. I have gone over all the correspondence of my predecessor who was very definite in his views about it. One of the first things that I did when I assumed this office was to write the Solicitor General in Ottawa expressing my concern about Bill C-192 and also to ask him if we might not be able to get together to discuss it. I sent two or three letters about this and some other things that are of concern to us and as yet we have not been able to arrange a suitable date to get together. I was hoping that when he came to address the John Howard Society about a month ago that he could come a little bit earlier, but his schedule was such that he was not able to do it. However, we still hope to have that opportunity of discussing it with him.

I was very pleased to hear the member for Wellington South express his views in connection with Bill C-192 because I agree with him. I certainly do not like these punitive aspects of the bill. I do not like the definite sentence. I do not like the double jeopardy clause in the bill or much of the terminology or even the philosophy of the bill. I do not like the idea of a judge being able to have them photographed and fingerprinted if he so wishes. I think this is going to be very serious as far as our young people are concerned.

Just a few days ago, I met with the Minister of Justice in an effort to co-ordinate our views, because as the member for Timiskaming has indicated there are many things that interrelate between the two departments. This particular discussion was to try to present a brief to the Solicitor General outlining our objections to the bill as far as he was concerned and as far as we were concerned.

So I would like to allay the fears of the member for Wellington South in that we are very much concerned about how this bill will affect our particular correctional system here in Ontario.

He also brought up the point that he would like to have members of our Legislature along with research assistants or some other people go with them when they visit institutions. As you know, we do not have any objection whatsoever to a member of the Legislature visiting our institutions; as a matter of fact we welcome it, because I do not think we have anything to hide. Some may be better than others, but I do not think we have anything to hide.

Having someone else go with them does create certain problems. Now I can assure the member for Wellington South that we will look into this very seriously to see if we cannot come up with some kind of a solution to the problems of confidentiality, anonymity and several other things that concern us about this. We will look into this and see if we cannot come up with some reasonable solution so that members may be able to take other people with them when they go and visit the institutions.

Now the member for Wellington South sent me a long list of questions. I would like to go over them and answer those that I can; where I cannot I will get the information for him at a later date.

First of all: Is there a long-range plan for the department for the next five-, 10- and 20-year periods and if so, can the minister outline the goals and directions that the department is taking in Ontario?

I would say yes, there is a long-range plan to the extent of five years. This is being re-evaluated at the present time because circumstances change; as a matter of fact, we have a meeting set up for next week in order to go over the long-range five-year plan of the department.

The second question: To this end, does a planning department, as such, exist within Correctional Services? If so, has it prepared a commentary on Bill C-192? Is the minister prepared to release that commentary to this committee?

Well I think my previous statements pretty well answered that question for the member.

And he also asked: Perhaps in association with his reply to my main remarks, will the minister comment on Mr. Justice Gale's observation that we have sent more people to jail in 1969 than has Britain, with close to 60 million inhabitants? Has the minister examined the alternatives, and the costs the community is prepared to accept, to keep people out of jail? What is the exact increase in the prison population in the last 10 years —updating the figures in the report of the committee on youth—and what is the trend over the next period of five, 10 and 20 years?

The statistics I will arrange to have sent to the member. He will understand I do not have those at my fingertips at the present time.

The question of sending more people to jail really is a question that probably should be put to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General's department because in reality they are the ones responsible for putting them into our jails.

Compared with the percentage spent on training in other aspects of our lives, is a sufficient amount of the Corrections budget going into training, particularly in in-service training?

Yes, larger and larger amounts are going into service training. We have very comprehensive training procedures for our correctional officers, and I think that the upgrading of the correctional officers already working in the various institutions and the new ones who are coming in are getting a very good training in our philosophy of how they should go about their particular job.

Then he asked. What value has the deputy minister found in his membership in the Ontario Educational Communications Authority in this regard?

I am sorry, I cannot speak for the deputy minister and I will get him to advise the member on this particular question.

The next one: In a recent announcement, is the minister satisfied that 50 counsellors are sufficient to cope with the drug problem?

Mr. Chairman, we are never satisfied with the number of people we have. We feel that in light of the restrictions placed on many departments we are fortunate in being able to get an additional 50 to help us cope with the drug problem. As for being satisfied, I do not think that we can be satisfied until we have got the problem completely beaten, which of course is not the case. But I feel we are fortunate in getting this many added to our complement when other departments have not been able to add any at all.

What is the case for probation officers coming under Corrections rather than as now under the aegis of the courts?

Probation officers, as you know, now come under The Department of the Attorney General and they look after people who have been sent on probation; as far as their coming under one particular auspices is concerned, I cannot give you an answer to that at the present time.

It might be a good idea to have the whole thing come under The Department of Correctional Services but at the present time I have not discussed this with the Attorney General. I will certainly do so to see what complications there might be in this connection.

There may be other questions that you have asked in your opening remarks which I have not covered. If so, perhaps during the estimates you might bring them up and I will try to answer them for you.

With respect to the comments of the member for Timiskaming, I am sympathetic to his reaction that there is a great deal of correlation between sentencing and what happens to them after. At the present time, as you know, we are responsible for those who have been sentenced by the courts; that is the dividing line. Once they have been sentenced by the court, they are our responsibility from then on.

The other thing that he mentioned could well be directed to the Minister of Justice but if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on a couple of them. I have felt—and this is a personal opinion as far as I am concerned—that not enough attention is given to the training of police officers who are dealing with young people. I think that there should be special training courses available. I do not mean a day, but I mean a month or a six-week, or even a two-month course in an effort to make sure that all those officers who are, particularly, going to be dealing with young people are trained in this aspect of their work.

I agree, too, that some people, in many cases depending on their status in life, may be put in jail and other people may be sent home. I think this is something that we should certainly try to avoid, but I am going to have to say that this, at the present time at least is the responsibility of The Department of Justice. As such, it does not really come within the purview of these particular estimates.

I would, however, like to comment on one other thing. The member mentioned, I believe, that we read from time to time in the newspaper of the building of new facilities; for example, the opening of the Quinte detention centre in Napanee on May 15. I do not know whether the member for Timiskaming was down there; I did not notice him there. One of the chief reasons for the building of that particular detention centre, other than the fact that the jails that were replaced were very outdated, was the fact that it will give us more scope for rehabilitation.

Most of the old jails of the province—and many of them were built between 1835 and 1870—were all maximum security types; they

were pretty old, dingy places. No matter what charge you were arrested on, you were put into one of these old jails. In Napanee, sure we have maximum security cells, but we also have minimum security cells for people—and there are young people and old people as well—who are really not dangerous, who will not be put in with hardened criminals.

This is one of the reasons for these new facilities. We can do a better job, first of all, in segregating the first offender from the second, third, fourth and fifth offender, and also at the same time give us more scope for social workers and others to work with those people who have been sentenced to these jails.

Another thing that I mentioned in my opening remarks was our temporary absence programme for those people who meet the requirements and are not kept in jail. They are allowed to go home. They are allowed to work. They are allowed to go to school, in many cases, provided they meet with the requirements of humanitarianism and rehabilitation.

This is another area in which we are really trying to keep people out of jails. We are not trying to second-guess the judges at all. They sentence them. We have to look after them, but when we assess them, and if they apply for the temporary absence programme and they meet our requirements they are allowed to go into the community. I think this is a very good idea.

As far as our rehabilitation programmes are concerned I would like to read you a letter that I received yesterday. As a matter of fact it came in pretty handy as far as these estimates are concerned. It gives an indication of the type of rehabilitation we are trying to achieve, and that in some cases we are successful. This comes from northern Ontario, which will be of particular interest to the member for Timiskaming, and it says:

> Dear Sir: I have just terminated a sentence of six months in Monteith. Fortunately I was one of the inmates to be picked to attend a group therapy in South Porcupine. I cannot go into details about my record, but it is not a good one.
>
> What I am trying to say is that in all the institutions that I have been in, this is the first time I was ever helped. Approximately eight months ago I was coming to the point of suicide. To me, then, this was the only answer to my problems. It took the South Porcupine programme and Mr. Groulx, who, you may know, is the assistant superintendent of Monteith, to really help me to understand and help myself face these problems without alcohol.
>
> If there were only more programmes and people like Mr. Groulx I am sure there would be a better chance for people like me, because I am not the person you have on your files and I am sure there are many more just like me in other institutions.

This letter, unsolicited, is from someone who feels he has been helped by the programmes that we have in operation; in this particular case in Monteith. We are endeavouring to do this type of work in all our correctional centres.

I will be the first one to say that we are not perfect. As a matter of fact, sometimes I think that people who have been sentenced —who have been out in the world for 25, 30, or 40 years and then are sentenced—they are put in jail or sentenced to a correctional institution and suddenly, we have got to have all the answers, as if we are going to cure them.

We are endeavouring to do as much as we can, and I wish some of the gentlemen here would take the trouble to go to some of our institutions, particularly some of our juvenile training schools, and watch the work that is going on there and I think they would come away very much impressed.

If you go to the Vanier Centre for Women in Brampton and see what we are trying to do there you will come away very impressed. And this is the philosophy behind our whole department. We have a statement of purpose here which I think you have read. Just in case some of you have not I am going to read it for you.

It says:

> The main purposes of The Department of Correctional Services are
>
> 1. To carry out the legal duties imposed upon the department by the courts for the protection of the society. This we have to do.
>
> 2. To attempt to modify the attitudes of those in its care and to provide them with the kind of training and treatment that will afford them better opportunities for successful personal and social adjustment in the community.
>
> All our programmes must be designed with prime emphasis on these purposes and carried out in such a way that they are in consonance with each other.

I think this is a good example of our statement of purpose and there are many others which I could quote for you.

I think the other particular question was in the case of drug addicts and alcoholics. One of the things I think we must realize is that it is pretty hard to cure somebody who does not want to get cured and he really has to signify to us that he wants to be cured, whether it is of alcoholism or whether it is of drug addiction.

As you know, we have the A. G. Brown Memorial Clinic in Mimico, and up until about a week ago, people who expressed the desire to be cured of their drug addiction or their alcoholism were sent to Mimico for the last three to six months of their sentence. We have changed this so that people who are serving a shorter sentence than this will also be sent to the clinic in an effort to try to help them within a limited period of time. When the new clinic is built in Brampton—and this building will be started this month—all drug addicts will go directly to the clinic.

But I would want to express again the two things that we say in our statement of purpose. We are going to keep those that are sent into our care and we are going to do as much as we can for them while they are there.

As I mentioned earlier, we have not got all the answers. We would be most interested if we could get some members of the opposition's answers. That might be of help to us, because we are willing to try.

Now Mr. Chairman, I may have missed some of the questions that the member for Timiskaming asked, but if I did, perhaps when we are going over the estimates he might ask them again and I will try to get the answers for him at that time.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, one of the great problems we get into in this department is its difficulty in operating in a vacuum. This is the reason that the hon. member who spoke for the NDP got into some difficulty. Over the years—

Mr. Pitman: You were the one who got difficult.

Mr. Singer: Oh no, oh no!

Over the years, we have said that the ability to consider The Department of Correctional Services as a separate and distinct institution operating by itself, operating with a separate civil service, operating apart from either The Department of Education or The Department of the Attorney General, makes no sense whatsoever because to the extent that the hon. member for Timiskaming wanted to interject the procedures in the courts, the attitudes of Crown attorneys, the attitudes of judges and so on, he was dealing with a very important part of this problem. But to the extent that we can call this minister to account for anything that happens to those persons who are dealt with by all of these officials, until they are delivered into the care of himself or his civil servants, is completely separate and apart.

And so, Mr. Chairman, this is why we have said over the years that it makes no sense—other than as a make-work project to create another minister and another personal hierarchy in command, another car and another driver and another executive assistant and another separate set of civil servants—to have this department separate and distinct from those departments with which it must work as an intimate part of government organization; not withstanding the fact that we have said this year after year, and notwithstanding the approach of the member for Timiskaming, I was not trying to set him by the heels at all. I am trying to highlight now the difficulty that this House has faced ever since this department was created as a separate entity.

As long as this sort of thing continues, Mr. Chairman, then just so long is this minister going to be able to say: "Well, I do not know what is going on, I can only treat the people who are there; rest assured I will talk to my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and when so far as it gets to Education, rest assured I will talk to him, and hopefully we will have together a continuing programme which will be to the good of all the people of Ontario."

Mr. Chairman, the point simply is that this just does not make sense, because unless and until we begin to examine a system of approach to bail problems in conjunction with our penal system, a system of instruction and co-ordination of the efforts of various Crown attorneys, a system of instruction and awareness, by and large, of our provincial court judges who are going to be dealing with sentencing; until we have a real understanding on the part of the provincial judges of what is available in our prison system, whether it be provincial or federal, of rehabilitation methods and so on; until we are able to say as a whole, this is how we deal with people with alcoholic problems, this

is how we deal with people with drug addiction problems, this is how we deal with people with mental problems, then, Mr. Chairman, the point I think is simple and obvious: the system is just not going to work.

I am sure if we had the Premier here tonight he would say: "Yes, I have heard this, the matter is under investigation, and in due course, it being a matter of government policy, we will let you know if and when we make a decision."

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): In the fullness of time!

Mr. Singer: So it is somewhat ludicrous to have to go through the estimates of this department year after year. Other than the nuts and bolts of a mechanical situation, most of which is not created by this minister, there is really nothing here that we can put our teeth into, because the people responsible for the whole system do not come before us together.

One minister is not responsible for the whole system, and so to effect or suggest any valid criticism other than hopefully to expect the minister to convey something to the Attorney General—I do not know whether they speak to each other, they might once in a while, or to debate something with the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch). How often they talk together I do not know either. The whole thing is so frustrating because we make the same speeches year after year.

Every year since I have been here, the same theories are put forward and the same kind of answers come back. Yes, we are building nicer buildings; yes, you are providing better trained and better paid custodial officials; yes, there is no great malevolence, and you are trying to do a job, but the job isolated in the way it is, Mr. Chairman, is to my mind meaningless.

This is why our party has said for so many years that this department has to join up and be an integral part either of The Department of Education or The Department of Justice so that as a whole we can deal with this. This is the idea that we took to our policy convention several months ago. It was advanced by some of us in presenting those policies and this has been adopted, and it has been said year after year after year. But listening to the minister, there is no imagination of this kind brought to the problems of government in this regard. There is no idea other than the casual, apparently corridor, conversations that they have that there is any great desire to integrate.

I look at the estimates here, I see that the centre of criminology gets a grants of $30,000 from this department. Then I turn over to the Justice estimates and I see that the centre of criminology gets another substantial grant out of The Department of Justice. It gets $48,800. I would have been interested to hear the Minister of Correctional Services tell us what, in fact, the centre of criminology does for his department; what particular recommendations it has, the extent to which it co-ordinates its advice to him with the advice that it gives to The Department of Justice and if there is any meaningful pattern of co-operation. But that is not the sort of thing unfortunately that we get. I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat this once again for the record so that hopefully some day we are going to have a Minister of Correctional Services stand up and say, "By myself I am nothing, but I can only be meaningful in the whole pattern of the job that is given to me insofar as I can fit in with the pattern of The Department of Education and/or The Department of Justice." But that is not the sort of thing we can get.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that after the next election when we take over the government, that this is the pattern that we are going to adopt. The thing will be changed and there will not be a minister in this department functioning on his own and all by himself.

I was intrigued, Mr. Chairman, by the comments of my colleague from Wellington South when he said he arrived at one of the institutions along with one of our office workers, one of our research men, within the Liberal Party, whom he asked to come along with him, to take notes and to help advise him, and that he found, much to his chagrin, that while he could go in himself, the gentleman whom he brought with him was denied admittance.

I was more than fascinated, Mr. Chairman, by the intriguing reply given by the minister to the effect that this was very serious and that the institution certainly should be open to ministers, he said at first. I think that is what he was thinking. It was just a Freudian slip, I am sure. He later corrected it to say members. Hopefully, he said, they were going to look into the thought of seeing if other responsible people should or could come in—they were going to investigate it, I am sorry. He then got caught up in the stock answer of his leader and said they were going to

look into it and, in due course, as I understand it, government policy will be announced in the fullness of time.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the minister had his heart where his mouth was, he would have said that a responsible person such as my colleague from Wellington South, or anyone of the other 116 members, as of right, should be able to go into those institutions to see what is going on, to make his own observations, and had a duty then to criticize or compliment as he sees fit. Then when one other person arrives with him, who this member is responsible for or any other member is responsible for, surely there cannot be a question that that other person should, in fact, be admitted as well. What the minister is trying to tell us is that the right to look at government institutions is a right that has to come from up above and as far up above as we can go is to the minister himself, in due course he is going to investigate and perhaps some day soon government policy in fact is going to be enunciated. I cannot think of anything more ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, I really cannot.

There is no reason why the member for Wellington South or any other member of this House, if acting in a reasonable or responsible way—and the member for Wellington South, whom I have known for many years, has never acted in any other way—if he presents himself at the door of one of these institutions, accompanied by someone he vouches for, there is no reason he should not be allowed to enter. Why should it have to be a topic of discussion? In fact, one must conclude, as the Tories raise their hackles and say, "You cannot get in unless we give you permission," that again, as in the case of the Niagara Escarpment or all of these other great mysteries, it is because they have something to hide.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): They have something to hide.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and unless and until the minister is prepared to lay down a reasonable and logical policy, which he did not do tonight, then I say that the minister should be condemned for it. His explanation tonight—he has been listening too closely to his leader, who will not answer anything at any time—just follows along the line of the new wave who have no responsibility and no answers for anything. Now if he wants to deal with that particular point—

Mr. Chairman: Before the hon. minister replies, I wonder if I might just take a moment to straighten out this matter as far as the vote is concerned. The leadoff speeches have been made and the minister has replied We are now dealing with vote 301, and the philosophical remarks of any member can apply to any particular item. However, we should deal with these in some order. I am just wondering if the committee feels we can deal with this first vote item by item or, if the minister concurs, we should take 301 in total.

Mr. Lewis: In total.

Mr. Chairman: I think myself it should be done in total, as far as vote 301 is concerned. Is this agreeable? The hon. minister then.

On vote 301.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment on one of the things the member for Downsview said. I do not know where he got the information that the member for Wellington South was ever refused admittance into any one of the institutions. This is not the case, so I am not quite sure what he is—he might check with the member for Wellington South, but I can say—

Mr. Singer: Perhaps the member for Wellington South—coloured it a bit—did not actually go to the door with another person, but he made inquiries in this building as to whether or not this would be permitted. So perhaps, with a little hyperbole—a word I learned from the hon. member on my left—I expanded a bit on that, but the principle is exactly the same.

The member for Wellington South, who is very cautious about how far he travels unless he knows he is going to gain admittance, inquired in advance and was told that he could not get in if accompanied by anybody. The principle is exactly the same. Now why would the minister say that?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Let me answer that question, Mr. Chairman. It is pretty hard to do it for one and not for another. Other members have also presented themselves at institutions over the past few years, accompanied by other people who have not been allowed in. Now, until I have a real opportunity to go into it and try to work out some kind of a formula whereby we can say "Yes, go ahead; go on in, under certain circumstances. If you do not like the circumstances or the rules laid down, then we can discuss them."

But we have certain responsibilities to the inmates, and to the public as well; and I cannot very well give approval to one and not to another.

I have the utmost respect for the member for Wellington South or anyone he would take in with him, but I do not see how I can really do it for one and not the other. I would like, as I mentioned, to have a good look at this and, as I also mentioned before, I do not think we have got anything to hide. If we have, then it should be brought out into the open so that we can deal with it.

Mr. Singer: It is very hard if you cannot get in.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Leave it open for any member.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right. Any member can go to any of our institutions and go in and inspect the entire institution, but at the present time the policy has been that they are not allowed to take anyone else in with them. As I promised the member for Wellington South tonight, I will review that with the department and come up with what I hope will be an acceptable solution.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this again is a question that we have talked about for years and years. I am not making a case for the member for Wellington South. Perhaps I would be more likely to make a case for him because I know him very well and I know of his honour and his integrity, but the same case applies even to the member for Scarborough West. I would think he should have exactly the same privileges as the member for Wellington South and I see no reason why any member of this House who presents himself at the door of one of the department's institutions accompanied by one or two people whom he vouches for, should not be granted admittance. Why now is the minister going to have to conduct a great investigation? Why now can he not get up on his feet and say this is the way it should be. Why is he so cautious and what is he worried about, unless, in fact, he has something to hide?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I am cautious because this has been a policy before, and one does not change a policy just because someone in the Legislature gets up and changes it.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on!

Hon. Mr. Apps: That is right. What else does the member want me to do? I indicated that I am going to review this, in the hope that we can come up with an acceptable solution that will allow—

Mr. Lewis: Do not be so pressured.

Mr. Brown: Do not take the next 25 years.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —any member to go into any of the institutions and under certain situations, take with them, one, two—I do not think they want an army. I think you can get everything with one or two people, but it shows that there has to be some kind of rules to conduct yourself when you are there.

Mr. Lewis: The Liberals never go anywhere alone.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there is only one representative of the new wave over there who has had the courage to be honest and frank with this Legislature since the new Premier took over, and that is the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence). He had no hesitation when questioned on a similar point to say, "Come and see my institutions. I welcome you. Come. There are no restrictions and there are no limitations at all."

Now why has this minister not got a similar courage and the frankness that his colleague had? I will tell you why, because there are not any guts represented in that whole front bench with the sole single exception of the Minister of Health, that is why. They are afraid of something.

And he comes here now and he knows of the complaint of my colleague from Wellington South and it is a similar complaint—I am not making a plea for him because he comes from Wellington South—it could be the member for Victoria or the member for Renfrew or the member for Simcoe, I do not care which one, we all should have the same equal rights and I ask you, what are you afraid of?

You are afraid of something. Because if you are going to have to conduct a great and long and complicated investigation and emerge with several pages of ifs, ands and buts and instructions, and identity cards and pictures and maybe fingerprints and Lord knows what, then I suggest that you are afraid of something.

Surely until this privilege is abused and seriously abused, then the initial right of inquiry by all members of the Legislature, accompanied by reasonable staff, should be automatic? There should not have to be any question about it.

Well there is no point in tearing away at that one any longer, Mr. Chairman, the minister and I just do not see eye to eye on it.

I want to ask the minister again about another point. In Napanee he was talking about his new institution there and I wonder the extent to which the minister has received representations from the various municipalities down there and I understood he has had many—

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, does this come under the first vote?

Mr. Singer: I would think so, unless the minister would like to deal with Napanee at a later stage.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, let us do it now then.

Mr. Singer: All right, I do not care. It is not a problem that is new to the minister. I am not catching him by surprise.

The municipalities down in his end of the province are very concerned—and they have expressed the concern to me and the local papers have written about it at great length—about the effect the creation of this new institution is having on municipal costs, on the taking away of the lock-ups, on transportation costs, all sorts of things that now they have to do involve difficulties in dealing with people before the courts, locking them up, losing a lock-up and all this sort of thing. I have several copies of the Napanee paper here. I can read at great length from the articles. I have talked to many people there and I understand many representations have been made to the minister.

I would like to hear from the minister if he has any reasonable and logical solution to what is a very serious problem of additional costs that have been thrown upon many of the municipalities who say they cannot afford to pay them.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to comment on that. I am sorry I did not send to the member for Downsview a copy of some of my remarks at the opening of the Quinte Regional Detention Centre.

I have had many representations, particularly, of course, from the city of Kingston, in connection with the cost of transporting back and forth from Kingston to Napanee. We have taken this up with the government and a formula has been worked out whereby they will receive I would say a very large percentage of the actual cost of transporting the prisoners back and forth.

I made that statement at the time that that is the case, and I thought I had alleviated the fears of those particular municipalities at that time. So the member can rest assured that this is being looked after and that I feel that the municipalities will be very satisfied with the results of it.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, if I may follow up on this, I am not one to be fobbed off with that kind of general explanation. I feel certain, from what I have been told, that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) knows of this problem and I feel certain that he has been spoken to by members of council in his area, and it blows over into the area represented by the hon. minister, and I do not think I can say this any better than the editorial in the Napanee Beaver of Wednesday, May 12, which says this—and since the minister has taken this approach I think the editorial perhaps should be on the record. The editorial is headed "Local Jails – Who is Responsible?" and it says:

> A lack of co-ordination in planning or at least absence of an understanding of what the implications of the new Quinte Regional Detentional Centre would be for the municipalities such as Napanee and Picton is evident. Last week both councils discussed steps to overcome the need for temporary cell accommodation for persons arrested. Napanee is interested in acquiring the facilities of the county jail and making renovations to provide for both the police station and lock-up. Picton, meanwhile, is taking a serious look at the expenditure of an estimated $51,550 to add municipal offices and lock-up facilities in a new addition to its firehall.

And let me digress, Mr. Chairman, anyone who is at all familiar with municipal problems in this province would recognize that the sum of $51,550 is a large sum of money to a municipality such as Picton, and they are very concerned about this kind of an expenditure, as well they should be. Let me go back to the editorial:

> In both instances councils have expressed concern in not knowing what is required or will be needed by way of lock-up accommodation when country jails are phased out. It is believed that this will happen in a matter of weeks.

And I understand, if I can digress again, that—what is the opening date? Today is it not?

Hon. Mr. Apps: May 15.

Mr. Singer: May 15? I thought it was June 1.

Hon. Mr. Apps: That was three days after that editorial.

Mr. Singer: Two days after that. All right. Well, that makes this one even more current because I had somehow the impression in my mind that it was going to open today. But if it opened three days after the editorial—let me go back to the editorial:

> In both instances councils have expressed concern not knowing what is required or will be needed by way of lock-up accommodation when county jails are being phased out. It is believed that this will happen in a matter of weeks, yet elected representatives seem to be in the dark insofar as what they are to do when this happens.

Again let me digress. I understand that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox has been talked to and he has promised to take it up. But I further understand, and he will correct me if I am wrong, that he has been able to bring back to his council no definitive answer.

The editorial goes on:

> It may well be, as Deputy Reeve Ernest Marshall has warned Napanee council, that while the acquiring of accommodation in the old county jail will save the town money, the operating cost could represent a substantial additional tax burden on the town and county.
>
> The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that while the consolidation in the direction of regional planning, which the new Quinte Regional Detention Centre represents, was being carried out, there was a complete vacuum—

and this is the point:

> —there was a complete vacuum in planning and information as to what responsibilities and facilities local municipalities would have to provide when the new regional centre was opened, and obsolete county jails closed.
>
> Now that the municipalities are confronted with what amounts to an emergency situation, initiative is being shown at the local level. It would seem, however, that the two aspects of planning in the detention area of justice administration should have proceeded forward at the same time. Municipalities in this first area to have a regional jail, should have been informed sooner as to what would be expected of them in the future in the manner of temporary jail facilities.

And I think, as a postscript to that, I have been told that there is a further complication by reason of the facilities made available to and the responsibilities of the Ontario Provincial Police.

Let me go back, Mr. Chairman, to my original theme: as long as the facilities of the administration of justice and the facilities of this department are kept separate and apart, this kind of confusion and vacuum is bound to exist and continue.

I think it is very sad, because what used to be a bastion of the Conservative Party in the Province of Ontario is fast disappearing from their grasp by reason only of the fact that they just have not the time or the patience or the understanding to sit down and explain to their local elected councils what is going on and how they are going to be helped to solve new problems that are created, albeit that they are created with the idea of providing more modern institutions and better methods of custodial care.

I hope that there is something new that the minister can add which will provide some answer to the complaints which I have heard in the last few days, and I would hope that my friend from Prince Edward-Lennox would rise and express his views because I understand that he is most familiar with this situation and shares my very serious concern about it.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be a good idea to go back over the history of the formation and planning and building of the new Quinte Regional Detention Centre.

The four counties involved were the first ones that really were interested in the building of this particular centre. As a matter of fact, I believe they were prepared at one time to undertake 50 per cent of the cost. In other words, they were the first ones that came and agreed that this would be a good idea. They had representatives on the committee that was formed to go into all aspects of it. And it is to their credit, I think, that they were the first four counties in the whole of this Province of Ontario that could see—

Mr. Singer: They had the four worst jails.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, that could be—

Mr. Singer: They had the four worst jails. Some were 200 years old.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Owen Sound has the worst jail.

Hon. Mr. Apps: That could be open to question; it depends on where you are from. But they were the first to come. They had all the opportunity in the world to discuss all aspects of it. I was the first one to admit that there was concern about the costs of transporting prisoners and, as I tried to indicate a little bit earlier, maybe not too successfully, this has been resolved, and I am confident those four counties will be very pleased with the results of that resolution.

Mr. Singer: They are not pleased today.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Secondly, as for the jails or the lock-ups, there is no problem in Kingston and no problem in Belleville, because they have their own jails.

Mr. Singer: What about Picton and Napanee?

Hon. Mr. Apps: They own those buildings; They may convert them and use them as lock-ups. It is not very far from Picton to Napanee or from Napanee to the regional detention centre, and I am confident that reasonable solutions can be worked out for these problems. But the biggest problem was to try to provide a facility where we could do more than we were doing down in those four counties.

And there is no question in my mind either that these are minor problems that will certainly be worked out, so nobody is hindered or injured to any great extent.

Mr. Singer: The minister describes them as minor problems. Has he been asked by any of the local councils to meet with them to explain how they are going to overcome what they think are major local problems? The minister considers them minor, but—

Hon. Mr. Apps: What problems is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Apps: What problems is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Singer: Lock-ups—transporting prisoners backward and forward. Has the minister met with them?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I met with the mayor of Kingston on many occasions.

Mr. Singer: No, no. I am not talking about the mayor of Kingston. The mayor of Kingston is the minister's buddy and he probably sees him every weekend. I am talking about people in Napanee and people in Picton and those other municipalities in the mid-area there.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I have not personally talked to the people in Picton and Napanee, but I understand the members representing those particular areas have talked to them. But I can speak for the city of Kingston—

Mr. Singer: Of course the minister can speak for Kingston; that is the place he represents. If he cannot speak for it, who can?

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right. Let me indicate again then to the hon. member that I have had discussions with the mayor of Kingston, who has expressed his concern about this. I think I have alleviated his fears; that it is not going to be a heavy financial burden or the financial burden that they had thought it might be if something were not done for them.

And I think too that the hon. member should look at this in perspective. We took over the administration of justice and saved the city of Kingston, I guess, $175,000 a year —something like that.

Mr. Singer: There is a lock-up in Kingston. They do not have to transport people back and forth to the regional detention centre. That is the difference.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Sure, but there is also the county jail as well; so, financially, as far as the city of Kingston is concerned, it is a long way ahead.

Mr. Singer: Kingston is miles ahead.

Hon. Mr. Apps: So are the other ones. The same thing applies to the other counties—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Apps: I am not quite clear on why the member still seems to be so disturbed about this, because I feel these problems are being looked after.

Mr. Singer: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox wants to get in here.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview and I will agree that there has been considerable concern about the cost of transportation of prisoners and about the use of temporary lock-ups. But I can assure him that on the day

of the official opening of the regional detention centre, all of the people were there. There were representatives from every town in the four counties—the place was packed—and they were reassured by what the minister said and they all have faith in this government and what they will do. Certainly I have not seen anything in the press or any news to indicate that they do not have this faith that something will be done that will be satisfactory to them. I likewise share in that faith.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not share the faith of the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, and unfortunately I do not think that this sharing of the faith that might have been expressed on May 15 is the same confidence that is being expressed on June 1.

Let me ask the minister again, very simply, has he been requested by the councils of Picton or Napanee to meet with them to discuss this problem?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that very quickly: No.

Mr. Singer: Has he received any correspondence from them within the last two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, but I have had a fair amount of discussion with the members representing those areas who probably have. By the way, I have received correspondence from the mayor of Belleville; I have received correspondence from him in this connection. But since the announcement on May 15, I have not heard.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister think it might be the better course of valour to seek a meeting with the heads and/or the councils of these municipalities? Because my information, which I believe is correct, is that they are very distrubed with the minister and his colleague, the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. It had better be something more than just having faith in the Conservative government that he is going to be able to tell them.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, Mr. Chairman, if they are disturbed, I would be most happy to meet with them.

Mr. Singer: That is good: I will convey his message. Unfortunately his colleagues do not convey that.

Hon. Mr. Apps: In this connection, I would be most happy to do that, because if there is any misunderstanding in connection with it, I would be most happy to try to clean it up for them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 301. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this vote doubtless will go on for some time, but I wondered if it might be possible to engage in a dialogue with the minister about the remarkable metamorphosis which he has undergone in the last several years between the time when he was chairing the select committee on youth and his ascent to this illustrious post as a member of the cabinet. What caused the remarkable change in his thinking and his attitudes toward corrections in the Province of Ontario?

I remember well that in his youth, he was part of a report which advocated the abolition of training schools for youths within the purview of The Department of Correctional Services. I can even remember, although he has probably forgotten now, of occasional chats we had together, if such can be revealed to this House, when we thought we might incorporate the adult institutions within the Attorney General's department and the junior offenders within The Department of Education and eliminate this essential study in punitive behaviour that exists within The Department of Correctional Services.

I just wondered what thinking transpired in the interim to make him such a devoted admirer of The Department of Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, if you read the report on the select committee on youth —and I might mention that I expected this probably would come up—I think one of the recommendations we made was that the training school aspect of The Department of Correctional Services should be incorporated within what we hoped at that time would be a new Department of Youth, so that we could co-ordinate many of the activities concerning the young people, probably to a better extent than they were at that time. I have really not, I would say, changed my mind in that respect. I think a Department of Youth would be an excellent place for all these things. Even the member for Timiskaming was indicating that there should be more of a correlation between the various departments.

Let me say, though, that there have been several developments that have taken place since then, and one of course has been the expansion of the youth and recreation branch

of The Department of Education, which is the department that I think many of your members feel that it should be in, although they did not feel it at the time because they all signed the particular—

Mr. Lewis: We were all seduced by the chairman.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —committee's report. But I think they have been doing a much better job than they did previously.

Mr. Lewis: All the more reason.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Now as for taking this department out of The Department of Correctional Services and placing it, where?

Mr. Lewis: The Department of Education, youth and recreation branch.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The member is in favour of The Department of Education. One of the problems that I feel would happen there is The Department of Education is a pretty big department and there would be a danger of it being relegated to the side without too much attention being paid to it, with the result that it would not get the emphasis that, I feel, it should. This is one of the reasons why I thought it should go to a Department of Youth and not The Department of Education, nor The Department of Social and Family Services where other people think that it might go. I am not committed to keeping this within The Department of Correctional Services, but I tell you this, I am impressed with some of the work that is being done in the training schools.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Yes, I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Apps: And I think that if you go around, you will agree with me on that.

Mr. Lewis: No, I will not agree with the minister.

Hon. Mr. Apps. You tend to agree with me.

Mr. Lewis: But I will concede that we have come out of the dark ages.

Hon. Mr. Apps: That is right. We are doing a much better job there than what was done before, a much better job than was done when we went around to look at them. I think the important thing is to make sure that we try to do a better and better job in these various training schools throughout the province. If I can do that within The Department of Correctional Services, I am going to be happy to do it. If I cannot, then I would be happy to let somebody else take a good crack at it, because I think it is very important and I do not think, particularly, it matters too much what department it is in as long as the attention that it should have is given to it.

On page 270, I say "should be with The Department of Youth." We have not got a Department of Youth and, goodness knows, I have tried over the years to promote that particular aspect. Failing that, I am going to take a dang good crack at it to make these training schools much better than they are today and there has been a great deal of improvement over the last four or five years.

Mr. Chairman, that is about all the answer I can give the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the area of departmental administration, we can come back to it—I guess, it is in the third vote. But I want to say to the minister that we, on this side at least, believe that he is fatally handicapped in his earnest wish—and I have no doubt that it is an earnest and genuine wish to do a job—by what he knows and we know to be true, namely, that, if you isolate so-called young offenders, in a department of correction, then you are largely defeated before you begin.

All that you are doing, essentially, is introducing as much palliative, psychological stuff as you can, because that is all that has happened to the department's training schools to alleviate what is essentially a totally wrong environment for kids to have been placed. The principle which prevailed in 1964, which we understood then, is the same principle which applies today; that the great majority of these kids have behaviour problems; that they are not, in any sense, criminal; that the entire apparatus of the department in dealing with them is perverse and if you really want to handle it appropriately, then the place to do it is within The Department of Education or treatment centres or group homes, or any one of those facilities which can be made available to handle young people short of the training school which, in its very essence, defeats that object.

They are not going to get anywhere with it and the minister will, necessarily, be converted to it and he will describe the wonders of—what is it?—White Oaks Village. I know we have given them all these mellifluous names; they are no longer training schools; they are villages. The fact that you have got kids going through the courts and into your

training schools under the age of 12 is preposterous enough and a sufficient indictment of your system, let alone to put them into the White Oaks Village and call—

Hon. Mr. Apps: That is a federal law.

Mr. Lewis: Federal law, nuts.

Hon. Mr. Apps: But it is.

Mr. Lewis: If we managed in this province the juvenile court system the way it should be managed, none of those kids under 16 would end up in training schools. They would end up in a variety of therapeutic community settings which would do something for them. You are locked into the training school environment and locked in, therefore, to The Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the minister. The minister is an excellent fellow. One would wish him in another portfolio, because he would do it with equal sincerity and capacity. But to sustain this portfolio runs counter to everything he himself once put to this House: to sustain a portfolio designed to incarcerate people in inappropriate settings, particularly young people, is indefensible. His opinions in 1964 were far more valid than his opinions today.

We recognize the need for a Department of Justice and the Attorney General, the obvious need for adult settings of one kind or another, and that is the department where it should probably be involved, at least, in certain of the higher security areas. But for young people to continue to be trapped in corrections with an enlightened minister who can make the point to his cabinet colleagues that this belongs in almost any other department of government short of corrections is something that is quite intolerable.

Hopefully, one of the legacies the minister will leave to this House is to dismember himself and to do it with some public focus, because he alone can cut his department at least in half in order to give it greater substance.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 301. Was the minister wishing to reply?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a couple of comments about that. The first thing I would say is let us wait and see.

Mr. Lewis: We have waited.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The member has waited two and one-half months.

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, all right, but in the meantime—

Mr. Lewis: It is a hell of a commentary on your predecessor.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, not necessarily. Now my predecessor did an excellent job.

Mr. Lewis: He was filled with braggadocio.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I think, if you will ask anyone who has any connection with the field of corrections, they will say that the former Minister of Correctional Services did an excellent job.

Mr. Lewis: Well, compared with George Wardrope and Irwin Haskett, I am prepared to sit down and stick it out.

Mr. Brown: If this is an excellent job, I will be interested in it. You had better come a little closer than that.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, I guess we all have our opinions and maybe some of them are more expert than others and I will grant that the member for Beaches-Woodbine is very knowledgeable in certain aspects of this, and I am certainly very willing to listen to what he says because I think through his praying and his work that he can make a great contribution in this area.

Mr. Brown: Well, still, I would suggest to the minister first that he stop calling them inmates.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Thank you, thank you, and I agree with you, and my apologies if I have done that.

But regardless of where the students are at the present time, whether they are in the correctional institutes—or where they are—which do have a lot of very capable people doing their best to help them—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I have no doubt.

Hon. Mr. Apps: And as an instance, I would like you to read portions of this letter. And I do not like to do this, but I am trying to convey to the people that there are some good things that happen in the various training schools and in the various correctional centres.

Mr. Lewis: Your predecessor also read letters.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, I do not think he read this one because this is addressed to me.

Mr. Lewis: Tributes to himself largely.

Hon. Mr. Apps: And this is no tribute to me.

Mr. Lewis: That is no tribute.

Hon. Mr. Apps: This is no tribute to me.

Mr. Lewis: Anything that was self-congratulatory he read into the record.

Mr. Sargent: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Apps: But this goes on. It says:

> Before our son was sent to Sprucedale I had a very distorted idea of what training schools were like and I certainly changed my opinion fast when I saw Sprucedale.
>
> I would appreciate it if you would pass along my sincere appreciation to the staff and members at Sprucedale school in Hagersville for the kindness they have shown to—

and she quotes the name of her boy:

> —and us, his parents. They have been very careful and understanding whenever we have had a question we wanted an answer for, and they have worked miracles with him.
>
> For example, in his Christmas report here in Toronto he averaged 30 per cent. On his marks in Sprucedale he averaged 58 per cent. You can imagine how pleased we were. We have not had one complaint about being treated unfairly—

Mr. Lewis: Giving a kid 58 per cent you consider to be a useful thing in White Oaks village?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, it appeared, Mr. Chairman, that this particular mother did feel that way.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well, that is just great therapy for the kid.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right.

> They certainly have done a wonderful job picking the staff at that school. Perhaps we, as parents, could take a few lessons from them.

Now these are the remarks of a parent of one of the boys at Sprucedale. I am encouraged when I read letters like this. Sure, I get letters just the opposite, of people complaining. It help sometimes to get a letter like this, and sort of reaffirms your faith in the desire of people to try to help the young people that are in these various training schools.

Mr. Brown: You have no basis on which to draw that from the letter. You do not know the mother.

Mr. Chairman: Much of our discussion has ranged in the vote 303, I believe. I think we should keep the rest of that conversation until we get to that vote.

We are on vote 301, departmental administration. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of you for my guidance. We got into the matter of regional detention centres here which I do not suppose should logically come under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, it comes under the next vote, I think.

Mr. Young: So if you want to drop that, I am quite willing to wait until the next vote and then raise the question I have.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything else on 301? The member for Wellington South.

Mr. Worton: Yes, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member for Yorkview finished with this, then?

Mr. Young: Well, just that, and you would rather leave this until the next vote?

Mr. Chairman: I think we should keep them in order.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, in the questions I put to the minister at an earlier date this evening, there was one that I did not get a chance to thoroughly digest but it was concerning the government on, or a committee on government productivity in regard to the Guelph correctional centre. Could you outline the recommendations that have been made in that regard to that investigation?

The second item that I would like to ask about is the professional services in regard to the money spent on criminology, to the University of Toronto and Ottawa. It is duplicated by another department, The Department of Justice. Could you comment on those two items, please.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the first one, on the one in Ottawa, we work very closely

with them. We have hired several of their graduates in the institutions and we feel a contribution to them is very worthwhile just on that basis actually, you know. They also do field work for us.

We have people going through courses who are sent to us in the summertime. We make use of the services in that way and we feel that this is very worthwhile.

As far as the one in Toronto is concerned, we do not have quite as close a liaison with them. It is peculiar that you should ask me about that because that is one of the things I am going to look into. I have already suggested that I meet with them to discuss the particular course that they are giving at the University of Toronto in an effort to see if we cannot probably make more use of their services as well.

Mr. Worton: The first, question, Mr. Minister, was the one on the productivity research at the Guelph centre. I understand that it is a pilot project. Could you bring us up to date on what is happening?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, I have a rather lengthy paper on this. I will read it if you like, or I could send it over to you.

Mr. Worton: Whatever suits you, suits me.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right. I will send it over to the hon. member and this will give him a very good indication of what is happening on that in Guelph.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else on vote 301?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the minister—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Grey-Bruce. Yes. I do not know where to discuss this but I am disturbed at the fact that in our county jails we do not have any cooks. The cooks come from the inmates—

Mr. Chairman: Should the county jails be under 302?

Hon. Mr. Apps: They come under the next vote.

Mr. Chairman: If you will just hold that, we will finish up 301—departmental administration—first of all. The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, to return to something I said before. On page 69 of the department's report, it has a heading, Jails. Under that heading, we get down to Convictions and the sub-heading under Convictions is Crimes. I would just like to read what they consider a crime: "Crimes against the person. Crimes against property; against public order and peace; against public morals and decency."

Then they come down to liquor offences as crimes and if one looks at the figures, crimes against property are 11,770; liquor offences, 27,559. Almost half the total convictions in Ontario are for liquor offences.

I wonder if the minister could break that down into offences such as illegal possession; crimes that involve consuming under age; consuming in a public place. Can he break that down for me?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have the figures on that. It would take a tremendous amount of work and even then, I do not know whether it would be quite as accurate as we would like it. I do not think we can get that for him.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, if it cannot be broken down, then I must assume that they are all liquor offences, other than bootlegging and this sort of thing, charges that could be handled by a detoxication centre, as Mr. Grossman was prone to put it. Yet, they have ended up in the jails. Surely, if you cannot break it down, and you have not broken it down, how can you assess the needs of these people? How do you assess where to put them, want to do with them?

Hon. Mr. Apps: At the time of the sentence, I think these files are all available to us. At the present time, we have not broken them down to the extent that the hon. member would wish. In order to do that now, we would have to go back and pick out all these files, among all the people in the various institutions. You realize just what a tremendous job that would be.

A great many of these could probably be looked after in what might be termed detoxication centres. We would be very happy as a matter of fact, because we would not have to look after many of these and that would be the case. Other than the fact that there is one good thing—if you can call it that—that happens to many of the chronic offenders, in that their addiction to alcohol is such that when they go to one of the institutions for a month or something like that, it probably keeps them alive a lot longer, because they are looked after and fed properly and so on, and

in that regard it is a help to them. But I would be the first to agree that if we could find some other means, such as a detoxication centre, for many of these people, it would be much better for them and it would prevent this revolving-door process so many people talk about. They come in, then they are out; they are in and they are out. There has been a committee, as you know, studying this; the report is in, and I would hope there would be a definite statement made in this connection very shortly.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, Just going back a little bit to what the minister was talking about a few minutes ago. He read a letter from a person from Monteith, saying that now that the relief programme is under way, he was able to go to Northeastern Psychiatric Hospital and have treatment and he thought this was a turning point in his life.

Surely, rather than that being an example of how well your system works, what it should be is really a condemnation of your system? Here is a man who has been in more than once by his own admission.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We do not know whether—

Mr. Jackson: We are just finding now that, under a day-release system, we can treat him. What we have been listening to ever since I came into this House is what the department is doing for these people at all times. We heard from the former Minister of Correctional Services how we have had treatment centres and psychologists and psychiatric treatment; yet now we are finding out that it is just not true in most of the institutions.

How far are we going now? How long do we have to wait? Surely it is a real condemnation of the whole system when we have 27,000 convictions for liquor offences—and we are talking about rehabilitating people. We will never rehabilitate a drunk by throwing him into jail. We will never rehabilitate him by putting him into Monteth.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We did in that particular case.

Mr. Jackson: Let me ask you how many letters you have like that. What kind of examples can you show me that you are treating people? It is my experience with Monteith—

Mr. Chairman: Care and treatment of the adult offender really is under vote 302. Again order, please. You are really under vote 302.

Mr. Jackson: Well surely this is the general policy of the department.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but it could be discussed under 302.

Mr. Jackson: All right, I will get it in 302.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything else under 301? The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to sort out the votes here, but I will try certainly to do so. I think at least this comes under the area which could be called minister's advisory council on the treatment of the offender. What bothers me about the department, for all the good I see going on in it, is what I think should be called the over-articulation, and I would like the minister to perhaps think a little about what is actually stated in his report.

I was reading the letter of the deputy minister to then Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman), and there are certain statements there which I find very hard to relate validity to the actual situation going on in the institutions you control.

> For example, for a number of years we recognized that if we are to be successful in carrying out our statement of purpose we must strive to rehabilitate the offender by providing for him a learning situation closely reflecting his future life.

I assume you are dealing with offender in terms of the entire population, juveniles as well as adults. What percentage of those offenders are in a real learning situation? How many of them really are in a position where they can take courses, where they can be learning a trade in terms of the total number in your institutions?

"He must be involved in decision-making," the letter says. What do you mean, "He must be involved in decision-making" in relation to, say, Millbrook reformatory?

And: "He must be able to take responsibility for his actions." What do you mean by that statement in relation to a place like Millbrook reformatory?

Then: "He must evaluate his needs and he must be involved in social interaction as fully as is possible in the correctional programme."

That is what I mean by over-articulation, Mr. Chairman. I would like the minister to indicate what is meant by that kind of language in relation to what is going on, largely among adults, in his institutions. I would also like him to deal with this whole business

of recidivism. Surely the real test of his institutions is the degree of success he has in allowing people to leave those institutions and remain outside. What is the direction in this regard? For example, there are a great many numbers on page 66 indicating the institutional history of those who are involved in these institutions. But what I would like to know is to what extent is it improving year by year? To what extent is it possible to say that these institutions are, indeed, making it possible for people to go out into a normal citizen's activity and not be found once again back in the minister's institutions?

The other areas which have been stressed by the minister's statement are where he talked a great deal about the Outward Bound programme. I think this is one of the most important aspects of his whole system, because if you are going to prepare people, whether they are young or whether they are older, then you are going to have to prepare them to accept the world outside that institution. The sooner you can get them back into that world with some kind of support from your department then you are going to have a much higher success rate.

Have you yet been able to determine, for example—I suppose there have not been that many who have gone through the programme and spent any time in society to indicate what the recidivist rate would be for that paricular group. But I would like to get some idea of what the percentage of those in your institutions are really involved in that Outward Bound programme.

Is it just a handful? Is it a few hundred? I think it is a couple of thousand—I think I saw the statistics—is it not?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I will give the member that answer.

Mr. Pitman: Anyhow, I think it is one or two thousand. What is that in terms of percentage? Does this really involve a very small, select, elite group in your institutions or are you really extending it as a full policy to try and get people out of these institutions as quickly as possible?

I would like to deal with the temporary absence programme. How is that getting along, for example? I wonder how the minitser's programme is going month by month, particularly in this period of unemployment. How do you get jobs for people who are in institutions when you are in a society which is such a ghastly mess in terms of finding employment for people who are outside the institution?

Mr. Chairman: Should that not be under item 4?

Mr. Pitman: I am dealing with the number. I think it does.

Mr. Chairman: After-care of adult offenders.

Mr. Pitman: No, it is dealing essentially, Mr. Chairman, with what I would call the whole area of articulation, of a total programme and the philosophy of that programme. I do not think I am dealing with a particular institution or particular groups of people.

Mr. Chairman: No, neither does this item. It says "after-care of adult offenders." This is all-encompassing. I think we must keep these in the right votes, anyway.

Mr. Pitman: I think I might leave it there.

Mr. Chairman: I will not restrict the member when we come to that item, but he should keep it in order.

Mr. Pitman: I am quite willing to accept whatever that vote covers.

Mr. Chairman: I think the first vote, of course, is general policy and administrative programmes, but the others specifically are as detailed here.

Mr. Pitman: All right. I would just like to ask the minister what percentage he has of that vote on temporary absence?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the actual percentage of the number of people in the various institutions.

On the temporary absence programme, the only thing I can give the member are the actual number who do go out, and I guess, it is for a 21-month period. Now 3,004 have taken advantage of this programme in various ways.

This is designed to try to rehabilitate the person who gets his temporary absence. It is not handed out indiscriminately. It is given on the basis of humanitarianism in one aspect, rehabilitation on the other. There are many instances of people who have come in and shown that they are capable of accepting this responsibility and are allowed out on a temporary absence programme. It is a comparatively new programme. I think it has been very successful.

You were mentioning about how we get jobs for these people. This is one of the countless things that there is—to get a job for somebody who has been in any of our institutions—because people have sort of an ingrained hesitation to give employment to someone who has been in an institution. This is why we are trying to develop citizen participation in our regional detention centres particularly and in all other areas where we have correctional centres; then they will be in a position to try to help us obtain jobs. The after-care workers are doing the same thing.

We fight an uphill battle. I think the philosophy behind it is gradually being accepted by the public, that if we are ever going to expect these people to lead useful lives we have to provide them with some sort of employment. There is nothing more discouraging for a fellow who has been in an institution, has taken care of himself and has acted well, than when he is out and he cannot find a job. It must be very discouraging. And we are endeavouring to create programmes that will enable this person to get a job once he gets out.

You were talking about the DARE programme. I think you were confusing it a little with the temporary absence programme.

Mr. Pitman: Which one is that?

Hon. Mr. Apps: The DARE programme, the one for the outward bound.

Mr. Pitman: The outward bound? I mixed the two programmes.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We are starting out with one camp, as I indicated, and we expect to have two before very long. We are trying to get these people out into the country. We have found that in camping situations, in the outdoors, they develop self-responsibility and so on, and this is very helpful to them. Actually we have a group out of Queen's University, a group of very fine young people, who will be providing sort of a camping and canoe trip experience for—I think there will be 20 of our boys from St. John's School going out with them for 10 days. They did this last year with some of the boys in Kingston and it worked out exceptionally well.

We feel a programme like this is going to be very helpful, particularly for the younger ones in training schools, because they are insecure people. They do not really know what they can do. They are apprehensive. By getting them involved in projects outside, we hope to develop them to the extent that they feel they can do these things. This is the philosophy behind it. As I indicated earlier, we have not got the whole solutions for everything, but we are endeavouring to probe here and there in trying to develop those areas in which we hope it will be of benefit to rehabilitate those people that we have.

Mind you, I do not think we are even going to do much for some of them, but there are an awful lot of them I think we can. This is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Pitman: Would it be possible for the minister to get the percentages, so we can get some idea of how many are involved in what might be called these frontier areas of the minister's department? Because I think the impression one gets from reading this document is that all kinds of exciting, wonderful things are happening.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, they are.

Mr. Pitman: The minister tells us they are! I would like to know what percentage of his institutional population is really being affected by these frontier programmes. In the answer to the problem of decision-making, what does the minister mean by an individual in his institutions being involved in decision-making? What kind of decisions do they make, as I said, at Millbrook, for example?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I do not know if the hon. member has ever been out to the Vanier Centre for Women and had an opportunity to sit in with them in their discussions?

Mr. Pitman: No, I have not.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I think if the hon. member would—and I extend an invitation for the hon. member to go out there at any time—I think he will see what we mean. They have an hour's discussion within the institution; they make decisions on many things.

Mr. Pitman: I have visited the minister's training schools. I have seen it happen there.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: I am talking about what could be called the harder institutions that the minister operates within his department.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Vanier is not, you might say, the most maximum security. It is a very minimum security but there is a certain

amount of security within Vanier and Ingleside, of course, is a very minimum security one altogether.

There are 24 to a cottage and they have regular discussions and they make decisions even about their everyday goings on in the institution. They could even make decisions on people applying for temporary absence. Sometimes they sit down and discuss this. They are making decisions about what is going on in their particular cottage all the time.

When I was with the committee on youth we visited an institution down in Los Angeles —and this was a private institution—where they tried this group therapy idea. They would try to get young people, particularly boys in this case, to attend this programme. They would sit down in the group and discuss the problems that they had. They had other people that did nothing but look for jobs for these kids. When they first would come in they were very reluctant to come in but gradually they started to come and people who had gone through it would encourage others to come. In this particular case, they had two fellows helping who really had gone through it and got jobs and were out being responsible citizens. This is all done through group discussion, where they could air their problems. In addition to that, I think one of the most important things, of course, was the fact that they had people getting jobs for them. When they were out they were given something to do.

Vanier, I think, is a great institution where you have people from Brampton who are most interested in these girls who are there. They are helping them all the time. They have their group discussions where they make decisions about what their programme is going to be.

Mr. Pitman: Kawartha Lakes School, I think, is also in that context, too. I have been there.

Hon. Mr. Apps: One of the things is—

Mr. Pitman: I am talking about the minister's adult institutions—

Mr. Chairman: This entire discussion is out of order at the present time. We are not on vote 302 yet. Does vote 301 carry? Vote 301 agreed to. We take it by item.

The first item is general administration under vote 302, which is rehabilitation. Is there anything under general administration, item 1.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, you were taking the whole vote before. You are taking it differently now, are you?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, because the first vote was difficult to separate. Now we are dealing with the specific vote or items under the specific vote 302. Is there anything under item 1 which is general administration? Shall item 1 carry?

Mr. Sargent: No, no! Is this where we talk about county jails?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Sargent: He told me it was in that. Item 2, care, treatment and training of adult jails in this vote.

Mr. Chairman: It will come under the next item in this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 carried? Carried. Item 2, care, treatment and training of adult offenders.

Mr. Sargent: Item 2, county jails.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman the minister, with all his great background—and we are all great admirers of his—I think he could stand a few body checks about the overall picture of his department.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): A little fancy skating, too.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, like the former minister did for the last eight years. He conned us into believing that he was going to do something about our area insofar as county jails were concerned.

Before the Minister of Trade and Development came in the present minister was saying what a great job he had done in his department, and I think maybe the minister was sincere; I think he was a good—what is the word?—penologist. Is that the word?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I better get out.

Mr. Sargent: He may have been sincere, but I think he did not have the faculty of selling the cabinet or the Treasury Board and getting some things done, like keeping his word. He told us eight years ago in my first effort in this House he would give us a jail in Owen Sound, a new county jail. We have

today, the worst setup in the Province of Ontario. It is a shocking, disgraceful, situation. I think the minister has not seen it. Has he seen it? I would be glad to fly him up there one day and have a look at it.

Mr. Worton: He stayed overnight when he played hockey.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, we should have had him down there that night.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The hospitality was too good.

Mr. Sargent: But I would like to ask the minister some things. What is going to happen about the regional county jail that has been promised? Is this programme going to work or are we just going to talk about it the rest of the time?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the department has undertaken to build one a year and to plan one a year. We have built the one in Napanee, and the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Detention Centre should be completed early in the year. The next one that we have just let tenders for is down in Lincoln and Welland. The next one is in London. There are very high priorities in connection with the Toronto jail which, if anybody has been in there, he will certainly admit it is not the nicest place in the world. Talk to our members for Hamilton and they will tell you that the Barton Street jail is not a particularly nice one. If you have been to Brampton and seen the overcrowding there, and—

Mr. Stokes: What about the one at Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Apps: It could be: I have not been up to Thunder Bay but I hope to get up there very shortly. All the jails—not all but a great majority of the jails in the province—are old jails that were built many years ago. We just do not have the finances to do them all at one time. I cannot give the member an answer as to when we can do something about the Owen Sound jail, other than the fact that we will try—

Mr. Sargent: And Walkerton, too.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —other than the fact that we will try to make them a little bit more comfortable; clean them up, fix them up, which I think we have done in many of the jails and my deputy minister says we have got a cook there now too. I am not going to get up and say to the member for Owen Sound, "You are going to get a jail next year," because he is not. I cannot tell him when we can rebuild that jail up in Owen Sound, but I will take him up on the offer to go up to Owen Sound within the very next few weeks and have a look at it. I know exactly what it is like and I can make my own comparisons between it and any other jail.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That is about as far as the member for Grey-Bruce will get.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that. I will hold the minister to that, but how does he sort out his priorities?

You say you do not have the money. Running down this street we have a $20 million subway they close at five o'clock. It cost us $20 million. That will build a lot of jails. You do not take enough money off that subway to pay for the ticket-takers, and we spent $20 million on it. What are priorities?

You spent about $30 or $40 million down here at Ontario Place. What are priorities? I am not belabouring the minister about this thing, but this is a lot of nonsense. I do not say what you said is nonsense but it is ridiculous that we cannot have the important things because the first connection that person has with the law is when they are apprehended and put into a county jail.

This is something that goes back to the old medieval ages. We have cells there; they are about 7½ feet long and three feet wide. You are locked in there all night and you are put in there at eight o'clock at night. The lights are turned on and you cannot do anything until six o clock in the morning.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): One thing, you will never fall out of bed there.

Mr. Sargent: You certainly will not because if there is a cot there is no place to go—there is only room for a cot. That is all there is there. You cannot believe the degradation that goes on in county jails for people who are not even convicted, not even proved guilty. This is what happens to them.

We have maybe 30 or 40 people in there and there is no cook They go around to the lot and they say "One of you boys can cook," and if there is nobody who can cook, they have a hell of a time.

Hon. Mr. Apps: They have one now.

Mr. Sargent: That is right back in the pot.

An. hon. member: Bring in Colonel Sanders.

Another hon. member: No cook, no food.

Mr. Sargent: Insofar as anything is concerned with innovation or new programmes for people in these jails, there are no books for them to read. What is your book-stocking programme for a county jail?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: They cannot read anyway

Mr. Sargent: I do not know, you came in late.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: I am right with you, though.

Mr. Sargent: I think I could maybe tell the minister more things privately, but I think that when you come to Owen Sound—even if we could knock out those individual cells and make them larger; make three cells into one big cell. A person is likely to get claustrophobia; it would drive you up the wall—one night in there would send you crazy. Someone said a long time ago that you should build your jails as though you yourself might use them. That was some great philosopher who said that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I think I will be happy if the minister will come and have a look at the jail and we will get some things done.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Fair enough!

Mr. Chairman: On 302, the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could ask the minister, in respect to this matter of priority, how the minister establishes priority? Is it because the member for Grey-Bruce gets up and says I want you to come up and take a look at our jail, does that constitute the next move? And if somebody else does the same thing, is that the one after that? How do we establish priorities?

In this whole concept so far, I think, by and large, we have been thinking in terms of regions of the province. It may well be that when regional government comes we will find that we have one of these county jails now projected within the confines of a regional government. This is something that we talked about before in this House a great deal. We should have had some outlines of where regional governments are going to be established and then think in terms of the regional detention centre as one of the facilities of each region.

I do not know whether a regional government is acceptable in the Owen Sound area. Certainly boundaries are going to be drawn up there and you are going to have larger regional governments there. All right, if you do, then, of course, the regional detention centre will be part of a function of that government. If we are not thinking in those terms, then I think we had better take another look at this invitation from the member for Owen Sound, because—

Mr. Worton: He would be glad to have you up there.

Mr. Young: You mean inside?

Mr. Worton: Inside? Yes.

Mr. Young: Fine, I would love to go in there and take a look around.

Mr. Sargent: Wait until after the next election.

Mr. Young: As long as the member for Grey-Bruce gives me the key before I go in so I can get out again, that is fine, but I would not want to stay in those cells that he has for his constituents.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would give us some idea of how these priorities are being established and what the plan is going to be. I think, in addition to that, he should indicate to us that he himself does not agree with this policy of "one a year over the next 25 years"—that he thinks that there ought to be a speed-up in this sort of thing, and that he is going to fight with those members of the Treasury Board to get far more capital funds for this kind of desperately important renovating process.

Certainly this minister—and I believe he is sincere in this whole bit—should be pressing and pressing hard, first of all, to get a speed-up in the process and, secondly, to get a reasonable pattern for these detention centres. And not simply because somebody somewhere is pressuring him, with the result that you might get two regional detention centres under what might be eventually one regional government. This would be fatal. This would be completely wrong in the whole planning process.

So perhaps the minister could enlighten us as to the priorities and as to the possibility of speed-up in this plan which has been handed to him by a former administration.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the priorities are worked out by what we call a departmental task force, who have visited the jails and make recommendations assisted by the engineers of The Department of Public Works. So regardless of the fact I am going up to Owen Sound, the ultimate decision will be made by the departmental task force. I like to be able to understand what they are talking about and the only way I can do that is visit the jail, so that if I feel there is something wrong I can probably have it reviewed and maybe make some readjustments on it.

Mr. Stokes: What about the recommendations of the grand juries, do you not listen to them?

Hon. Mr. Apps: We get many recommendations from the grand jury. Mostly they are critical of the facilities, but they commend the staff, which in itself, I think, is a step forward because even though these facilities may not be all they should be, if you have good men running them, then you are going to be a lot better off.

But the priorities are determined by this departmental task force, so that should relieve your feelings. It might not help the member for Owen Sound to any great extent.

Mr. Young: I would hope, Mr. Minister, that these priorities are also established in relationship to what the thinking is in respect to large municipal governments, regional municipal governments of the future, so that you are not going to get two detention centres in an area where you might have boundaries drawn for one regional government. I recognize that this is still in the realm of possibility, but I think this ought to be done in co-operation with The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the deputy minister that this is done —that there are discussions with The Department of Municipal Affairs, and that apparently the number of people projected over a period of 15 years is a consideration as to where the jails will be built, but Municipal Affairs are brought into the picture in this connection.

Mr. Young: What about the speed-up, Mr. Chairman? Is there a chance of getting a speed-up?

Hon. Mr. Apps: As I mentioned, at the present time we are building one a year and we are planning one a year. We are a little bit ahead of our schedule at the present time, and you can rest assured that I am going to be pressing to speed up this particular programme up. We hope to be able to build or start nine in four years, which is pretty good when you also consider the fact that we have other commitments as well, in correctional centres, in adult training schools and things like that. We took over three jails in 1968, because the municipalities really were not in a position to do too much about them. We took them over, we instituted this programme and I can assure the hon. gentlemen that we are going to push forward just as fast as we can.

Mr. Young: You are a faster skater than the former minister, so we ought to get better speed?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I hope so.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the former minister scoffed at the idea that we—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not scoff. I denied it.

Mr. Sargent: He scoffed at the suggestion that there were electronic listening devices in the jail system. Would the minister know, or would he find out, the extent—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not scoff. I denied it.

Mr. Sargent: You said there was no way it could have happened.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not scoff, I denied it.

Mr. Sargent: Certainly you denied it. It is all over the States, but it would not happen here in Ontario though! The evidence I have from people in these jails is that the authorities have electronic listening devices bugging, as it were; so I would like the minister to advise me if he knows, or if he will find out, if this goes on.

Mr. Worton: Some of my best friends say it.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, some of my best friends too.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, out of the 42 jails we are responsible for in the province, I believe there are six that are equipped with listening devices, where conversations can be listened to. We discourage this and in all the new detention centres this of course is out of the question; we are not allowing it.

Mr. Stokes: In spite of the denial of your predecessor?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I do not know—

Mr. Sargent: I thank the minister for his frankness; this is what we need—a fresh new approach and truth in government.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can clarify that. There are no listening devices as such, They can listen in on the conversations of visitors, but there are no listening devices throughout the institution where they can listen to what is going on in the various cells. The six are where they can listen to a visit. They have a telephone on each side. They could listen but they do not do it; we discourage it. Occasionally, they could listen when maybe they had some reason to believe that something funny is going on, but in the new ones we are building there is no way in which that could be done.

Mr. Sargent: Where are the fixed installations that we have?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I have not got that information at my fingertips here; I can get that for you.

Mr Sargent: May I ask the minister if he is going to eradicate this? Is he going to stop it?

Hon. Mr Apps: I think that is a good idea.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr Chairman. Could the minister inform me how many persons are in our correctional institutions, our lock-ups, who are troubled by alcohol—alcoholics, in a sense? Has he that information?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, other than the fact it came up earlier that there were 11,000 and some-odd people that were sentenced because of alcoholic problems.

Mr. Jackson: Twenty-seven thousand.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Was it 27,000? My apologies. It was 27,000.

Mr Haggerty: Twenty-seven thousand. Would the minister say that these are the persons who every fall or late fall come along to the municipality wanting some warm place to put up for the winter, so throw a brick into a window and then are locked up for the winter?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, that would include some of them.

Mr. Haggerty: Some of them?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I would say, too, that because there were 27,000 convictions does not really mean that there were 27,000 people. There may be some that you are thinking of, that may have come in and out several times during the year. This shows only 27,000 convictions. What the actual number of people was, I am sorry I do not have that information for you.

Mr. Haggerty: The reason I bring this to the minister's attention is that I am kind of familiar with this, particularly in Welland—the old Welland county jail is still there today —but I have seen in many instances that these persons, in the spring of the year when they are let out, they go right across the hall to The Department of Social and Family Services and go on welfare.

I was just wondering—I know they have not the proper facilities in this old jail at the present time but a number of schools are left vacant and idle within the Welland County Board of Education—I wonder if perhaps you could not use some of these facilities for rehabilitation for this type of person, instead of putting them in lock-ups. They could use these schools, some four-, five- and six-roomed schools. The heating plant, everything, is there. There is in many cases five or six acres of land, maybe more than that, available so that you could put them out on to some kind of working farms.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the only problem with using the schools, you could only use them in the evenings—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): No, no. They are vacant.

Mr. Haggerty: These are abandoned schools.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): The taxpayers are still paying for them.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Oh, you mean vacant abandoned schools? Well, one of the problems

there, of course, and this may be a financial one which should not be looked at but we are forced to do that, is that these people are sentenced to our care; we have to give them supervision 24 hours a day pretty well, and it may be a little bit difficult to do that in a lot of different areas rather than have them all in one place.

Mr. Haggerty: For example, there are a number of colleges in that area—Niagara College, the Brock University—where the students are dealing with this type of a problem, social workers, and you could use their services in the summer time or the winter time as part of their schooling programme There are a number of these schools vacant, laying idle, all across the province.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to look into that situation and see just how far this is practical.

Mr. Haggerty: I am sure it could be practical.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to what I was talking about before I was cut off a little earlier, and that is the 27,000 convictions for liquor offences.

If I put these figures together correctly, the greatest number of them are for drunkenness, and what the other offences are I do not know, but the greatest number are just for intoxication. If you look at the situation throughout Ontario right now, and throughout Canada, and maybe throughout the world, you find that the greatest number of those persons are where jobs are hard to come by, or even when there are jobs the incomes are very low.

I would just like to ask the minister how many persons, to his knowledge, and maybe to the knowledge of his department, come from those conditions? How many actually come from income brackets that we are in? How many come from income brackets of $7,000 and $8,000?

When he brings out these figures, does it not indicate to him that what we are doing is putting people in jail, not because they drink, but because they happen to fall in a situation that brings on that unhappy state?

Just before I finish, Mr. Chairman, I have a clipping here, and I am not sure where it came from—I think it is out of the Toronto Daily Star—it says that Ontario Health Minister Bert Lawrence said he was going to ask the cabinet to propose changes in The Liquor Control Act that would recognize chronic drunks need medical treatment not jail. That might be fine now that we have in the liquor laws that instead of jail sentences under the liquor laws we class them as chronic ill, and put them into hospitals.

In the meantime, if we have this number going into our present correctional institutions, what happens when we suddenly decide that these people are ill, and start putting them in the hospitals? What happens to all of the plant that has been built?

We have the situation in schools right now where over the next few years we are going to see registration fall off; we are going to end up with schools we do not need. If we keep building at the rate we have built over the last few years we will have empty schools by the dozens, and if we keep building custodial institutions then if we take those persons convicted under the liquor laws of Ontario out of those institutions and put them in hospitals where they belong, or in treatment centres where they belong, what are we going to do with all of these custodial centres we are building?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, first of all, as I mentioned earlier, the 27,000 convictions do not necessarily mean 27,000 people. I am sorry but I do not have the breakdown of exactly how many people in Ontario. That would be very difficult to get.

Secondly, some of them are in jail only for a very short length of time—maybe a couple of days, or one or two days, some of them a month, depending on what they do. The detoxication centres, as I understand them, would be the place for them to go where they can sober up and then leave.

I think a very small percentage—maybe five per cent of them—might need hospital care, whereas the others would go in, sober up, and they would leave. So I do not think that the number of hospital beds which are required would be that great.

But I agree with the hon. member that these detoxication centres would certainly be of great help in that they would care for the person without having them go through the procedure of being admitted to jail and going through the whole series that they have to go through. That really is not the fundamental problem though. The fundamental problem, I guess, is not to have them in that condition in the first place.

I would agree, as well, that many people of lower income, when they drink, tend to drink probably more in public places, and, if they become intoxicated then their chances of being picked up, I would think, are greater than those people with a higher income who might do their drinking at home and get in the same condition, but who are not in a place where they are going to get picked up. But the fundamental solution to all this of course is to try to persuade people that they should not drink to that extent. There are a lot of pretty competent people who have tried to solve that problem and have not been successful so far. Maybe some day they will.

In the meantime, as it stands now we are responsible for it. We help some of them, as I said before, even to keeping them and feeding them and probably letting them out in a little better condition than they were when they came in.

I think these detoxication centres are certainly an answer to some of it. They are not the whole answer, by any means. You get into the whole question of liquor outlets and drinking ages and so on, as to whether all this tends to increase the overconsumption of alcohol or not.

There are many things involved in it, but as far as the centres are concerned, I think they would be fine. They would certainly solve a lot of the accommodation problems we have, particularly on weekends. We could probably look after them a little bit better and save people from the indignity really of having to go through this process of being booked in and sentenced and out on bail and fined and so on.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, just one last question.

Mr. Sargent: With the permission of the Chair, I would like to go back to my previous statement here, asking the minister if there were listening devices in our institutions. The former minister said that he did not scoff at them, but he denied that these things were happening.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has misled the House. One minute later, the new minister admitted that there were six such cases in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Not listening devices as such.

Mr. Worton: What are they?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the point is this. We have established the fact that the former minister denied this. He knew what I was asking him that time and he denied it. He has been at it again tonight and one minute later the minister and his three top aides admit this is the case in Ontario. I am trying to establish the fact—what can we believe from this man when he hides and holds stuff back from the House which is information?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying the former minister—

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: —and I think it is high time that we as members of this House are asked to account for one deeds here. You sit there and grin like a—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A Cheshire cat.

Mr. Sargent: The minister should be ashamed of himself and the fact that he can do this kind of thing and get away with it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order or privilege, whichever you need? The hon. member is making quite a point of something which is really nothing at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is quite obvious to anyone who goes through the estimates that what the hon. member was referring to obviously was listening devices in the cells and in the dormitories.

Mr. Sargent: I say in the jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just sit down and let me finish. That is what he was referring to. This has always been a point of contention in penology, whether you should put listening devices in the cells.

There has never been any question as far as I can recall as to whether there should be listening devices in the interview rooms where people are visiting prisoners, because there are maximum security inmates, prisoners, in those institutions. It is the proper thing to do, in many instances, to let them know that it is possible that their interviews, for these people when they are visiting, that their conversations may be listened to. It is quite obvious to them in most of these jails. They see the telephone there.

There is nothing hidden. They see the officer sitting there; he could pick up the telephone receiver and often does in the view of those people who are visiting. That is not what the hon. member was referring to at all, and he need not try to make a big thing of nothing at all. I denied at that time and I still do—

Mr. Sargent: And the minister denied tonight?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —deny that there are any listening devices in respect to the manner in which the hon. member was referring to. He should not try to make anything—

Mr. Sargent: How does the minister know what I was referring to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —out of nothing at all.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I very specifically said in the institutions. I did not say in the cells. I said in the institutions.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Did the minister feel better there than in The Department of Trade and Development now?

Mr. Sargent: This minister can double-talk his way out of anything. He can feed us false information here and now he double-talks like this. This man has misled the House, Mr. Chairman. I think you should rule on it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Further discussion at this hour will be out of order, in the absence of an order to sit beyond the hour of 10.30.

Mr. Sargent: You are a real phoney.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I have ruled that further discussion on this debate be out of order at this hour.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before I move the House adjourn, I would announce that the estimates will continue on Thursday in the House. I understand that the estimates committee will be dealing with the estimates of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Apps, continued 2245

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2275

No. 55

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 3, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon our guests in the east gallery are students from the E. J. James Public School in Oakville; in the west gallery from Escott Public School in Escott; the English Second Language School in Flemington Park, Don Mills; and in both galleries from the C. B. Parsons Junior High School in Toronto. In Mr. Speaker's gallery we have students from Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute in Scarborough, who are hosting students from Attawapiskat School at Hudson Bay. Later we will be having students from Saltfleet High School, Stoney Creek and Westwood Secondary School in Malton.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): I gave an undertaking on Monday to provide members of the Legislature and other interested persons with copies of a draft bill related to the University of Toronto. I should like now to table an exposure draft of the new University of Toronto Act. This exposure draft is being made public at this time so that all those who are interested will have an opportunity to comment on it prior to its introduction in this House.

The draft has been prepared on the basis of a number of considerations. The Commission on University Government and the University Wide Committee provided an expression of the views of those within the university. The government has been concerned in particular with the public interest. As I stated on Monday, it is our opinion that the strong support for unicameralism from within the university should be recognized, and this bill includes that provision.

A most important change in this draft bill, from the proposals that came forward from within the university, is that which provides for a larger representation of the general public in the governing of the University of Toronto. The government, as a matter of policy, has decided that 50 per cent of the governing council should be drawn from outside the university. As I stated on Monday, the term "outside the university" is to include those members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, those elected by the alumni and the chancellor of the university.

Accordingly, I wish to table this draft for the information and comments of the members of this House.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make on the fire situation in the province. At 10 o'clock this morning I declared a restricted fire zone in the forest districts of Kapuskasing, Cochrane and Swastika. A restricted fire zone prohibits burning and open camp fires. Portable stoves and charcoal burners are permitted.

There are 34 forest fires burning in the province today. Four of these are not under control. One is located 20 miles northwest of Dryden and covers 4,000 acres. A second covers 1,300 acres, 30 miles west of Geraldton. A third is one mile southwest of Moosonee and covers 600 acres. The fourth fire not under control covers 3,500 acres, about 20 miles north of Kirkland Lake.

As a precautionary measure about 400 women and children were evacuated from Moosonee to Moose Factory Island yesterday afternoon. All but 16 have returned to Moosonee. The 16 remaining at Moose Factory are elderly or invalids and are staying at the hospital.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House of the government's decision in the matter of the William R. Allen—Spadina—Expressway.

As all of us know, this has been an issue of anxious interest to the people of Metropolitan Toronto and, since Toronto is their capital city, to the people of Ontario. The subject has been exhaustively debated, the project itself has been examined and re-examined, substantial sums of money have already been invested in planning, preparation and in construction. Literally years of time have been expended by various public bodies, professional groups, citizen organizations and private individuals in vigorous discussion and debate on the merits or otherwise of this project.

Together with my colleagues, and in consultation with our experts, I have studied the project again so as to reach a final determination in the matter. As a new government, and without prejudice to the past, it is our responsibility to do so. We are fully aware that our decision will represent not a judgement upon the past but a decision upon which policies for the future will be built.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose on this occasion to re-argue the case for or against the Spadina Expressway. The arguments are so familiar to so many that a reiteration of them would be an imposition. I will say, however, that the decision has been dfficult, one which will be difficult for many to accept and as disappointing to some as it will be pleasing to others.

The issue of the Spadina Expressway is not only a substantive one, but it has become a symbolic one among the population at large whose legitimate concerns for the planning and development of the capital city of their province, their communities, and their transportation facilities are all keenly felt and whose interest in conserving their urban amenities and environment has become one of the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario does not propose to proceed in support of the plan for the Spadina Expressway. We do propose to co-operate with the appropriate municipal authorities in the development of alternative transportation facilities, in which we shall offer appreciably greater provincial financial assistance for rapid transit services, including land acquisition and parking in connection with these services.

It is our conclusion that if we are to serve adequately and sensibly the transportation needs of the Toronto area, both in the suburbs and downtown, we must place our reliance on means and methods other than those which will encourage and proliferate the use of the passenger car as the basic means of transportation.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the Premier not tell the truth that the government is broke and cannot afford it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, in determining how best to serve the future needs of Metropolitan Toronto, we must make a decision as to whether we are trying to build a transportation system to serve the automobile or one which will best serve people. If we are building a transportation system to serve the automobile, the Spadina Expressway would be a good place to start. But if we are building a transportation system to serve people, the Spadina Expressway is a good place to stop. It is our determination to opt for the latter.

In taking this position, I am well aware and very sensitive to the fact that we are reversing a decision which was taken by the majority of the elected representatives of Metropolitan Toronto. I have no doubts whatsoever as to the strength of their convictions in this matter; nor do I question the matter of their right to determine their interest as they see it and as they saw it in 1963 when the Ontario Municipal Board first gave approval to the application of Metropolitan Toronto to construct this expressway.

But the government and Legislature of Ontario have their responsibilities as well and their interests. We can do no less than discharge them in the light of present day circumstances. So saying, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the judgement of the Legislature will be consistent with that of the government.

There have been profound and significant changes in regard to the evaluation of this project since its original conception; not the least of these has been the cost of it. Seven years after the Ontario Municipal Board's approval was given, the estimated cost had more than doubled. But more important, in my judgement, has been the growing evidence and accumulative experience gathered elsewhere on this continent which demonstrates the ultimate futility of giving priority to the passenger car as a means of transportation into and out of the cities. In some instances, Mr. Speaker, the decision may have been late in coming, but for Ontario, as far as Toronto is concerned, we believe the time to act is now.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this government cannot help but heed the rising public anxiety and concern in questions relating to pollution and environmental control. I trust that our decision will give further assurance of our determination to respond to these concerns.

I have no doubt that, while the estimated cost of this expressway has doubled over the past seven years, the numbers of the general public opposed to the undertaking have multiplied many times over. Whether such would constitute a majority or not I cannot say, but it is at least a substantial and significant minority, including, I might add, vast numbers of those who will inherit the cities and the environment we are now creating. I am confident that if the people of the Toronto

that we will know tomorrow were consulted, they would give overwhelming approval to the decision their government has taken today.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this House, whatever their constituency, share with me I am sure, an admiration and affection for our provincial capital. We are proud of its growth. We are the beneficiaries of its commerce and industry and its cultural developments. As a capital city, there are few, if any, in North America, more generously endowed with natural beauty and attractions. Toronto has downtown residential areas, historic landmarks, parklands and recreational facilities which are almost unique to urban life today and which will be beyond value or price to the urban life of tomorrow.

It would seem to me imperative that those of us who have responsibility and, I might add, final authority, must do all we can to maintain the quality of our urban life, preserve our ravines and parks, conserve our residential communities, private homes and historic landmarks, and enhance and repair our waterfront. Anyone who has this week visited the newly created Yonge Street mall will be visibly struck by the realization of how much the people of this city enjoy and value its attractions when given the opportunity to do so freely. One might borrow some of the popular rhetoric and say, looking at the thousands of cheerful Torontonians and their neighbours making use of the mall, that the streets belong to the people.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the city does not belong to the automobile. We have taken this decision in the clear understanding that for those who live in the suburbs, for whom Toronto is their place of work or the scene for their pleasure, alternative, efficient and economic means can and will be provided for their transportation requirements. As for those who will continue to live in the city, we recognize their need for a transportation system that provides maximum facility and convenience but which will neither depreciate nor destroy their community life.

Mr. Speaker, I would express the hope that our conclusion will lead us directly into intensive discussion which will apply to the future and that we will not find ourselves re-arguing the past. To do so may provide some satisfaction to our critics but, in terms of the public's transportation needs, it will not get anyone anywhere. The spirit which has motivated our decision is both positive and progressive.

We shall be prepared very shortly to discuss with the appropriate municipal authorities new proposals for financial and other assistance in meeting their needs. We shall do so with the greatest goodwill, and on the understanding that both they and we seek the same achievement, which is to maintain a city and a life for its people that are an inspiration and example for all and a source of pride and satisfaction to the people of Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It kind of gets you right here. Who writes that stuff?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will not get the member but it might get some others.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

DECISION ON SPADINA EXPRESSWAY

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the Premier, further to his statement, if I am correct in my understanding that even that part of the Spadina Expressway which is already built will be abandoned as a thoroughfare for automobiles and that only rapid transit will use it? In other words, it will not be completed past where it is presently built? It will not be extended down to Eglinton?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is the import of the statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask further then, can the Premier inform the House what financial commitment has been made on the automobile part of the route so far? Surely, that has been a part of his study?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the figures are difficult to break down between the rights-of-way—what has been committed, shall we say, to the expressway portion and what part would be the moneys allocated to the rapid transit or the subway facility.

I shall endeavour to get this breakdown for the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but they are very directly related.

Mr. Nixon: Let me just make this clear, as a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Cannot the Pemier tell the House what moneys already expended are, in fact, going to be abandoned by his decision today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can get for the Leader of the Opposition the total of the sums of money—

Mr. Nixon: The Premier does not know right now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that have been expended. Just what portion of these funds will still be used in a positive sense relates to the decision as to the moving ahead with the rapid transit portion—what portion of those funds would be normally allocated to them.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: The Premier then is indicating that the decision on moving ahead with the rapid transit portion rests with the municipality and not with the government; he is not prepared to make this decision on behalf of the municipality at this time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker. I made it very clear in the statement, I hope, that the government was prepared to sit down with the metropolitan officials to discuss increased financial participation in terms of land acquisition, parking, and so on, as far as it relates to the rapid transit portion.

Mr. Nixon: Two further supplementaries, then Mr. Speaker: The Premier then can give no timetable as to when the modern, efficient, rapid transit that he referred to in his statement would be available? And secondly, he is not prepared at this time to indicate what sort of assistance would be made available? He is not prepared to inform the Legislature before, as he says, he sits down with the municipalities on this continuing problem?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Nixon: Just a moment, I would like it on the record, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is not prepared to indicate the timetable in the improvement of the rapid transit system.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West—supplementary?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes, a supplementary—prefaced, if I may, by the comment that we applaud enthusiastically the decision of the cabinet, on balance, Mr. Speaker, in every sense.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): We applaud the members' applause.

Mr. Lewis: That will not happen often—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know.

Mr. Lewis: —but it is nice to see it from time to time. I want simply to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the Premier thinks this will require the introduction of legislation flowing from the Throne Speech announcement about a new percentage subsidy for public and rapid transit generally. Will we have legislation before this session terminates?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not only will it be necessary, we will have it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, has the Premier approached Ottawa to make available the rail lines now serving the northwest section of the city, which are not fully utilized, and to increase the service as has been recently approved for the northeast section of the city?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not given this any thought in the last two or three days as it relates to this particular problem, but I certainly will give consideration to the point raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: In view of the fact that the drainage system will no longer be necessary, will it be possible to restore the Nordheimer Ravine to its pristine wooded state?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. member means by pristine wooded state, as to what it was prior to or after; I quite honestly cannot comment as to the possibility of so restoring it. I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: Use part of the $20 million land bank.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I do not applaud the decision, I condemn it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Does the hon. member speak for his leader?

Mr. Singer: Could the Premier advise us, Mr. Speaker, the cost to date—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: As soon as the members are through! Could the Premier advise us, Mr. Speaker, the cost to date to the Province of Ontario in building "Spaghetti Junction," the fantastic intersection and interchange at 401, plus the total cost to date that the province has expended in its 50 per cent subsidy to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would put that on the order paper, I would be delighted to get that for him.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, could the Premier advise us how the present Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton), who was responsible for the multi-million-dollar provincial commitment, can continue longer in the cabinet in light of the decision this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that very clearly. He can not only stay in this cabinet now, and for some many years to come, because he has the capacity to recognize, as we have in this government, that circumstances lead to change.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And while the hon. member for Downsview and his leader and his party have never recognized that, this government does.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier advise us—

Mr. Lewis: Where do you find these straight men—how much do you pay them?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier advise us how, if he accepts the traditions of democratic procedure—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Now it is going to become a crucifixion.

Mr. Singer: —when the commitments of a cabinet minister are no longer accepted, that minister, under our theory of responsible government, can continue to occupy his position?

Mr. Lewis: Does the member realize what the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) did just now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just told the hon. member how, why, when and where, and I would think it would be rather obvious to him and to me. It was one of the most unnecessary questions that he has asked, and there have been many.

Mr. Pitman: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Premier does not understand that there is responsible government.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: Yes, a further supplementary: Could the Premier advise us—

Mr. Pitman: The member will carry on all afternoon.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier advise us how many jobs it was anticipated would have been created and would be available now to unemployed citizens in Toronto had the programme gone ahead?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government has been suggesting ways and means—and that party over there has been defending its federal cohorts—for the last four weeks in this Legislature as to the ways and means of a job. It would be far more constructive if he would take that up with them.

Mr. Singer: Would the Premier—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answer is no.

Mr. Singer: —Mr. Speaker, name one way or means, that he has suggested?

Mr. Nixon: What ways are there? Name one!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answer is no.

Mr. Singer: Name one way.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): One way is not asking us to subscribe.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not now asking a question supplementary to the original. The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Can the Prime Minister indicate if this announcement will in any way affect other expressway projects in other cities in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, they will all be assessed on their individual merits. There will be the provincial policy as it relates to greater incentives financially for the creation of rapid transit facilities which, of course, obviously will be considered by some municipalities.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): When is the government going to announce that?

Mr. Makarchuk: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that some of these projects are under way, can the Prime Minister indicate when the announcement is to be made so there will not be any termination which may waste funds?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The announcement will be made, Mr. Speaker—I was going to say in the fullness of time, but that would provoke them—fairly soon.

Mr. Lewis: What about the Scarborough Expressway?

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, on that matter: Since some of these expressways are presently in the advanced stages of planning, and some are in construction—Windsor and Brantford is one that my hon. friend has raised—is the Prime Minister indicating that—

Mr. Lewis: Scarborough?

Mr. Nixon: —there will be a freeze on all of these activities pending further review?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no freeze.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal opinion, I applaud the—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, come on, get to the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will ask the question.

Mr. T. Reid: My supplementary question is, does the Premier intend to instruct his responsible officials to improve the GO Transit service to the people in Scarborough in the immediate future?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government of this province is always seeking ways and means to improve every aspect of provincial services and this includes GO.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The Premier will recall that in his—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): The member will not get a chance to do it.

Mr. Singer: Did he quit?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Speak up!

Mr. Lewis: If the professional patsy to my right can contain himself for a moment, I would be pleased to. The Premier will recall that in his dissenting decision in the OMB hearing, the Chairman, Mr. Kennedy, linked the Spadina and Scarborough expressways rather closely in terms of future construction. Has the cabinet yet rendered a decision, or does it intend to, on the extension of the Scarborough?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, it is the extension of the Gardiner, but I sometimes do get names confused. That is not before cabinet; it is before the Ontario Municipal Board.

Mr. Nixon: Will the government review that a little later in the year?

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition any further questions?

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A question of the hon. Premier: Has he given his view to the Prime Minister of Canada on the proposal that the federal-provincial conference be postponed, and has he any response to the suggestion that a second conference might be proposed at which commercial—let us say, economic activity—be the main topic of discussion, rather than simply added on to the discussions on the constitution?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition as clearly as I might have. As far as Ontario is concerned, we have made no representations for postponement, nor do we propose to do so, and we have not been asked for any. In my view, it would be unfortunate if it were to be postponed.

As it relates to consideration of economic matters, I suggested to the Prime Minister of Canada some weeks ago, that I thought it would be wise if we could add this to the agenda. The Prime Minister of Canada has indicated, as I understand it, that he would be prepared to do so at the end of the three-day agenda related to constitutional discussions. As to whether or not there is an agreement or consensus across the country to have this done, I cannot inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition at this moment.

SECOND TORONTO REGIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. Nixon: A second question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Can he make a clear statement as to what is going on in the development of plans and, particularly, in the decisions associated with the second airport proposed for Ontario in the Toronto

region? Are we going to continue to be treated by the government of Canada and by the government of Ontario to a "yes, you are—no, you are not" kind of confrontation? Or can we have some facts as to what the proposals are by the two governments and what, in fact, is holding up the decision?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member has been on the end of the pipeline again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has the member been on the end of the pipe line? No. I was just wondering. Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Nixon: Without the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) here, the Prime Minister really cannot put that across.

Mr. Singer: We can always get the Minister of Trade and Development to make an off-the-top-of-the-head attack.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has not been the day for the member for Downsview. It is kind of obvious. Mr. Speaker, I regret—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was not meant to be either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member said he would not get his Oscar for today's performance.

Mr. Lewis: We know the minister's philosophical commitment to the statement, but there was St. Andrew, St. Patrick, St. George—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is all on a matter of principle; always on a matter of principle. Mr. Speaker, I regret the implication and I am quite prepared to recognize that it may not be quite as it was stated from the Prime Minister of Canada—that Ontario, and I think the words used were "the municipalities", were delaying the decision as it related to the location of or proposed location of a site for a second airport facility in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me what is and will remain a confidential letter to the Prime Minister of Canada, dated April 29. I have before me a copy of a letter from the Minister of Transportation and Communications—then Minister of Transport—to Mr. Jamieson dated April 28. I think I can refer to the hon. minister's letter in which he set out and asked for, as I did, specific information as it related to the federal policy as to payments for the infrastructure that was necessary for the creation of a second airport site.

To me this is fundamental; it is basic. It means millions and millions of dollars as far as the province is concerned. I think we must, if we are going to make a contribution as to possible sites, know what the federal policy is with respect to the servicing of the airport. And with great respect, Mr. Speaker, we have had replies to neither of those letters.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: I wonder if the Premier can make it clear as to whether there is, in fact, agreement between the two governments on a site or is the present delay simply on the matters of who shall pay what percentage of the servicing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, because the determination of site has certain economic implications. I will not use site A, B, C and D because I have a feeling that this was used by the federal Minister of Transport. But let us assume there are X number of sites. The economics of one site as opposed to another could be very significant. There is no agreement on a single site at this moment as far as the province of Ontario is concerned. Our interest is finding out from the federal government what their policy is as it relates to the servicing of the airport because they are—

Mr. Sargent: The service could be self-amortizing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know whether or not it could be self-amortizing, Mr. Speaker. All I know is that it is going to cost somebody a pile of dough and we want to find out—and it will be different for each site—and this is why I think it is important that we have this information.

Mr. Nixon: A final supplementary, as far as I am concerned: The Premier is simply waiting for word from Ottawa? That is all there is to it? He indicates yes.

OFFTRACK BETTING

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Is the Attorney General now in a position to make some statement as to Ontario's position on recommendations to the government of Canada on offtrack betting legislation and regulations?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: After that useful statement, we assume that this was a matter that was discussed and not settled with the Minister of Justice for Canada?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It was certainly discussed as it has been discussed with him a number of times since I assumed this portfolio. It was discussed with the federal Minister of Justice by my predecessor many times, as well.

The federal minister has asked me to refrain from public comment now until I receive from him a letter. I am awaiting that letter. When the letter is received it will be discussed—

Mr. Lewis: These federal people!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —by my cabinet colleagues and policy will be announced in due course. In view of the undertaking that I have given to Mr. Turner, I feel that the useful type of contribution that I have just made to a useful type of question like that must remain.

Mr. Lewis: That is fuller and better than usual. There are not as many beads of sweat on the minister's brow as at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: To the Minister of Justice: On May 11 he promised the—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: About six months.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on May 11 the minister promised a statement of policy from this government by June 11. Is that forthcoming?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, who did that?

Mr. Sargent: The minister promised a statement of the government's policy in this regard within 30 days.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I did not.

Hr. Sargent: Then the Toronto Star report is wrong?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Absolutely, 100 per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on page—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has answered the question. The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River now has the floor.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): By way of supplementary, does the minister not feel that a happy conclusion to this whole problem would be the province taking over these betting shops and running them, much as they do the liquor outlets in the Province of Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister advise who is protecting the people of Ontario in placing their bets at the present time? There is no record of any bets being placed, there is no inspection by the government—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we will let the minister answer the question, if he wishes.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He probably will not.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am not too sure I understand the differing opinions between the member from Owen Sound and the member behind him. The question of prosecution where there are alleged offences under the Criminal Code is one that is being very aggressively pursued by all of the police forces of this province as far as I know.

These are certainly my instructions to them, and one complaint at the moment, of course, is that in certain localities the courts are being clogged by these prosecutions. If my friend is attempting to imply here that we are not doing our utmost to enforce the law I say to him I reject that implication very sincerely.

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary: Would the minister explain to me then—at the rate of $5 million being placed with offtrack betting, there is no record of these moneys that have been placed with these offtrack people—what record or protection is he giving the people in saying that this money is getting to the track? No one knows what is going on. Does the minister know what is going on?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If we have any evidence to the contrary, prosecutions take place.

Mr. Sargent: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

CANCELLATION OF RAIL SERVICES

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Transport and Communications is it? Transportation and Communications —and my congratulations to his continuing seniority:

Will the Province of Ontario intervene in the numerous cancellations sought by the Canadian National Railways of rather important internal routes?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes; very vigorously yes.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the minister by now is fully aware of the routes that CN seeks cancellation for, will we oppose cancellation for all of those routes? Can I seek from him specifically an assurance that those in northern Ontario will be vigorously opposed by the government?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It has been our practice and it will continue, Mr. Speaker, to intervene in every proposal for abandonment of services by either the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific Railroad in Ontario. That will continue.

Mr. Deacon: As a supplementary, in this intervention will the minister direct that his staff not only intervene in opposition to any cancellation but propose well documented means of improving the service to these centres so that the service could possibly become of greater value than it now is to the community?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this is taken into account in terms of these interventions, because of course it is becoming obvious to us that the lessening of service that is provided is to some extent calculated to reduce it to the point where the patronage is also reduced. We are convinced of this and we propose to pursue it along those lines, as I say, very vigorously.

There can be no question about the other side of the coin either, that if a service is restored to something like normality I think it is a responsibility of the public to then utilize it, or the railways will have a perfect right to propose abandonment, and this has characterized the operations of a number of services throughout the province.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Will the minister propose or provide studies which would show what is necessary to have the public support it? The public does not support it for good reasons.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not now on the original question that he mentioned before.

Mr. Deacon: A matter of intervention—

Mr. Speaker: I rule that one out of order. The member for Thunder Bay has a supplementary?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the minister look into the possibility of extending the Ontario Northland Railway and its facilities to underserviced areas in the event that you are not successful with your intervention?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, yes, we will.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries? The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: A very short supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I want to ask the hon. minister how far along he is in devising the grid of transportation services within which railway services will form a part. Is there any possibility that he will be getting some indication of how far along that grid is in intervening against these cutbacks which will very much undermine that grid when it eventually comes?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is an appropriate question, Mr. Speaker, but shall we put it this way, this new ministry has just been created for a short period of time. There is very intensive study, appraisal and everything else going on at this moment. We are going to expand our efforts and we are going to expand the pursuit of these interventions in even a broader fashion than we have in the past.

Probably this is superfluous, Mr. Speaker, but again it is obvious to me—and I have no hesitancy in saying so—that some of the curtailment of services is associated with the fact that if it can be established as a losing proposition, there is an 80 per cent grant from the federal authorities on it. I have reason to believe that that is taken into account as well.

So we propose to pursue these matters in a broader sense than ever before and, as I say, as vigorously as we possibly can. But I think you, in fairness, should allow some time to explore the field to the extent that it should be broadened, but we are at it now.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider approaching the Canadian Transport

Commission with respect to the lines that have already been abandoned for the purpose of trying to renegotiate the commencement of the service once again?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to concentrate our efforts on applications for further abandonment which will keep us rather busy, I think, for the short-term future. Whether it is possible to reactivate any of these lines that have been abandoned is a moot question. It has been established to the satisfaction of the commission that they are losing operations, whether it has been done by accident, or by design, or whether there just was not sufficient patronage. Frankly, I would doubt the success of such an exercise before the Canadian Transport Commission. However, it is worth looking into and we will pursue that line too.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation—

Mr. Lewis: No, no!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Singer: The member is not through yet?

Mr. Lewis: I have one question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Many of my intended ministers, Mr. Speaker, are rapidly transiting themselves out of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment. If the member for Sudbury East has a supplementary, he is entitled to that.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister in his reply stated that the Ontario government always looked into the abandonments. Could the minister indicate what action the government took this past spring when the CNR abandoned trains No. 107, 108, 11 and 8—the Panoramas from Winnipeg to Toronto and from Winnipeg to Montreal? What action did the government undertake besides the telegram that was sent?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we intervened, which constitutes an appearance before the commission. We are assisted in this by the Minister of Justice's staff, together with The Department of Treasury and Economics, who do the economic studies in support; but a solicitor from the department of the Minister of Justice goes through the intervention process. The support, economic and otherwise, is provided, as I said, by The Department of Treasury and Economics and the former Department of Transport, now merged into Transportation and Communications. It is done in great depth. The studies are complete in every sense of the word, and this is the way it is approached. It is not an exchange of telegrams, I can assure the hon. member. It is an in-depth approach in terms of intervention in every circumstance.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister table copies of the materials exchanged with the federal government with respect to trains 107 and 108?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think the question should be put to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General because the carriage of the intervention is done through his department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West now has the floor.

QUARRYING PERMITS IN NIAGARA ESCARPMENT AREA

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. Of the 27 permits issued to quarrying in the Niagara Escarpment area by his department, are any of them new since the emergency legislation of September?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, not one of the permits that were issued is new. They were all renewals to existing quarry operators.

Mr. Lewis: Not one is a new quarry permit?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Right.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Have any permit applications been rejected by the minister's department since the September announcement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have not accepted any.

Mr. Lewis: I mean renewal applications.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Lewis: So if I understand it correctly, although I am a little mystified, all the renewal applications to his department have been approved.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, because they have been all for existing operations in that particular area. There are no new permits granted for any quarries on the Niagara Escarpment.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the enforcement of The Niagara Escarpment Protection Act is going beyond the Act itself, and I am very pleased to report this to the House.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, could the minister say that last line again?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are going beyond the requirements of the Act.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Could he explain that to me—beyond? What does he mean by "beyond?"

Mr. Lewis: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Back in September the permits for renewal were granted on the basis of one month, three to six months, or 12 months, I take it that in the life of the minister's own stewardship of his post he has granted further renewal extensions to the existing operations?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I think this is correct.

Mr. Lewis: That he has?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does he recall how many he has granted in his period of time?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I do not recall.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North has a supplementary.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Does the minister presently have an application for a permit for mining or quarrying from either the Pickand Mather, which deals in iron ore and ferrous alloys, or Dow Chemical, both of which have large industrial holdings in the Bruce Peninsula within the Niagara Escarpment protected area?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Good: A supplementary: Has the hon. minister had any consultation with either of these firms as to their projected development of industrial mining in that area?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. Good: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One more.

Mr. Good: Was any application made to the former minister that you know of?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Have any of the conditions that previously existed on the permits been altered in the reissuing of the new permits to quarries?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would explain to the hon. member that when The Niagara Escarpment Protection Act came in, the present operators had 90 days to submit an application. With that application a site plan must be filed with the minister and with the department, and that site plan has been adhered to very closely. Our inspectors go out and make sure that they are living up to their agreement and the permits are reissued, providing they are living up to their terms of the site plan.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a supplementary, specifically with regard to the Cope quarry in Saltfleet township. As mentioned in the list that was provided, have there been any alterations to the conditions that previously existed as a result of the housing development which will be going in immediately around the quarry area?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, there are some 27 operators, and I think the member will understand that I do not know each one individually. But I will be glad to follow that up and get him the information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the minister yet able to advise me in relation to the inquiry about quarrying on the Niagara Escarpment, which I addressed to him the other day, and the petition?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, the letter that was directed to me was mailed on May 20, arrived in my office on May 27 and the answer went out on May 31.

Mr. Singer: What is the minister's position? Is the complaint justifed or not? They say the quarrying is going on—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Are we referring to the same thing? The reply is in the mail to the individual.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Read the mail.

Mr. Singer: Well, would the minister tell the House what he said?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Let the member tell the House after he reads his mail.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary? The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I have a supplementary. Does the minister acquire all the surface and mining rights for all these acquisitions?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Acquisitions?

Mr. Sargent: I mean all these areas that we are talking about on the escarpment. Does the minister retain all the surface and mining rights?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, these are all private properties, Mr. Speaker. They are all private properties, and all we do is—

Mr. Sargent: Then, would the Minister of Lands and Forests know whether he retains the mining rights for these areas?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, either by way of a supplementary or a new question: I take it the minister did not feel the need for an aerial survey or a personal inspection of the permits for which he has renewed the extension since he assumed the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, we will be examining the full length of the Niagara Escarpment on Monday morning.

Mr. Lewis: Right! But for those permits that was fine. Before the minister brings in the permanent legislation the minister needs an aerial survey. Is that it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Right.

Mr. Lewis: Himself?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What was that again?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: It was fine for the minister to extend permits to quarry on the escarpment since he became minister without any personal inspection of any kind, but for the permanent legislation he is going to take an aerial survey?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think the member should realize that we have inspectors who are in the Niagara Escarpment and doing a tremendous job, I will admit. They are all inspected, yes.

Mr. Lewis: I see, but their judgement and his predecessor's judgement is not enough on which to base permanent legislation? That is what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It certainly does.

Mr. Randall: We are going to have a groundhog survey on Tuesday.

Mr. Makarchuk: Back to the hamburger stand!

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs: The Minister of Municipal Affairs will recall, since the Minister of Municipal Affairs admonished the municipal conference which he addressed in North Bay to the effect that "certain regional municipalities were making non-essential expenditures" in the pursuit of regional government, can be indicate to the House which regional municipalities he meant and which non-essential expenditures he was describing?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall I admonished them. I made, dealing with certain facts—

Mr. Pitman: The Treasurer insulted them; this minister admonished them.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): I did not insult anybody.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Would the member believe Metro on the Spadina?

Mr. Lewis: I can understand why his feelings were the same.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I can understand why the member's are not.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. I thought that was fine today.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, on the average last year, municipal expenditures throughout the province went up by about 12 to 15 per cent. Expenditures went up among the municipalities in the Niagara region by a total of 34 per cent. Now, only a small portion of that increase was related directly to regional government and that was more than offset by additional moneys they received for regional government, which was in excess of $1 million.

Our concern when we see expenditures increasing that much is that I should look at them very carefully in those areas and also in the other areas. Those regions are seeking additional assistance from us, and I think in protection of the taxpayers we should draw those matters to their attention.

Mr. Lewis: Right. By way of supplementary, since the minister has now taken a lusty whack at the regional municipality of Niagara, would he like to inform the House which parts of that 34 per cent increase were on non-essential expenditures unrelated to the requirements of regional government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing in the—

Mr. Sargent: No one will ever know.

Mr. Lewis: Come on. The minister made the charge, now give us the document.

Hon. Mr. Bales: All right. We are dealing on total budgets, because that is the way they provide the information, and it takes some time to break it down into individual services for each area.

Mr. Stokes: The minister had to have it in order to make the allegation.

Mr. Lewis: The minister made the assertion. He must have had the goods.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We are dealing on the total budgets that they submitted to us. We are also working on the matter of finding out where they did this, but the fact is that we had—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —that total information and I announced some time ago that I had a task force within the department examining these things and they are doing so.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: The minister cannot now give to the House one example of an unnecessary expenditure unrelated to regional government of which he accused the regional governments in Ontario? Is it not therefore possible that the increase Mr. Speaker, might well all be related directly or indirectly to regional government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not so.

Mr. Lewis: Then give us the facts.

Mr. Sargent: Ask the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator). He will tell you.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have carefully examined the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we have examined the regional government expenditures for the Niagara region. Those people are doing a good job, but nevertheless you have to recognize that their expenses in their budget for last year have increased substantially beyond the average for municipalities in other parts of this province.

Mr. Lewis: But they are not in regions. Give us the specifics. The minister made the charge—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Just a minute, we are dealing with municipalities some of which have the same responsibilities as they had before.

Mr. Lewis: The minister used the phrase—

Hon. Mr. Bales: In other cases they have lesser responsibilities.

Mr. Lewis: The minister used the phrase "non-essential expenditures."

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has asked his question.

Mr. Lewis: I would appreciate an answer.

Mr. Singer: He wants to answer it too; nobody can get a word in edgewise.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Downsview should relax.

Mr. Stokes: We are trying to save the member from embarrassing himself.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Waterloo North a supplementary?

Mr. Good: In the matter of the increased costs in the Niagara region, Mr. Speaker,

could the minister inform the House whether or not the additional moneys put in by the province for the setting up of the regional police force were included in the increase of 34 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The police force becomes regional in the year 1971, not in the year 1970.

Mr. Good: As a supplementary: In the increase in the setting up of the police force this year for next year's operation, were those costs included in the 34 per cent increase?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, the grant they will receive this year for the police commission is $350,000.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West completed his questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have.

Mr. Speaker: Then the Minister of Tourism and Information has the reply to a question.

OLD FORT WILLIAM EXPENDITURES

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As requested by the hon. member for Scarborough West, I should like to table a letter from the vice-president of CPR in connection with the original site of Fort William at Thunder Bay.

In the second part of his question, the hon. member was seeking information on who owns the property abutting the proposed site for Fort William upon which we hold option. The land intended for the site is surrounded on three sides by the Kam River. All the property now under option by The Department of Public Works was owned by Mr. Donald King. Mr. King and his brother retained part of the property abutting the fourth side of the proposed site. There are presently public access roads leading to the site and the department has no plans for further land acquisition in regard to either roads or the site itself.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on that question—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker: To the hon. minister who just made that statement, has the decision now been made to proceed with the restoration or the building or something representing old Fort William on the new site?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It has been made in a sense, but I am still waiting for a reply from the federal Department of Transport, having asked them to intervene if the original site was possible or still could be available. But it is doubtful. As soon as I hear from him, we are planning to go ahead to reconstruct Fort William on the Pointe de Meuron.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Trade and Development has been carrying an answer around for some days. Perhaps he wishes to give it.

LOANS TO LAKE ERIE COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) on May 25 asked: "Is it true that the Lake Erie commercial fishermen, who filed application for a loan at the end of March, have received only 30 per cent of their loans? If so, when will they receive the other 70 per cent?"

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that all of the 19 loans for which applications have been submitted at the end of March, 1971, will be fully disbursed within the next 10 days. Eleven of these fishermen were given emergency advances on their loans to enable them to get into operation. Seven of these 11 have received a second instalment on the loan, while one fishermen has received his full loan.

The reason the balance of the funds has not yet been disbursed has been due mainly to insufficient information supplied by the fishermen with regard to their equipment. This is now being expedited by ODC providing legal assistance to the fishermen to get their registrations of equipment up to date. This is required to meet registry requirements in order that our loans can be completed. We expect this, as I say, to occur within the next 10 days.

Mr. T. P. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister inform the House if his department, in conjunction with Lands and Forests, has any other programme, other than loans for aiding commercial fishermen who are suffering because of mercury contamination? In other words, is the department providing any assistance for those fishermen who are fishing, particularly in northern Ontario, and whose fish are being destroyed because of mercury contamination?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are other programmes, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. T. P. Reid: What are they?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is another programme, Mr. Speaker, which was announced some time ago, for fishermen, which is a programme other than a loan.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What is that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I believe, if the hon. member will look up Hansard—or I will look it up for him—the details were provided by both the Minister of Lands and Forests and myself. I will get the details for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Makarchuk: Did the minister say that all the fishermen on Lake Erie who have applied for ODC loans have received assistance, or will receive assistance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that there were 19 loans applied for and all of those which were submitted by March, 1971 will be fully disbursed within the next 10 days.

Mr. Makarchuk: A further supplementary: One fisherman by the name of Gary Vaughan —will he receive his assistance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

The member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) advises me, and I am sure the members would like to know, that in Mr. Speaker's gallery we have some distinguished visitors, being the Economic Development Commission of the Wikwemikong Unceded Indian Reservation on Manitoulin Island, which I am told is the second largest Indian reservation in Canada. I am sure we welcome them here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answers to questions on the notice paper, numbers 8, 9, 12, 13 and 14. (See Appendix, page 2324)

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the 1970 annual report of The Department of Highways of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson, from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the Township of Pelee.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the Town of Burlington.

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Your committee recommends that the standing procedural affairs committee consider whether or not section 2 of Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the City of Windsor, should be considered by the private bills committee at this session, he said section 2 not conforming to the notice which was reported on by the procedural affairs committee.

Mr. Villeneuve from the standing human resources committee reports the following resolution:

RESOLVED:

That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of The Department of Social and Family Services be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972:

Department of Social and Family Services

Departmental administration programme	$4,317,000
Social development programe	$300,724,000
Children's services programme	$49,905,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. Could I ask the House leader if we can assume that The Department of Mines will be discussed immediately in committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is my understanding.

Mr. Lewis: You never had any other intention.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I made a motion last week.

Mr. Martel: There have been three changes in the last minutes.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is on the order paper.

Mr. Stokes: We were advised otherwise, that is why I asked.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think in fairness to the House, Mr. Speaker, the deputy minister is away but in spite of that difficulty, we would like to carry out our undertaking and carry on.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

(*concluded*)

On vote 302:

Mr. Chairman: Estimates of The Department of Correctional Services, vote 302, item 2.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3 agreed to.

On item 4, aftercare of adult offenders.

The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. K. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, you have moved very rapidly in the last two or three minutes; I may have lost track of precisely what is happening. I would like to engage the minister (Mr. Apps) in a discussioin about the Burwash institution. I should say that I want to be associated in these comments with the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), who has visited that institution and has had some correspondence with the minister, but he has to be in the supply committee this afternoon.

I preface my questions by an observation which I am sure will meet with the approval of the minister, that the well-being of the officers of correction has a profound effect on the rehabilitation process. Where you have officers who are content in their work, their morale is high, which influences the whole prison community.

I have received reports from various sources and I believe them to be authoritative, that the conditions in Burwash institution are very far from being satisfactory for the men who work there. Specifically, I refer to the living conditions of the single men, who find their quarters quite unsatisfactory.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member speaking to item 2 of this vote?

Mr. Bolton: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Items 1, 2 and 3 have been carried.

Mr. Bolton: No, sir, I was standing—

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 is before the committee.

Mr. Bolton: I was standing when you carried—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): You move rather rapidly.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, I have no objections. I think there is something that should be discussed, so if it is all right with you I would like to answer the question when it is made.

Mr. Chairman: It is not a case of whether it is all right with me or not, it is a case of abiding by the procedures that have been adopted in this House.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: Order please Will the hon. member please take his seat.

I clearly and distinctly called the department, I called the vote, I indicated the item, I put the motion to the committee, there was no response in both cases.

In view of the fact that the hon. minister does not object, I just want to point out to the committee that there was nothing done in any hurry. It was done properly.

Mr. Pitman: It was.

Mr. Chairman: There was no hurry on the part of the Chair. They were clearly put to the committee. However, if the hon. minister does not object, I will permit the hon. member to return to item 2.

Mr. Bolton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to point out, if I may, that I was on my feet and you were not looking in this direction when you called the vote.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the hon. member that the proper method of getting the attention of the Chair is to rise and address the Chair. The members are on their feet from time to time and it is impossible to determine whether they wish to gain the Chair's eye, whether they wish to participate in the debate, or whether they are leaving their seat.

Mr. Bolton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in future, I will be less respectful, I will call out that I wish to speak. I thought I was being courteous in standing waiting to catch your eye.

To revert to the subject of the conditions at Burwash, I am informed that it is many years since the living quarters of the staff, the single staff, have been improved in any way whatsoever. I am told it is so cold in the winter time that they sit there in their parkas when they are playing cards, and even have snow within the room. I believe these facts have been passed on to the minister. I just wish to read them into the record and say I trust that some action will be taken promptly to improve the situation, because morale is at a very low ebb and it has interfered very seriously with the condition of not only the workers there but the prisoners.

Another item to which I must make reference is the matter of the hospital at Burwash. I am told that if anybody is in hospital, there is no protection during the night; there is no medical attention apart from the installation of a buzzer which can be rung by the patient if he is in need. This seems to me a shockingly inadequate medical provision. A patient might ring the buzzer and he might wait for a very long time. He might even need oxygen, and there is no oxygen piped in there. I trust the minister will look into Burwash very thoroughly indeed for these reasons.

A third point about this institution, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the general provisions for correctional officers, and that is their inability to obtain transfer from one institution to another. This procedure seems to be very complex. If a man, for instance, transfers to Burwash as a correctional officer, for most of these men this is going to be the end of the line; and their grave dissatisfaction with the total supervision, the whole atmosphere, the restrictive conditions is very grave indeed and reflects very seriously on the whole rehabilitation process. I urge the minister to have a thorough-going inquiry and investigation and indicate to the House what improvements are planned and when they may be expected. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of discussing this in the House with the member, and I can certainly appreciate the concern shown by him and his colleague from Sudbury East in this connection. This is of great concern to me. As the member may know, I visited Burwash shortly after I became the new minister, and one of the things that certainly stood out was the fact that the housing within the grounds, and particularly for the single staff—it is called, I guess, the Royal York up there—was in pretty poor condition.

After coming back from Burwash and having discussed this as well with the member for Sudbury East, I contacted The Department of Public Works, and at the present time the working drawings are being prepared for new single staff quarters in Burwash. So that is well on its way.

In addition to that, I contacted the new Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) in an effort to see what could be done by the Ontario Housing Corporation to survey and go over the whole residence area within the grounds. You will be pleased to know that, on June 9, staff of the Ontario Housing Corporation, along with our own staff, are going to Burwash to thoroughly survey the area and determine how the Ontario Housing Corporation can put its funds to work in order to provide additional staff houses in addition to the single quarters there. We are working on that.

I assured the hon. member for Sudbury East this would be done, and I am sure he will be pleased to know that plans are well on the way, first of all, to build a new single staff quarters there, and to survey the married staff quarters to see how the Ontario Housing Corporation can be of help to provide new facilities as well for them.

As the member will realize, one of the problems with having staff within an institution is that they tend sometimes to become a little institutionalized themselves; they have really no outside interest. We are trying to do our best to phase out some of the old houses within the institutional grounds and provide other places where the staff can live. I am concerned about it; I realize that situations like this can cause a depletion in the morale of the correctional workers on the staff there, and you can rest assured that we are working on it and we

hope to come up with some very definite announcements in that connection.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, I would like to thank the minister for these encouraging remarks and to further point out that it will help morale. One point is that the correctional officers have a great deal of difficulty in having visitors; they are treated as if they were themselves confined in prison quarters, and this is very bad for morale.

The second point has to do with the people who visit inmates. They arrive at about 5:30 in the morning, and it would be very gracious and very helpful if provision could be made for them to be at least provided with coffee or some sort of amenity when they arrive.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, you will also be pleased to know that arrangements have been made for them to have coffee in the morning when they arrive. As you know, they are provided with lunch, which costs the visitors 50 cents. In view of the discussions with the member for Sudbury East, I have arranged this; I think this is being done now. We realize this is a reasonable thing to do, because as you mentioned, visitors come there very early in the morning and they have to sit around without anything to eat or drink until noon. I think we are providing them with free coffee so at least that will be of some help to them.

Now you mentioned also, transfers, in connection with the difficulty of transferring staff from one institution to another. This is done from time to time whenever it can be arranged. It is very difficult to transfer staff from, say, Burwash when there are vacancies there, to fill a vacancy somewhere else, because you have got to turn around and fill the vacancy that is left in Burwash when they may not have full complement there. But we do endeavour as far as possible to make transfers when we can do it.

As you know, the qualifications and the circumstances in the other centres have to be the same as in the centre which the person wants to be transferred from; at the same time the superintendent in the new centre must also give his approval because he is the one who has to administer the centre and as a result he wants to have some say in who is obtained.

Now the thought crossed my mind, particularly as far as Burwash is concerned, that after a certain period of time there might be some merit in considering that those who want to be transferred out of Burwash be given that opportunity. Now, mind you, there are a lot of them that do not; they have established their homes there, they do not want to move. But we realize that Burwash is a rather isolated area, we realize that in some cases very good people want to move from there to one of the other ones. It could be, as I say, that there might be some merit in saying after they have been there for, I do not know, 10 years or so, and they feel they want to get out, that we might consider trying to do that if they so desire.

The problem at the present time is the fact that we do not want to create additional vacancies when there may be some vacancies still there. We want to make sure that the superintendent in the new institution in which the transferee may go has some say in who he receives. Also we have to make sure, of course, that the qualifications of the transferee meet with the qualifications of the opening in the other centre.

As far as the hospital is concerned, only the minor cases really are left in the hospital at Burwash; any major cases of people who are sick are transferred into the hospital in Sudbury, and the liaison between Burwash and the hospital in Sudbury, as the member may know, is very, very good. As a result, anybody who is seriously ill or is injured, gets transferred directly to the hospital in Sudbury. Only, you could say, the minor injuries or the people who are not very sick are left in the hospital at Burwash.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk for a few moments to the minister, through you, about the Millbrook reformatory, another problem—

Hon. Mr. Apps: We are still on two now, I take it?

Mr. Pitman: We are still on the second one, yes. I was one of those slow members who did not quite get my book opened soon enough to—Well, I think that so far as Millbrook reformatory is concerned, I am sure the minister would regard this as really an unfortunate error or mistake, of another decade; an extension of the philosophy of jails and reformatories which is really quite irrational and inappropriate in the 1970s.

Now, the question is, how does the minister eject himself from this situation? I think if he just reads his own report, he finds really a gathering of a very inappropriate group of

people. You have here the severe behavioural problems—people who cannot be contained within the minimum security institutions that he has under his jurisdiction; you have in there as well the escape artists, one might call them—those who seem to find it quite easy to walk away from the institutions which have lower walls and lower gates. As well as that, you have other groups: sex deviates, pedophiles, you have arsonists, and I think, as well as that, you have drug addicts.

Now, I am sure the minister would have to agree that a more inappropriate group of people could never be found in terms of providing an effective rehabilitation process in one institution. You have got the first two groups I mentioned, who I think might be called the hard core; those for whom rehabilitation will be a very long and difficult process, a demanding process, and in the meantime, the recognition of the protection, in terms of the staff at the reformatory and in protection of society as a whole, it demands a certain degree of care.

On the other hand, you have people who our society is looking upon more and more as people who do not need rehabilitation as much as a total process of health. It is really, in many cases, a problem of a change of thinking on our part. In fact, some of the people who spent their time in Millbrook a few years ago, if they had been under the new legislation of the federal government, would not be there at all.

In other words, you have here a group of people who desperately need psychiatric care. They do not need a jail setting. Here you have a situation with which I have nothing but the greatest sympathy and, I hope, a little bit of understanding—I have visited this institution on a number of occasions—for those who try to operate one institution to try and look after people who represent both ends of this spectrum.

If any need repression, I suppose they represent those who would need the most repression of those who are members of this community and those on the other end of that spectrum, who really desperately need psychiatric care.

The problem is, how do you run one institution for two groups like this? How do you provide a degree of opportunity for self-development for one group and still make it possible for the custodial people in that institution to feel the least bit of safety? There have been a number of incidents—and I am not going to bring these incidents up. I am not going to discuss that aspect of it. The minister, I am sure, has been briefed on the problems that Millbrook has represented over the years.

To recap a point made by the member for Middlesex South, this is a problem of morale. It has its devastating effect upon the day-to-day morale, to say nothing of the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) standing up in the midst of their negotiations and telling them that they were not going to get more than five per cent. If that was not bad enough they have this continuing problem that goes on day by day and the tremendous difficulty this represents to those who work in that institution.

On top of that, you have the fact that it is isolated. Millbrook, once again, is an expression of the philosophy of the 1950s that you put jails out in the country—you know, where you could see people escaping through the fields. Now, of course, here is the minister talking about Outward Bound programmes, talking about community relationships, talking about somehow tying in the rehabilitation of the individual in this institution, so that his rehabilitation and his relationship with the community begins before he leaves that context and finds himself ejected into the total freedom of the community. How do you do that in an institution like this?

You know, the government has made a terrible mistake, although the minister is indeed trying to deal with this mistake to some extent. I think now the sexual deviates are being transferred to the Alex Brown Memorial Clinic, or institutions anyway—and there again, a certain number of them are, but it really depends on what the length of the sentence is in some cases. In some cases it depends to a degree on the fact that you just do not have room for any more than a small percentage, and therefore people who need psychiatric care are left at Millbrook, where there is a very minimal servicing psychiatrically, or in terms of social service context.

As I say, I do not know what you do with that kind of a situation, I really do not. The best thing that could possibly happen to the minister would be for him to insure it, you know, and then suddenly go and blow it up, because I just do not know how he gets out of it any other way. As I say, I do not want to see him compound the problem, because I know that one of the things that he has on his list of priorities is the Kawartha detention centre. This is a detention centre which will look after Victoria-Haliburton, Peterborough county, Durham and Northumberland. And,

of course, at one point they had actually bought land to build a new institution and then, in the rethinking of this situation, they decided they would try to recreate an institution and make Millbrook into a detention centre.

I would like to know what the minister's priorities are and when he thinks this development is going to start. But far more than that, I mean, if the Kawartha detention centre is set next year or the year after—I suppose politically I would like to see it next year, but if it is the year after or the year after that, that really does not bother me as much as the fact that it is going to be done and done properly—because I would like to know what the plans of the minister are. Surely he will believe that any detention centre should be an in-community thing. It should be a detention centre in which people are simply withdrawn from the community for a short period of time, while you try to restore those relations with the community as quickly as you can.

How do you do it out in Millbrook? It is bad enough even for the people who work there, riding back and forth 15 or 20 miles to any large community. So I just suggest to the minister that this is a very real problem he has inherited. I do not know how he is going to extricate himself from it. But I am desperately anxious that he does not compound the problem by developing a Kawartha detention centre out among the hills and the valleys of Millbrook and, at the same time, creating a situation which he is going to have to cope with later, because some of the programmes which he has developed in terms of men going out to work and coming back in again at night—I can never get the name of it—

Hon. Mr. Apps: That is the temporary absence programme.

Mr. Pitman: That is the temporary absence programme. The temporary absence, the Outward Bound programme, the community-oriented, all these programmes, which are the new directions in the department, I am desperately anxious that those programmes not be undermined, and not become irrelevant in the Kawartha area simply because the minister is stuck with a piece of architecture which is totally irrelevant to the 1970s.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I think our philosophy has changed somewhat in the department since Millbrook was built, and I think I can safely say that if we had to do it all over again we would not have built it there.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, but we have got it now.

Hon. Mr. Apps: So we have got it now. We realize many of the things that the member has pointed out. The morale of the staff, I think, is pretty good. I think the superintendent there, Mr. Bond, is doing a tremendous job at Millbrook.

Mr. Pitman: A very tremendous job.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I visited that about four or five weeks ago and I was rather impressed, not only with his attitude but the attitude of the staff there. And let me tell you what our plans are as far as Millbrook is concerned.

The member mentioned that we have there the behavioural problems: the sex deviates, the drug addicts, the arsonists, and the escapists. It is a pretty complex group of residents there. When the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic is finished in Brampton—and the start of construction on that, I think, will be the end of this month, so this is on its way; construction is beginning—we will transfer out of Millbrook, then, the sex deviates and the drug addicts, and these amount to quite a large percentage of the population of Millbrook.

Before the arsonists go to Millbrook, they will be going to the neuro-psychiatric clinic in Guelph. If they are really, really bad, and there is not much can be done, they will go to Millbrook. So we will have in Millbrook, at the time, the behavioural problems, the escapists, and the few arsonists—there are not really that many. We will have the sex deviates and the drug addicts out of there. So that will solve some of the problem of Millbrook.

The hon. member mentioned the fact that it is sort of isolated. It is and it is not. It is not as isolated as it used to be. Peterborough is not that far away. I would hope that the people in Peterborough would concern themselves with Millbrook as well as the people in and around Millbrook, because there are a lot of people with expertise in Peterborough who could be of great help, and I think they are now.

They are coming down from the university—

Mr. Pitman: Oh yes!

Hon. Mr. Apps: —from Peterborough to Millbrook. If we can increase this participation, I think that will be a great help. We are planning, as the hon. member mentioned, to convert some of Millbrook into a regional detention centre. We hope it will be as good

as any of the regional detention centres that we have. We hope to have the same programme in the centre there. We hope that the people in the surrounding area and Peterborough will help, as they are helping in other areas, us try to help the people who will be in the regional detention centre.

So things are moving. I think that when the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic is completed, when we get the sex deviates and drug addicts out of there, then a lot of it will be solved. We are moving ahead and I feel that we are coming along just fine.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, if I might just continue, I assume then that the conversion of that section of Millbrook will be a considerable conversion, as you probably realize and as you probably know.

In a maximum security institution there are the single cells and all of the paraphernalia there must be in a maximum security institution. I cannot imagine a more inappropriate setting for a short-term detention situation for an individual. Is the conversion really not just a matter of renaming a wing of the Millbrook institution? Is it a full-scale rehabilitation of that setting?

Secondly, can the minister give me any idea when it is going to happen and, thirdly, can the minister give me any idea as to how the minister can link up Peterborough with that? I know all about the university and I know all about the various medical people going down; I know social workers spend some time out there. I know that there is a great deal of contact and I have had some of those contacts relating to me very directly.

What I am concerned about in particular and what I think is the most important aspect of the minister's programme, is the opportunity for people to get out of the institution during the day to go to work and be able to come back into the institution for support at night or for help and assistance of various kinds. That surely is the future of that department. That could be very difficult. Do you see the possibility of running a bus from Millbrook into Peterborough? There is very little work at Millbrook; I am sure the hon. minister realizes that. The community is not going to provide any real employment opportunities. They have got to get it either in Peterborough or Lindsay or go down to the Cobourg-Port Hope complex on the lake.

Does the minister have any plans or is anyone working on future plans of this kind of thrust in terms of that institution?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the plans of the new detention centre that is going to evolve out of Millbrook when these residents are moved into other areas, but the same scheme is going to be used in Millbrook as it is in any other detention centre.

We hope the temporary absence programme will be as good there as anywhere. If it is necessary to arrange to get them to Peterborough or Lindsay and back, or down as far as Cobourg and back, well, this can be arranged. It is the job of the community programme branch of our department to develop this kind of community liaison with the staff and the residents of the detention centres. The philosophy behind the regional detention centre is just that.

I am sure there is no way in which we are just going to say: "Now, we have moved these other people out; we are just going to move the new ones right into the same places, with the same conditions and everything else." No, we have got to make the modifications. Surely, we are going to have some maximum security areas but we are going to have to have minimum security areas.

Mr. Pitman: The minister has already got them.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We are in the process of developing a forestry camp not far from there which will be of help to the detention centre. So the same philosophy that we have insofar as the new regional detention centres are concerned will certainly apply to the one from Millbrook.

Mr. Pitman: Is there any timing at all? Where is it at?

Hon. Mr. Apps: The Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic is to be started this month.

Mr. Pitman: Where does this detention centre stand on the list of needs?

Hon. Mr. Apps: As soon as they have moved out into the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic, then it would be my thought, at least, if I had the opportunity of having anything to do with it, I would say that this would come right as soon as they move out, that the new renovations would be started.

Mr. Pitman: Good. Then we can start. That is what I want to know.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Just a brief question, Mr. Chairman. I have been informed that in the prisons—

Hon. Mr. Apps: I was reprimanded yesterday by your friend from Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) that they should be called residents.

Mr. Jackson: My colleague was talking about juvenile offenders, by the way.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Oh, sorry. They are students.

Mr. Jackson: They are refused permission to write to prospective employers for possible jobs. If the temporary absence programme is going to work they must have the opportunity to apply for jobs and the opportunity to go out for interviews. Is this true or is it not true?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, I would not say that is true. I would say it depends. I do not think they are allowed to take the Sudbury Star and go down all the list of help-wanted ads and write a letter to each one of them, looking for a job. I do not think that is allowed.

But if they have, let us say, a reasonable chance of getting a job—in other words, if one of the aftercare officers or one of their friends or their families have approached somebody, say in Sudbury, for a job for them and they want to write to a person like that—then there is no objection to that whatsoever. I think that provided they show that they are responsible residents then the temporary absence will be given through the superintendent.

I do not think they will allow sort of indiscriminate applications going all over the country for jobs that they would probably not have much of an opportunity of obtaining. However, if there is reasonable assurance that there is a job waiting for them, there is no reason at all that they should be held back.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, on the same point; if a person were to know of a job in another part of the country—say that he was in Burwash and knew of a job in Toronto—is it possible for him to write to that prospective employer and if he gets the job does he have any chance of a transfer to the area of employment?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I would say so. Or he might get hold of the aftercare officer and have him sort of sound out the employer for one; or write to a friend he knows in the area who may know of a job and have him look into it for him. What I am trying to say is that there is no indiscriminate use of letters.

We do not allow indiscriminate use of letters to apply for jobs all over the country. But if there is reasonable expectation that there is a job waiting for them and this is borne out by the investigations, then, fine. There is no problem at all.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried.

Item 3—Ontario Board of Parole. Item 3 carried.

Item 4—aftercare of adult offenders. Item 4 carried. That completes vote 302.

Vote 302 agreed to.

On vote 303:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 303, rehabilitation of juveniles programme. Item 1, general administration. The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: Again, I would just like to strengthen the argument put forth by the leader of the New Democratic Party yesterday, or on Tuesday, in that we feel that it should not be part of this department. Juvenile residents should not be within the correctional system; they should be within the educational system, if anything. Surely that is what the minister should be working toward? We hope he will work much harder than his predecessors and that when we rise next year to speak on Correctional Services we will not be talking of juvenile offenders.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I think I went into that fairly deeply on Tuesday as to some of the answers to the question that was just asked. I mentioned at the time that I am not wedded to The Department of Correctional Services as far as the training schools are concerned.

At the present time I cannot see that any other department would do a better job than, I hope, I can do within the realm of Correctional Services. I am, or let us say I intend, to investigate the amount of liaison or overlapping between the adult offenders and the juvenile offenders; to see if there is a great deal or whether it could be separated still further than it is at the present time.

There is some overlapping in the aftercare offices, where they look after both. Whether that is a good thing or not—I have a question mark there. I am not so sure that it is—whether you should not divide them a little bit more and have aftercare offices for

juveniles and have them for the adult offenders.

There is a little saving of money particularly in sparsely settled areas, say in northern Ontario, where it would be very expensive because of the few people involved and the great distances they have to travel. It might be a good idea to combine them. It may not be a good idea in other areas of the province where there might be more people out as wards of the institutions.

But I thought I had answered that pretty well. I am not convinced that The Department of Education would be a good spot for it because it is a pretty big department; it might get lost in there where it would not get the individual attention of the minister. Not because the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) would not want to do it, but the demands of the Education portfolio are such that he would not have the time to pay the same attention, as perhaps I could in a smaller department. The same as if it were in Social and Family Services or any one of the other departments.

I think the important thing is to try and make sure we pay as much attention to it and do as good a job as we can, and that is what I hope to do.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, general administration. The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Oh, I am sorry—

Mr. Chairman: Well, we are at vote 303, but really we should be dealing with the first item, which is general administration. I know the conversation did stray somewhat.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to speak under this item because I would like to explore for a moment this whole question of juveniles and the administration of all these institutions.

I think what has been suggested by this party is that it would be in the better interests of young men that they not be associated with a department which is essentially correctional; which, at least in its past tendencies, has been of a nature to put a degree of stigma on them. As well as that, I think one of the things that the minister cannot do in this programme, under this part of the department, is deal with what I think social workers are seeing taking place across this province.

About three years ago, the principal of a high school in my area decided that the need in this particular community was for some kind of group homes, group homes which would not have the stigma of being a training school, because what he wanted to do was isolate, or to draw out of the homes, some of these youngsters about nine, 10, 11 and 12 when these kids were showing tendencies which looked as though they were headed toward some kind of correctional institution. He called quite a large conference of teachers, he called people from the juvenile court, he called people from the children's aid society, he had people there from the political and public life of the community, and there was a considerable discussion about how you can deal with these kinds of kids, how in a sense you prohibit their going into an institutional setting later in life.

This is a preventive work rather than an attempt to rehabilitate. As the minister well knows, for $1 of prevention you spend $10, $15, $20 for rehabilitation. What they were trying to do was to try and find some of the context in which this could happen. We discovered as soon as you got talking about this under training group homes, there were no funds for it under the minister's department, because, of course, it would have to be a training school. Indeed, you could not get the kids into it because they would have to be put there by the juvenile court or they would have to be assigned to it by their own parents, and as people realize, the parents would be very loath to assign their children to an institutional setting which was essentially correctional.

At the same time, it did not come under The Department of Education because it would not be in the normal scheme of the educational system—of schools, and so on.

At the same time, The Department of Social and Family Services really had nothing to do with it—or at least they did not insofar as money was concerned. Nor did The Department of Health; you could almost have called this a semi-health problem.

We had this kind of a situation where a very real need was identified and these kids are going to be in the minister's institutions. Representatives of the police were there. In Peterborough they do have a gentleman who is excellent in dealing with juveniles and these are kids he sees day after day and he was willing to go on record in saying that this was the kind of thing that was needed.

If this area of activity was not consigned to a Correctional Services department, what I think many of us would hope is that there

would be a whole variety of institutional settings. That is, there would not be just the training school, and a difference even within those training schools, but you would have a very great many different kinds of training schools, at least of institutions, some of them in which kids could actually put themselves.

We have been hearing a great deal in the last few days about the problems with kids who cannot get along with their families and so therefore they walk out of their homes. Then they become a charge upon the Minister of Social and Family Services or the welfare department in that particular municipality, and they do not want the responsibility.

And, of course, there is very little family counselling available from social workers in most municipalities. They do not want the responsibility of looking after these kids, many of whom form communes or go into some kind of a setting which many of us think, perhaps rightly or wrongly, probably is detrimental to their health and their future.

Is it not too bad that there is not some kind of institutional setting for a kid who says, "Okay, I am not getting along at home; obviously I cannot get along with my parents." We could have some situation whereby they could go to a committee or a tribunal or some kind and say they want to go into, one of the minister's group homes for the sake of a better term, and simply withdraw from their home situation and from their community setting for a short period and go back into that community setting later.

What I am simply suggesting is that in the minister's open-mindness about where the juvenile should be looked after—and let me assure you I have the greatest respect for what the minister is doing in this area, because I have visited the Kawartha training school. I was very honoured to be the speaker at their graduation ceremonies one year and I know a number of the people who work there quite well, and the irony is that the Hall-Dennis report is more followed in the minister's schools than in some of the schools that are outside this educational system. There is some irony involved in this too.

But, to come back, the point is that I think that outside the Correctional Services situation you might have the opportunity to develop a whole series of different kinds of settings for young people from the age of 10 to perhaps 16 or 18 which would not be essentially correctional. They would not essentially be isolated or in a sense cut off from the normal situation. There would be a graduation from normal school family setting to various kinds of settings for young people, and I just suggest that to the minister as one of the inputs I think he should make in the decisions he is going to make in regard to juveniles.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody would really argue with the philosophy behind that. We are endeavouring to do that within the situation as we have it at the present time. I agree that the stigma of a training school should really not be there. Whether that is because it is within The Department of Correctional Services or not, I am not quite sure. I think you might get the stigma regardless of where it would be if they were sent there by the courts. I think we have to realize now that all the community efforts have been exhausted before they came into our care—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, but—

Hon. Mr. Apps: In other words, at the present time—

Mr. Pitman: Yes, that is right: at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —all the community facilities have been exhausted before they come into our care and we are sort of the last resort and they are sent to training school.

In the minds of the public I am not quite sure what "training school" signifies, whether the term signifies these kids are behind bars.

Mr. Pitman: For many it does.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, they are locked in, but—I do not know whether you have been to White Oaks, where we look after the younger ones. They are in individual homes with around eight to a home; they have continuous care. They go to the classes as any normal boy would, and it is as far removed from what many people think of a training school as one can think; it is almost like living in a cottage-type atmosphere.

Mr. Pitman: Right.

Mr. Apps: Granted there are certain pretty strict rules, but that is necessary for some of them; however, we are trying to get away from the stigma of the training schools as such. Granted, if we could prevent them from coming to us, we would be the happiest people in the world—if we could get more

family counselling, if we could get families together. Because you realize, as well as I do, that many of these boys and girls who come into the training schools come from broken homes, where the mother does not care what happens, the father has gone somewhere or they are having problems with alcohol. Nobody cares about them; they are left running around the streets.

The solution is to try to do something before they get to us. Once they get to us and we receive them as students, rightly or wrongly, we have them and we have to try to remedy something that has been ingrained into them for maybe the last seven, eight or nine years. I think we do a pretty good job with them; certainly there are some that we do not help, but there are a lot of them that we do. And I have been tremendously encouraged in going around to these training schools, at Kawartha Lakes, at Trelawney, at White Oaks and Sprucedale—not only by the programmes but by the morale of the staff. We have been talking about the morale of the adult institutions. You should go down and then go around with the superintendent, and have the little fellows come up and say, "Hi Mr. Bain;" or "Hi," whoever-it-may-be. There is a great rapport between superintendents and the young people in the training schools. I think we are making progress.

As to whether it should be in this department, again, that is the problem. If you could co-ordinate the whole thing right along, maybe that would be a good thing. At the present time, this is not the case. At the present time, we need a lot more preventive services, I think, to keep these boys and girls from being sent to us.

Mr. Pitman: Right!

Hon. Mr. Apps: But they are being sent to us, and I am encouraged with the results in many of the training schools. Mind you, there are some that we have problems with; there is no question about that. We have a special training school at Hillcrest out in Guelph, where some of the ones that are pretty hard to handle are sent. I was up there, too, and the superintendent is doing a good job with those boys. The community is involved, which is a wonderful thing, the same way as it is involved in Hagersville. I think I mentioned this earlier.

You have a mother in the community coming to teach remedial reading to a little fellow 12 years old. One of his problems is that nobody has ever paid any attention to him at all, probably ever since he was old enough to start to read. This mother is sitting down helping this little fellow read. For the first time in his life, I think, he has had someone who is taking a really genuine interest in him. For the mother, I think, it must be a great experience, too, because she can see the progress she is making with the little fellow who has had problems.

Now, this is the thinking behind our community involvement—to get more people doing this; and I think the more we can get involved like this the better we are going to do about it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1. The hon. member for Humber?

Does item 1 carry? Carried.

Item 2. The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is in some way connected with what the hon. member for Peterborough was saying, and that is the lack of a clear demarcation between the responsibility for the services performed for juveniles. The hon. member for Peterborough was talking about the lack of hostels—this is in essence what he was describing—lack of hostels for our youngsters.

Mr. Pitman: Homes, yes.

Mr. Ben: It is something that has been raised here annually, every time these estimates come up or the estimates of the hon. Minister of Health or the hon. Minister of Education.

I propose at the present time to deal with that dividing line that separates those that have been sentenced to training schools and those that have not. For example, Mr. Chairman, the minister has responsibility over paroles. This comes within the scope of his department.

Hon. Mr. Apps: We call them aftercare officers. You are talking about training schools, now?

Mr. Ben: Yes. I appreciate that every year we manage to coin some new technical phrase for the people involved to coincide with the current thinking, and now they are aftercare officers. But at any rate you do have responsibility—your department does—for aftercare officers, persons who at one time were referred to as parole officers.

The Minister of Justice, or the Attorney General, however the person styles himself, has jurisdiction over probationers—persons put on probation.

For example, at the Metropolitan Toronto juvenile and family court, they have a responsibility for the operation of that department, until the judge has found the juvenile guilty of being a juvenile delinquent and has referred him to a training school. A judge may find a juvenile to be delinquent and not refer him to a training school, in which case he does not come within the scope or ambit of your responsibility.

Yet Mr. Minister, it appears to me from my past experience that the dividing line between the needs of those two examples is fine indeed. In many instances, the presiding magistrate did nothing more than flip a mental coin in deciding whether he should refer that boy to your system for rehabilitation and education, or whether he should put the lad on probation.

If he sent the boy to your system I am prepared to admit, Mr. Minister, that there has been much enlightened reform in your department since I was a critic and it was called The Department of Reform Institutions. Much of the stigma that the hon. member for Peterborough was discussing is, in truth, nonexistent. There is still some—and there always will be. That is regrettable, but it is being more and more, each and every day, viewed in a more enlightened manner.

What concerns me, Mr. Minister, are those lads found to be delinquent but who are put on probation and lack the continuous, expert guidance and assistance that they would be receiving had the judge, when passing sentence, referred them to your schools rather than put the boys on probation. I do not for one minute want to denigrate the services performed by the probationary staff under the Minister of Justice's department. A lot of good people are involved. But from our point of view, in most instances because of the workload it is seldom that the probation officer sees the lad more than once a month as is provided by the judge's order.

He cannot give the young lad the continuous guidance that people in your institutions are able to give them. I think that this is a loss to those youngsters. I think that some discussions should be had between you and the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) to see that, at least insofar as juveniles are concerned, responsibility for looking after probationers be brought within your department. Either that, or your whole department and the probationary services with reference to juveniles be brought within the responsibility of The Department of Education.

I think the latter suggestion would be extremely hard to sell to anybody on the government side since Correctional Services has been a separate function for so long a time. I do feel that to bring the juvenile probationary services within the ambit of your responsibility would be simple, would be reasonable and would be beneficial to the persons involved. You would then have a greater variety of auxiliary services at the immediate disposal of the probation officer.

I said immediate because no doubt probation officers can avail themselves of any of the services of your department; any of the services of The Department of Health; any of the services of The Department of Education; any of the services of The Department of Social and Family Services. But if the probationers were brought within the scope of your department, those services would be immediately available. Complicated provisions would have to be made for the crossing of departmental lines in order to perform these services and I would ask that you give some consideration to that.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very reasonable suggestion. As a matter of fact, I think the member for Humber will be pleased to know that this is now being studied by the government productivity committee to find out whether this is a practical thing for us to do.

Mr. Ben: I am indeed well pleased and I compliment the minister.

Hon. Mr. Apps: As far as I can see, it sounds like a very good idea. I mean, we could use the same aftercare officers in many cases to look after the probationers, as we do with the wards of the departments, so there is no real problem in it as far as I can see at the present time.

Now, whether a judge, of course, in his wisdom, decides to put a young person on probation or whether he decides to send him into our care, that is his decision. There is not much we can do about that. But I might say that with our new reception and diagnostic centre at Oakville which is, I guess, about approximately half finished now, we will be in a position then that when they are sent into our care, they will go to that centre. We will have some very competent people assess them, and it could be that we would be able to let them out right away or we could refer them to special health-care centres or other centres manned by people that are trained to look after this particular type of boy or girl.

But, as for your main point, it certainly sounds to me like a good idea. This is being studied and as soon as we get the report back then maybe we can come to some decision as to whether this can be done or not.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Ben: Before I finish or leave this subject, I would not want it to be thought that we are unaware of what the many worthy people in the Big Brother movement and the Big Sister movement—who involve themselves so deeply in looking after our youngsters, whether they be probationers, or whether they be youngsters who have not yet been found guilty of being delinquents, or maybe who have not even been brought up before juvenile court—are doing. They should receive our support and our praise for their work. However, I do not think that the burden should be thrown on them the way it is. You are always seeing advertisements asking that you support the Big Brothers and the Big Sisters or take part in their activities, which means that they are short both of help and of funds. I would like that to be made clear.

One other point, Mr. Minister—I am sorry, does the minister wish to say something about that?

Hon. Mr. Apps: It is all right. Go ahead and I will answer them both at the same time.

Mr. Ben: Was it something—?

Hon. Mr. Apps: What I was just going to say is that organizations like the Big Brother movement and many other organizations—I do not think the people in this province realize the tremendous contribution that these people are making to the young people of the province. It is a type of service that I do not think any government could duplicate. I do not think they could afford to duplicate it in the first place, and I do not think perhaps they could duplicate the dedicated care. When someone is doing something on their own voluntarily, then they are really interested in it, and I certainly agree with you about the Big Brothers. And I would not stop there; I would go to many other institutions throughout the province who are doing a great job for the young people on these problems, and they certainly should be commended.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Minister, a question I was going to raise, my second point, deals with recidivists. A number of years ago when I was studying the statistics published by your department, Mr. Minister, I could not but help note that the rate of recidivism was extremely high, or at least, out of proportion to the average for certain schools, one of them being the St. John's Training School. At that time they were over capacity insofar as their foundation was concerned. Does this still prevail? Which of the training schools that come within the ambit of your responsibility, either private or governmental, has the highest rate of recidivism?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, Mr. Chairman, all the schools are different types. I am sorry I do not have those figures, but I will endeavour to get them for the member for Humber, and as soon as I do, I will make sure he gets them.

Mr. Ben: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Yes. I would just like to raise a brief question with the minister. Over the past few weeks and during The Department of Health estimates the increase in venereal disease in the province has become of concern. I just picked up a small article from today's Toronto Daily Star. I will read it, and I would like to know the inference of the article in regard to the minister's department. It reads:

> London, Ontario—Doctors attending a special conference on the control of venereal disease agreed yesterday that the age limit of minors for treatment without parental consent should be lowered to 12 from 16.
>
> The 55 area doctors also endorsed a recommendation that The Department of Correctional Services provide staff and facilities to examine and treat persons in custody for VD.

What is the inference to this article in the recommendation of the doctors' conference? Is there not enough medical examination and treatment?

Hon. Mr. Apps: In the institutions? We have doctors who are either at the institutions or are on call all the time, and if any instance of this comes to their knowledge—they would certainly know when they come to the institution, or when they get to the diagnostic centre, because that would show up right there, and we do have the doctors and the nurses and the facilities to do that.

Mr. Gisborn: Then the minister has no idea of the reference by the conference of doctors that services and staff should be provided to bring about examination and treatment in the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, the staff are there, and this service is provided now. I have not seen the article so I really cannot go into that fully, but as far as having medical facilities is concerned, and staff and nurses available to treat anything like that, they are available now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member—

Mr. Gisborn: May I pursue it a little further? To what degree do the physical exams take place on entering?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the exam takes place on entry. In other words, when a young person comes to one of our institutions then he has the physical exam at that time. So if there is any treatment needed, then it is started immediately. If it is something serious then they are sent into the hospital, there are working arrangements between the training school and whatever hospital is closest. So that the examination is done immediately they arrive, and if there is something found that needs treatment then treatment will be started right away. If it can be done within the institution fine, but if it cannot be, then they are taken to the hospital.

Mr. Gisborn: Then the minister is assuring the House that the medical exam goes to that degree of examination?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, I think I can assure the House that this is so.

Mr. Bolton: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister if there has been any change at the Don Jail? There was a time when all vag. ones were inspected immediately for VD and I believe this has been changed.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I am sorry—you are talking about the Don Jail now? Not talking about training schools?

Mr. Bolton: No. Since the question of VD came up, I wanted to introduce that question at this moment.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Would you mind! I think it is out of order, but—

Mr. Bolton: Sorry.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: This is item 2, rehabilitation of juveniles. Does item 2 carry?

We will move to item 3, which is the aftercare of juveniles. The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, is the minister's department giving any consideration—I will not use the word parolling, but releasing—to releasing aftercare residents of these schools to foster parents, even though these residents or these juveniles have parents of their own who have accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, maybe if I go over the procedure whereby a student from one of the schools is released back to his home or to foster parents—The first criteria, of course, is that the young person has made progress within the training school to the extent that the superintendent feels that he has now reached the point where he can return to a normal life outside the institution.

The aftercare officer within the training centre then goes out to the home to assess the home to find out if in her opinion the home is the proper place for the boy or girl to go, and it could be that it is, or it could be that he is going right back into the same situation that he was in before he got into trouble.

The officer then makes out a report on the situation, which is then referred to the training school advisory board, and then the training school advisory board makes the decision as to when and where this particular person will go. They could go to a foster home and if they go to a foster home, then the foster home is assessed the same way as the boy's or girl's original home is. So that no one is sent out without an assessment being made of where they are going.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Minister, do you have a central registry of prospective foster homes for the acceptance of children released for aftercare, where, for those children to return to their own homes would not be—to use your words—a return to normal life. In other words, what I am saying is this, Mr. Minister. Probably a lot of the youngsters in your care and custody are there because the environment in which they lived was not a normal family life as we know it.

They were consigned to your care for a certain period of time. You have been able to undo some of the harmful effects of the environment which was to them then their normal life, and to send them back to such

life would be simply having them regress to what they were before they came into your care and custody.

Under those circumstances I would hardly expect you to release them on parole to their own home. But do you have a list of readily available foster parents, who have already been cleared, so it is not a case of a parole officer going out and knocking on doors trying to find suitable accommodation and making a survey?

Do you have homes that have already been cleared, so that you have all of this information at your fingertips and say: "Well here is young Jimmy. We think that he has done wonderfully, but we do know that we cannot send him back at the present time. We do not know if we should ever send him back for that matter. Why do we not send him to Mr. and Mrs. A, a couple who have shown in the past that they are willing to accept these children? Or Mr. and Mrs. B, or Mr. and Mrs. C?" Do you have such a list?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, first of all, we do not have a central registry as such within the department here in Toronto. But the various training schools, through their aftercare officers, have listed people who could conceivably be used to look after young people who are not able to be sent back to their homes.

As I mentioned earlier—and I agree with the member for Humber—there are some areas where you cannot send them back home because they are going to be in the same situation they were before. So, within the training school, they do have people who, from their experience—and in many cases they have previously sent there children who have reached the age of 18 and have been discharged from our care—and these people have worked out well so they are pretty good people to have, so that you can refer other children to them.

Also, despite the best assessment that you can get from the aftercare officers, there are occasions when the child just does not fit in with the foster home which he or she is going to, so no definite arrangement is made; it is on a tentative basis until it becomes apparent that this is a good home for them to be in.

Everything we can do to prepare the way for the boy or the girl for the foster parent is done. We try—and I know the aftercare officers do the best that they can—to make sure that they are going back to a good home where someone is really interested in looking after them.

Mr. Ben: The next point that I want to raise, Mr. Chairman, is a rhetorical question. I am not satisfied that what I am going to put forward as a suggestion is a good one. I am fishing for your opinion. You are satisfied that putting children in foster homes is a step forward in some cases. I applaud the fact that most of your training schools are now what they call the cottage type.

Has the minister's department given any consideration to setting up cottage-type, halfway houses throughout the city, so that they are hard to recognize as being such? Perhaps I should not use the phrase "cottage-type." You should perhaps use the phrase bungalow-type or family-type halfway houses, where you would have a set of foster parents who could look after a maximum of, say, half a dozen boys, or perhaps half a dozen children, both boys and girls, to give it a more family-life setting?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, we do have some of those homes at the present time, but not nearly as many as would like to have. In some cases, it is very difficult because you run into zoning problems and everything else when you try to do it. But this is something that we do have some of. We are exploring the possibility all the time to increase that number because, in most cases, they work out pretty well. The key to it, of course, is the person in charge of this particular type of halfway home, as you might call it. If you get people who are generally interested in young people and want to help them, then they are pretty successful. You get some people—unfortunately, there are perhaps a few—who are in it just for the money they might be able to get out of it.

There are problems involved in this type of halfway house and I think the solution, of course, is to get some of each. You will find many good homes where boys and girls can be sent to. I think that you will find there are many halfway houses that will do a good job as well. So, it is combination of both. We try to get the best of both worlds, as it were, in order to make sure that we do have good homes for the boys and girls to go.

Mr. Ben: Sweden—I should say Switzerland—pioneered a system of using cottage-type settings for orphaned children during the war where they had couples to act as mother and father. They had, working in the home to help them, servants who were prospective fathers and mothers themselves to the degree that they were being prepared

to take over a similar operation. So, I am sure that you would find a sufficient number of people of that type to act. When I say sufficient number, I am sure you are not going to be seeking 100,000, or 10,000 or 5,000, or even 500, because you certainly are not going to be setting these up like prefabricated units. I deplore the difficulty that one of the hon. members in this House —the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine— had in setting up these John Brown homes, where people objected that the zoning bylaw was being contravened.

But I do believe that none of the zoning bylaws in effect in the Province of Ontario has any bearing on the subject matter, because they do not bind the Crown unless the Crown specifically provides that they shall. In other words, the Crown is not subject to any zoning restrictions in any jurisdiction. The law that sets up the zoning is passed by an inferior body which derives all its power from this province, and the law that gives it the power to pass zoning bylaws would also have to contain a provision that they could bind the Crown, and since they cannot, the government can go and establish these halfway houses wherever it pleases.

I feel certain that if the minister should do this, he is going to have to exercise discretion. He is not going to be putting these halfway houses where they would stand out like a sore thumb, because we would be losing a lot of the effect of welding these youngsters or bringing them back into the community. But there are still a lot of large houses that have eight, 10 or 16 rooms that at one time used to house large, rich families, or rich, large families; they could be utilized for this purpose, and you could put in about six or eight children so that it would not look too out of the ordinary. I think there is a lot of merit to it.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, I would think that there would be merit, although our experience has been that there are several things we have to think of. Firstly, we have got to think of the boy or the girl. Sometimes they react better in a group; sometimes they react better if they are in a home with perhaps just one or two people. Secondly, we have found that it is much better to put them in a home where there are other children—in other words, a family may have one child and are willing to take perhaps two or three additional ones. It works out better that way.

Another thing is that it has to be accepted by the community. As you realize, we are trying to develop community acceptance and we do not want to force ourselves into a community where it could be that people are not quite willing to accept them and they make life miserable for the kids. There are a lot of things to consider.

We have found that a group home, where we have a mother and father who own their own place and are willing to take two, three or four boys or girls, works out perhaps better than if we go and buy a home and hire somebody to look after six or seven children. But we are exploring all these things and I think, as I said before, we have to try to do everything we can with this, whether it is one, two, three or four persons, taking into consideration the boy or the girl and the community, with the ultimate aim of trying to make their re-entry into the community just as easy as possible.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, I could not concur more in what the minister says about preferring a foster setting; for that reason I brought up foster setting first. I am also aware of the difficulty in obtaining people who have the aptitude for looking after children and who have the heart and the patience to do so. This is difficult.

We have enough difficulties finding parents who can bring up their own children properly, never mind taking on a burden of somebody else's who were problem children to begin with. And it is because of this feeling that there might be a scarcity of qualified foster parents, that I was suggesting establishing these halfway houses, where one set of foster parents probably could look after twice the number of children than they could if they were in their own settings.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 3? The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Two questions, Mr. Chairman. First of all, does this department have a programme of providing courses and in-training courses to such foster parents looking after aftercare, through the community colleges or other means, or does the department provide training to assist them in carrying out their role?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, I do not think we have a training course as such, although one of the duties of the aftercare officer is to visit the home before anyone is placed there to make sure that the atmosphere in the home is such that they feel that this would

be a good home for the boy or girl to go into.

Mr. Deacon: Would it not be a good idea to have a system, even, where groups of aftercare parents are brought together on occasion to exchange views and get direction from the department's guidance people, aftercare people, in this whole question?

Sometimes, working in isolation, problems are blown up to immense proportions and it is sometimes a good idea to find out simple answers that others have found in their experience. I would suggest that the minister give consideration to this approach.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we do have a social worker that does go around to these home and tries to indicate to the people just what we feel should be done when they do get one of these boys or girls.

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about a different programme. I am not talking about the isolated visit, the individual visit of the social worker, but I am talking about the opportunity to exchange experiences and ideas that others actually experienced. It is one thing to talk to somebody who is not involved every day with the problems and another thing to talk to somebody who is, and I think the minister will appreciate there is quite a difference in the two approaches. So I would ask the minister to study implementation of such a programme.

The second thing I want to know is why would there be any delay at any time in the payment for the services that are provided by these aftercare parents? I asked the minister a point about this and I was just shocked to find the problem that some of the parents had in getting payment for provision of their services. Certainly if I came home without my pay cheque to my wife she might not let me in the door, but to have these parents in the position that they do not get money for some time after providing the services is just pretty poor. It is bad for morale and I suggest the minister should look into this.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, first of all I am advised that our aftercare staff do hold group discussions with foster parents when there are enough within a certain area that this can be done. So this is being done, and I think it is a good idea and I would hope that we would be able to increase this because it should be of great help.

Secondly, in connection with the other point the hon. member raised, as he will remember, he wrote me a letter on that. I was shocked, too, as a matter of fact, that some of this did happen, but I do not think it was too prevalent and I am certainly looking into it. I do not think there is really any excuse for it, and I apologize for the fact it did happen, and will try to make sure it does not happen again.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, has the minister's department any statistics on the safety programme in the vocational training facilities? To be a little more clear, there is nothing in the report that indicates that there have been so many injuries in the—let us take for instance the slaughterhouse in Guelph Reformatory.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Is the hon. member talking about training schools now?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we do. You are talking now about the vocational training within the training schools, the juvenile training schools?

We do not have any statistics: It had not come to my mind that there were many of these at all.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, let us deal specifically then with the slaughterhouse in Guelph.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, you are not in the same vote now. That vote has been passed, we are in vote 303, which is training schools.

Mr. Gisborn: Okay then, but have we any statistics at all, any report? Let us take the vocational training programme. Certainly some students have been injured in their term in the workshop. What I am leading up to is what extent is the safety programme working, if there is a degree of injuries received in the training programme? And what would be the department's position if one received a permanent disability and his compensation, if any, after release?

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right, fine. Mr. Chairman, all the machines that we have in the various training schools—and I will digress a little bit and go into the adult training schools as well—are equipped with safety devices to try to make sure that someone does not receive any injuries. Occasionally

injuries do happen from time to time through no fault of the resident, and in some cases perhaps maybe because of the resident, but normally through no fault of the resident. And compensation is assessed by the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the compensation is given to the resident on that basis. So even if they do not belong to the Workmen's Compensation Board, the board does the assessment for the injury and the compensation is paid on that basis.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, that is what brought the question to my mind. Usually the estimates of various departments have an estimated amount for that reason, and there is none in yours. Does the minister have some idea of how many might have been injured, and any that received a compensatory benefit after release based on employment and injury?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, I think, Mr. Chairman, if we digress and go back to vote 302, section 4, the Compassionate Allowances to Permanently Handicapped Inmates: so far we have made arrangements for $14,000 for the coming year for that. This was in our estimates for that particular item.

Mr. Gisborn: It is in the book some place?

Hon. Mr. Apps: On page 43 at the bottom.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Well, on the same point—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Right after the hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I will come back.

Mr. Gisborn: May I pursue my point?

Mr. Ben: That is under 302. We carried that vote.

Mr. Gisborn: That is community allowances.

Mr. Ben: All right. If you want to pursue it. He still has the floor if you want to pursue it.

Mr. Chairman: Did the hon. member for Hamilton East wish to pursue this?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, I would like to know where it is, so that I am satisfied that there is an amount there, before I follow up on my last question.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I might point out that on page 45 you will find an item of $6,000 for compassionate allowance.

Mr. Gisborn: That takes the place of a figure given in other estimates to cover workmen's compensation under the regulations and systems that are used in the department where the workmen's compensation board makes the assessment and then the department pays it if there is any entitlement.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Gisborn: Now the final question in this regard. Have there been any cases where one would have been permanently handicapped and then released and would be receiving a pension on that basis?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Oh yes. There would be.

Mr. Gisborn: Where would one find any statistical report in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I do not think we have that report. I do not have it here for you.

Mr. Chairman, I will look into it and see if I can find something on that. I know that these are being paid in cases, they are being assessed and paid after they leave the institutions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the minister what plans are afoot in his department to receive youngsters 16 and 17 years of age. I asked this question inasmuch as I contemplate that with the passing of the Act dealing with the treatment of young offenders by the Parliament of Canada, we will have across Canada a uniform age at which—I think it is going to come to it—a person ceases to be a juvenile and becomes a minor. When I was saying this the hon. minister was shaking his head vigorously.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, let me clarify it for you. There is no uniform age; it could be 17 or 18. They are making the suggestion it might be 17, but they have a little bit of leeway to make it 17 or 18.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister misunderstood me. I am not suggesting that the Act before the Parliament of Canada specifies a new age. I am simply expressing as my personal opinion that with the passage of this Act we can look forward in Canada to a uniform age. Quebec, I think, at the present time has 21 as the age.

I think there is a marked difference across Canada.

Hon. Mr. Apps: It varies from 16 to 18, depending on the province.

Mr. Ben: From 16 to 18 and 19. I am only suggesting that we shall see in Canada in the next few years, perhaps five years, a uniform age across Canada, one age, so that the treatment of young offenders will, indeed be uniform across Canada. And I see this age, Mr. Minister, being higher than 16. It may be 17 as the minister suggests, or it may be 18, as the minister also suggests. At any rate, your services will have to be expanded to receive a new category of residents, as the minister terms them.

Have you any plans afoot to—well, sir, has there been any government discussion about raising the age? Secondly, has the minister had any discussion with his colleagues with reference to the facilities for dealing with young offenders, as was suggested at the time the minister chaired the committee on youth?

You may recall, Mr. Minister, that there was a suggestion that we have a court system to deal with youngsters who are no longer juveniles but who are not yet adults. We had a long discussion on that topic about training sufficient magistrates to be able to specifically deal with these young offenders. And if so, to which category of correctional services will they be sent? I am sorry I am asking you so many questions all at once, Mr. Minister. Perhaps I should just start at the begining again.

One, are you making any plans to increase the age to which the youngster remains a juvenile?

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right. Can I answer that one?

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Apps: All right. First of all, of course, under that law, if it is passed, we will have no alternative. That is what the age will be and, then, we will have to look after them. This creates certain problems for us, because we feel it will increase by a considerable extent the number of young people whom we are going to have in our care. We may be able to look after some of them within the facilities that we have, but I do not think there is any way that we could look after them all within those same facilities. So, obviously, we are going to have to expand our facilities.

The Act has indicated that there would be a two-year phasing-in. We do not think that is quite long enough because sometimes it takes us a little bit longer than two years from the time they make a recommendation until we see the actual facility built. So, this is one of the things that we hope to persuade the federal government that if it does bring in the legislation at 17, for instance, that it will give us a longer time to phase this in. We are thinking we should have five years rather than two to be able to do a good job.

Mr. Ben: Has any consideration been given to the establishment of facilities for young offenders, other than juveniles who have not yet attained majority? Or does the minister suspect that we are going to have a lowering of the age of majority down to 17 or 18 to coincide with the movement upward of the top limit of the age of juvenility?

Does the minister intend—

Hon. Mr. Apps: I am not quite sure whether I understand all those questions again. Probably the member had better go over them again.

Mr. Ben: All right. At the present time in this jurisdiction, a person remains a minor until he is 21 years of age, and there are many contracts he cannot enter into. If he does enter into certain contracts they may be voidable or void. There is a lot of discussion about dropping that age of majority down to 19 or 18. For example, we were discussing voting and permitting 18-year-olds to vote. So, we have two discussions going on simultaneously: One, to increase the age to which a youngster remains a juvenile to 17 or 18; secondly, to lower the age at which a person attains majority from 21 to either 18 or 19.

It is not very logical to leave a gap is it? So, either we must work toward a common denominator and say, at 18, a person ceases to be a juvenile and becomes an adult, or else if we are going to retain the gap, we have to call those people youths, as distinguished from juveniles or from adults, and have some kind of transient facilities and services for the group called youth. Does the minister now understand what I am driving at and can he give me an answer?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I think so Mr. Chairman. At the present time, we have certain facilities for those age groups—16, 17 and 18—at what we call our adult training schools. We

make a distinction between juvenile training schools and adult training centres; so we have certain facilities for these people now. The tendency could be that judges might sentence more 16-year-olds to a juvenile training school than they do now to an adult training centre. This is where our concern comes in, that we are going to get many more of these 16-year-olds than we do at the present time. As I say, we are going to have to expand those facilities to a considerable extent to look after the increased number that we think that we are going to receive.

Mr. Ben: I take it what the minister is saying is that, at the present time, a judge may be reluctant to sentence a 16-year-old to what would be an adult institution, but that if the law is changed and the 16-year-old would now be treated as an adult, he may be more inclined to send a child to the centre. This is a problem is it?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask one question in regard to the matter raised by my colleague. How does the Workmen's Compensation Board assess the amount that the workman or the inmate would be in receipt of, if he were to be injured immediately prior to being released from the institution, and if his earnings during the time that he was in the institution were based on the day rate that is allowed? How would they then calculate an assessment for him that would be appropriate after his release, prior to the time that he received a permanent partial disability pension, assuming he got one?

Hon. Mr. Apps: This goes back to vote 302—

Mr. Deans: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —but I have the information here. The financial assessment, based on an assured-earnings basis, is determined annually by the Workmen's Compensation Board. The system used by the Workmen's Compensation Board to arrive at the rate is to average the weekly earnings of all workmen reporting accidents to the board during the past year, and the rate is set as three-quarters of this average to the nearest $5.

This is done because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the previous earnings of inmates of our institutions, and also as the occupation and location where they were employed, previous convictions and age of inmates varied to a considerable extent, a standard rate is considered fair and practical. I do not know whether that answers your question, but they do it on a very fair basis, I think.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried.

Vote 303 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the estimates of The Department of Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, another aspect of the budget which distressed me greatly was that concerning the $10 million set aside for the land bank. It is not that I oppose the purchase by the government of lands for public use, for recreation—I think it is a very important thing—but to introduce this at a time when the government has not taken any steps to eliminate the land prices in this area soaring from a matter of $300 or $400 an acre to $10,000 or more an acre for raw land in the areas that we have not yet developed, is an atrocious way of using public funds.

We are, in this budget item, going to be competing with speculators and giving them more reasons to hang on to their land in the hope that they will get something more for it later on; because they have got to get yet another buyer in the market to support the values that they have placed on these lands as a result of the shortage of places where people can build within commuting distance of this metropolis.

It is an atrocious condemnation of government policy when we have created the ideal

situation for speculators to make gains that do not contribute anything to the improvement of the public situation for housing in this area. I cite the fact that even the speculators do not do very well in some cases because of the length of time, the interminable delays, that surround the approval of developments in the area.

Good developers want to be able to purchase their land and turn it into housing, useful housing situations, as fast as possible. But they are frustrated in this objective because of the manner in which we in this province are providing the basic services that are required for any development to proceed, for persons to be able to produce houses.

We must recognize, Mr. Speaker, that for housing we have got to have water and sewage services; we have got to have transportation and access; we have got to have the resources, as well, to finance the schools, to furnish the other amenities that are required wherever people live. But we have not, as a province, taken a proper approach and we have not taken a realistic approach to meeting the drastic burdens that we have left in the hands of municipalities to provide these services, to provide the education facilities. As a result of that, we have placed them with a burden they are unable, with their taxation resources, to meet.

It is time that we looked at this before we get into competition with speculators in the purchase of land. I cite as an example of a speculator's situation, of course—and I mentioned this once before—the experience of myself and others as shareholders of Thorncliffe Park, which purchased land at $9,000 an acre almost in the heart of Toronto back in 1955, sold that land as high as $200,000 an acre, and, in the end, the price of the stock went from $5.50 over a period of time to $8. Now, that was hardly more than interest over the 12 years that that stock took to move from $5.50 to $8, because there was so much money used up in carrying costs, in developing costs, in all types of things that frustrated the development of that property. Now, we should be taking steps that will facilitate developers in going ahead with good programmes for the provision of places for people to live.

The costs of water, sewers and all these items are things that, on a local level, can be handled much better than—I am sorry, I must repeat that: The cost of providing the basic plants, the trunks for the sewage services, is something the province can best do, because it has the legislative powers to enter in on the lands of other municipalities, design the project so that it is not just looking after an isolated community, or even a region, go beyond the boundaries and ensure that—for example, in the case of the area in which I live, the region of York, water is made available from Lake Ontario by a pipeline—that the sewage can be treated up in that area by one means or another so that we do not have to resort to the rather strange plan that has been proposed for building sewage collector systems around Metro Toronto, as if Metro Toronto was a walled city. They are very costly. And in my view it is a completely unrealistic proposal that the Ontario Water Resources Commission submitted or, actually they did not fully publish their report, but they did suggest that they had this type of concept for the treatment of sewage in the area north of Toronto.

In addition to the need for services, there has to be means provided for access. There has to be a provision of some means for people getting here by public transportation, not only by that but also by automobile, access to where they are living.

The last point is the need to provide municipalities with their programme of assistance over a period of 10 years in order for them to adjust to the very heavy initial costs and the actual imbalance of assessments that are usually associated with heavy residential development in the area. But if this land-bank body of $10 million were diverted into solving those three basic problems so that we would have an excess of building land available in this commuter area around Metropolitan Toronto we would certainly see a change in land prices.

For example, if it now costs $23,000 to buy a lot, as it does near the railway tracks at Steeles Avenue, east of Bayview, and one can buy a similar lot of similar size 25 miles away for $2,500, there is certainly going to be an alignment of the purchases of housing lots around Toronto. The fact is that they can save considerable money by travelling 25 miles farther.

Now, if we give them good public transportation access and we provide a large supply of such $2,500 lots by the way we assist municipalities farther out to provide the services and to finance the services then we will see a tremendous change in the land prices within Toronto and within the Metro area as well as the area immediately lying outside.

I well remember as a person involved in some land development companies how I

was constantly pressuring management to dispose of raw land either by developing it immediately or, if there was no prospect of development, selling it to someone else. There are tremendous risks involved in the ownership of raw land. People in this area have come to think of land as always going up in price and that it will do nothing but go up. But it does not always have that history. Raw land has very heavy interest commitments on it. For example, 15 per cent would be usually a minimum and, if a man buys 100 acre farm at a price of say $300 acre, or $30,000, his annual interest on that $30,000 is $4,500. In addition, his agricultural taxes would be in the order of $4 to $5 an acre, so there is another several hundred dollars.

If we tax that land at market value, as we could tax agricultural land where services were available and where the province has designated assistance to municipalities, we could immediately make it impossible for speculators to hang on to that land for any period of time. Especially they would not hang on to it if they could see a prospect of oversupply of serviced land being made available as a result of the province's programme.

People have told me they condemn the steps our party has taken in connection with the escarpment land and the fact that we have caused The Department of Public Works to hold back on their programme of acquisition of available lands because of our criticism. They say that these lands are going to do nothing but go up in value.

They will certainly do nothing but go up in value if we do nothing to get at the root of what is causing this continual price spiral. For example, in the Collingwood area, where there is skiing, a lot of people are buying lots on which to build chalets. But other people are holding on to land that is very desirable at the top of the escarpment and it would be very desirable to appease the demand for these building lots.

We have not made arrangements for services to those lands. We have not made arrangements with the municipalities to persuade them to approve subdivisions up there to help ease the supply and to be sure there is an ample supply of building lots and that the price of these lots would therefore not get out of hand.

Because after all, when a speculator decides to purchase land he is looking at what he can expect to get from that land some time from now and the basis of evaluation has been the price he has been able to obtain for a building lot. If he knows that building lot situation is under such tight control because of our provincial regulations there is always going to be a shortage. He knows that each year the price is going to go up a little bit and he feels quite comfortable. But just change that policy to where we have an oversupply of land on which people can build, then we are going to see a very quick change in the attitude of speculators.

We can get land and we should get land, substantial park land, and make it available to the public. We should take other steps to ensure that this is so—steps such as the enactment of legislation that would encourage and enable us to develop footpaths through a lot of our beautiful land, so it is open and accessible to the public.

These are things we should do after we have taken the first basic step and announced a definite policy of eliminating the artificially created shortage of building lots in this country and in this province. The people have said to me that you are talking about a pretty expensive programme when you talk about the OWRC putting in services and making sure there is an ample supply to the towns and municipalities of this province.

In this budget we see a total expenditure of around $53 million. It should be $253 million for provision of local treatment plants and water supplies. It is ridiculous for us to be so restrictive in our budget for something that is so essential to our future development.

I do not think we should be getting into the provision of the local collector systems and the water supply system. That is a local item and it is an item we should leave in the hands of the local people. Our role should be to provide them with a service at a reasonable level with no commitment on their part as far as agreements are concerned, that we have now. Agreements that require the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board are ridiculous.

We should make it possible for them to obtain their water supply and their treatment facilities for sewage on the same basis as Ontario Hydro provides wholesale service for distribution of power in this province. If we would adopt this type of approach, we would incur major expenditures but we could also look to the pattern of Ontario Hydro and the way this is financed.

Ontario Hydro has been doing its own borrowing for years, on the guarantee of the province. It is now borrowing many hundreds

of millions of dollars on our guarantee. Ontario Hydro does not really need that guarantee any more; it has a long history of successful operation. It has a history that would enable it, with a development of a good borrowing instrument, to borrow on its own good record without incurring that burden on our debt structure that is implied by the guarantees we now provide Hydro. This is an exceedingly important step for this province to proceed with, because the borrowings by Hydro are going to increase tremendously in size in the future. They will have a very bad and serious impact on our own debt-raising ability, especially when we have other programmes that we need so desperately to be able to proceed with. It is possible it would cost Ontario Hydro another one-quarter to three-eighths of one per cent in interest rates to be on its own. It seems to me that it is no reason for the ordinary taxpayers of this province to subsidize this aspect any longer, when we now have launched and developed such a fine self-sufficient operation and especially at a time when we do need desperately the funds for the provision of services to our municipalities.

A method of improving the position of municipalities with regard to schools would not only be that of supplying an 80 per cent grant but also providing a subsidy on new house construction that would make up, over a 10-year period, for what they do not have in the way of industrial assessment. This could be based upon the same programme as the mine revenue payments to mining municipalities, where they actually mark homes as being homes of miners and subsidies are paid by the province to those homes.

In the case of areas where the province wants a lot of development to occur, where it wants to encourage municipalities to proceed with home construction to ease the demand, then we could provide, very simply, within our existing system, a subidy programme that could be a 10-year programme declining over the period of the 10 years.

On the provision of transportation, which is so necessary to what I have been discussing here, I was delighted with the Spadina decision with regard to the stopping of this use of highways for moving traffic. But I regret that the province at the same time did not announce a definite amount of funds that they were going to pay over and make available to Metro for the construction of the Spadina subway. To stop one thing as important as access from the northwest of the city to downtown Toronto is unpardonable when at the same time the government did not announce the alternative solution to the problem and what the province is going to do to make that solution possible.

In the area north of Toronto the province has introduced a GO bus system which has exceeded in traffic the estimates it said could not be reached by a GO train; yet that GO bus system is taking 30 minutes longer than a GO commuter train would take if it were in service there. This shows there is a tremendous need for good public transportation and we could extend that service to areas 30, 40 or 50 miles from this city and, to satisfy the housing needs of this metropolis, make available vastly more communities than there are now in a position to satisfy that demand.

It is time we had some specific action instead of more talk of different types of grants and studies of grants that they might be making. I think today we had a good example, where the province has come out with a decision to stop something without coming out at the same time and saying, "This is the answer. We will assist you to meet your problem."

Mr. Speaker, this brings me around to the question of the Toronto-centred region and the problems I see it will cause, if it is proceeded with along the lines outlined a year ago when it was unveiled.

First of all, I am delighted that the province took the steps to develop a plan. We have needed this for a long time, but I am sorry that it restricted its planning to such a narrow concept, which is really based upon making a sewage lagoon of Lake Ontario. The government apparently seems to feel that the only places it can put sewage plants is down on the lake where it can put the effluent into the lake and, therefore, because it is such a huge lake, it will not have any serious effect. They also hope to divide the developed area—that narrow band east and west that they are going to develop—by a parkway from the beautiful parklands and green belts. If any person in this government can show me where a parkway has not been the means of attracting development, rather than separating developed from undeveloped areas, I would be very interested in seeing that area, because whenever we have heavy transportation corridors, development occurs, particularly at intersections and right across that whole parkway belt. At major intersections, like Highways 400 and 404, with Yonge Street, Highway 27 and Highway 48, at all these points there would be tremendous pressures for development,

particularly when the province, on one side, has caused land speculation to put land prices up to tens of thousands of dollars an acre, and, on the other side of the parkway, it is hoping to keep the land down to agricultural value.

It is an impractical and an impossible objective. In presenting this plan, the province has, I think, quite wisely not shown how it hopes to be able to achieve this plan and make this plan become a reality, because there is not such a way; there is not a possibility in making this present concept of a Toronto-centred region work out. The plan, that, in my view, they should be considering and they should change to is a radial concept of development, where they can enable centres of communities, that are now built and established, to expand, where people who move out to these new communities will already find existing services, existing activities and existing situations which can be improved and made more attractive as these communities develop.

It will not restrict our planning to a narrow-band concept. It will make it possible for those who live in residential developments to have their recreational areas adjoining them, instead of at the other side of some supposed parkway belt. It would make it possible for us to utilize the established transportation corridors we now have by rail and by road, and to improve them. It will make it possible for us to make available to home buyers, literally 10 times or more possibilities of places they can purchase so that there will not be the restriction and the shortage of supply that cause speculation to run rampant.

An excellent analysis and critique of the Toronto-centred region plan was recently prepared by students at York University, and it was readily apparent to them from many of these points that I have brought out here, as well as others, as to why the planners of the province have completely missed the basic points of good planning in this Toronto-centred region concept that has been prepared.

The whole basis of the MTART study, as I mentioned before, was that it was supposed to be a transportation study, but it was one that was really a sewage services and water supply study, not a transportation study. It is time that we recognized the fallacy of building a plan on that basis. I do not say that we should ignore the needs of dealing with sewage and water supply and these other items.

As a matter of fact, this next item I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, is that very item.

We have, at the present time, continued to proceed with the traditional means of treating sewage. We have not yet experimented on any trial basis as they have south of the border with new ways of dealing with and handling the effluent from sewage plants. For example, in Michigan, there are three or four experimental programmes now. There is also once in Pennsylvania where the effluent is not being allowed to run into the creek but is being used as irrigation water for agricultural lands and parklands and golf courses. This makes eminent good sense because, although the effluent that comes out of our sewage plants is chlorinated and does not have bacteria, it still has undesirable phosphates and nitrates in it which encourage algae growth in the streams and in the rivers. For that reason, that expansion of sewage plants is dependent upon the effect that the effluent of those sewage plants would have on the streams, because we do not want to encourage the algae.

Does it not seem much more sensible, instead of having the golf courses and the farmers buy expensive fertilizers, to supply them with water that has been treated by primary and secondary treatment but still has the phosphates and nitrates in it? This water not only has those two qualities which make it desirable, but it also has oxygen, because it will have been aerated in the sewage plant. It also is of a much warmer temperature than the water that is now used for irrigation from the deep wells and, in every way, would be much better to supply the job of irrigation much more effectively than would the present system of irrigation by well water.

If we combine the new methods of using our upstream plants that this would enable us to do, we would eliminate the need to have great, huge sewer collectors. We would be able to put expanded plants such as in my area—Weston plant; the Richmond Hill plant; the Thornhill plant; the John Street plant; the Markham plant; the Unionville plant. If we expanded those, we would be able to lift the restrictions on housing building in those areas. It is this very severe restriction that the OWRC imposes upon the amount of building that will take place in these areas that causes the land speculation I spoke about earlier.

Also, in dealing with our sewage, we could combine the product of the sewage

plant with some of our garbage. I find that studies that are now being done in Indiana show that the combination of the compost from the sewage plant and the pulverized garbage makes a far better compost than just the compost or the sewage on its own.

Garbage is a word that has become pretty important in the area north of Toronto where there is a strong pressure from Metro to open up old gravel pits and have them filled with garbage. The difficulty with this is that people find having garbage operations of this sort—these landfill projects—quite undesirable for several reasons.

First of all, the truck traffic that carries that garbage in; secondly, the trucks nearly always dump a bit of the garbage along the way; thirdly, it is very difficult to operate these landfill projects in such a way that there is no objectionable odour coming from them; and fourthly, the way we have been doing it, we have been making a flat Saskatchewan plain out of the beautiful valley lands around Toronto. People feel that is a most uninteresting way of directing that our landscape be developed.

If the province would change their present approach and insist on full utilization of incineration as a means of disposal of garbage, the new techniques will enable us to eliminate a lot of the truck traffic that really, now, is having to move many miles to find places to dump. Also, if we, as a province, properly integrate the establishment of these incinerators we will be able to utilize the steam for heating. This has many advantages.

First of all, we are now using fossil fuels for heating in most of our developments. If we utilize the waste steam from the garbage, we would be able to get sufficient revenue to actually pay the cost of operating the incinerators. We would also, at the same time, eliminate the need of burning these fossil fuels. Incineration and utilization of steam as well means that the stack temperature of the incinerator can be so low that almost complete elimination of any precipitants can be achieved. Anything that goes out of those plants, such as the new one at Hamilton—they would be 90 per cent more efficient than the most efficient plants which are now operating in the Toronto area.

I am hopeful that, in addition to the use of incinerators, we will insist that any of the landfill projects use only pulverized garbage, so that it will eliminate the small and unpleasant features as I mentioned before in connection with landfill projects. And that the province takes for itself a definite role in establishing and getting these garbage and sewage plants operating because it is beyond the means and the powers of municipalities to do it at the present time. All we are doing is causing citizen wars with the municipalities and certainly, we have a dandy one going on in the town of Vaughan.

The next subject I want to speak about, Mr. Speaker, is the role of citizen participation. A lot of the elected representatives have objected to the increasing animosity shown by citizen groups toward their elected representatives. They have pointed out that we, who are elected, are responsible to the electors who elected us for the decisions we make. When our term of office is up, and if we stand again, we have to be accountable for the way we dealt with situations that came before us.

It is essential to us as elected representatives that we have good communication and dialogue with our citizens. We must recognize the fact that those who become involved in citizen groups sometimes are purely out to establish for themselves political base, which is not something entirely undesirable. We want to encourage people to establish themselves in politics and encourage good people to do so. Even if they did, it is important that we encourage people to take positions, become involved, become knowledgeable and help us in reaching our decisions.

My experience in business and my experience in politics has been that some of the best ideas and solutions to problems have come from ordinary citizens who happen to be facing the problem. The experts have views but certainly in my experience, experts' views are those to be considered in arriving at a decision, but no more so than those of the citizens who are affected by the decisions.

I suggest that perhaps we should consider establishing grant systems to citizens' elected representative structures such as that which was proposed for the Spadina area by a group down there a years or two ago. The suggestion was that the funds be paid to have a community worker and that this citizen group consist of the elected federal, provincial, municipal and board of education representatives in the area affected, as well as the heads of legitimate citizen groups.

This meant that the citizens, groups and the elected representatives were having direct access to each other. One of our problems as government members is that we really have to

work through a civil service at all times, because after all the civil servants are the ones who are actually carrying out the expenditures or control the expenditures that we approve here in the Legislature.

Often, we become quite unaware ourselves of what is actually happening in the programmes we have approved. We are well removed from the citizens. The citizens become frustrated because their objectives are not being achieved and we do not really sense or ever find out the reasons. If we establish the funding of citizen organizations where citizen representatives and elected representatives were exposed to each other in dealing with important community functions, we would certainly have a good means of communication that we do not now have.

One citizen grant was made recently toward the establishment of a community centre in the Don Vale area but on that board they do not have at this time the representation of elected representatives that I have suggested. I have since suggested that the experience in the Trefann Court area of Toronto this last year or two—where a citizens' elected representative group has been studying solutions for that area—the success of their work points to the fact that we must find a new way of communicating and keeping in communication with concerned citizens that we represent.

Certainly, it is not our function—and I am not suggesting here that it is our function that we should be doing everything that citizens tell us—but it certainly is our responsibility to find out what they are trying to say, then make our own decisions. I am suggesting that we have to change the present situation of near confrontation that often exists between ourselves and the citizens. This situation has developed because our structures of government are becoming so big, so remote. Here is an example of frustration in which I had personal involvement this winter.

I represented a group which was seeking a grant from the federal government in connection with a film they wanted to produce. Verbal approval of the grant was given me by the minister eight weeks later, but it was another 11 weeks afterwards before a letter confirming the grant was issued. This was because the civil service became involved with great details and did not have the opportunity of working directly between the politician and the citizens concerned to clarify and deal with matters that were concerned the civil servants. These frustrations are the things that annoy and frustrate the citizens and they are things we have to eliminate.

Another point I want to bring up today, Mr. Speaker, is that in connection with our summer youth programmes. I am disappointed that the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the government have not taken a definite position encouraging and supporting the various groups who have been endeavouring to deal with problems of our youth for the summer. The turn-down of the Morocco application out in Scarborough, the Grassroots application in Long Branch, and the more-or-less hands-off attitude is not good.

We do have a great opportunity this summer for improving the relationships between some of us and the youth of this province. Travel is a tremendous educational opportunity. The youth can help establish job centres that are much more flexible and useful than going through the Manpower procedures which are really not youthful for this particular situation. Youth and adults can work together in providing food and shelter facilities and it is a means by which we can establish a new understanding that is seriously needed today, especially at a time when a lot of us are so really frightened by the increase in the use of drugs by the younger generation.

If this province would encourage local governments and local community groups by agreeing to support accommodations to the extent of 50 cents per bed per night to local government and other community groups toward the cost of providing breakfast and accommodation to these youngsters. It would do a tremendous amount to stimulate more community programmes on a person-to-person basis.

I entirely agree with the Premier that this is work which should be done on a local basis and it can be done on a local basis, but it requires the encouragement and endorsation of this province. I am shocked that the Premier has not come out with a statement, not only encouraging local groups to do this, but also introducing the small subsidy I have suggested to signify the government endorsation of the whole programme. These programmes then would be supervised and they would be a great means of communication between the adults and youth of the province.

For example, that programme suggested by my colleague from Humber (Mr. Ben), of making available beds in homes, is an excellent one, and one that I hope a lot of people will endorse and actually put into practice. I know in our own home we will be doing that, but it is a great opportunity for an establishment of good friendship relations on a person-to-person basis. This should eliminate a lot

of the mistrust and misunderstanding that has arisen just because of the length of hair of some youngsters.

The last point I want to bring up here, Mr. Speaker, is that of the role of the Provincial Auditor. I think it is a step in the right direction that we have taken as a result of the recommendations of the—I forget the name of this committee in the fancy reporting of it. It has to do with the management of government and I forget the name of the committee. It is in here somewhere—on productivity. What they suggest is that the role of the Provincial Auditor should be one of shifting from a pre-audit role that it now takes, to that of post-audit. There are three types of auditing that are done and can be done, not only in business, but in government, and I suggest that these three types are as follows:

First of all, we can do as we are now doing, do a good job of checking invoices. We can be sure that there is not $100 missing in the petty cash. It is an accountant's detailed job of going through the papers and checking through them to be sure that the funds are accounted for properly.

Then there is a second type of auditing which really involves far more—it is far more significant and involves far more money generally—and that is checking the pricing, checking the need of the purchases that are made, checking the many items where not just hundreds of dollars but thousands of dollars could be involved. It is a broader, qualitative audit that can be done and should be done.

There is still a third area, and that is a management audit, one where judging the effectiveness of the programme. The public accounts committee of this Legislature has been working for some time and has been trying to evaluate the position of various sections of the government with regard to this whole audit procedure. There is no question that the change in the operations of the Provincial Auditor to a post-audit will take care of the first item, but we need to expand these functions so that he actually does qualitative checks as well, because at the present time there is no real qualitative spot-checking done of the expenditures and the vast expenditures that we now make in this province.

The last thing is something that we could do in conjunction with the Provincial Auditor and perhaps outside consultants, and that is the management audit. I think it is the true role of this legislative committee, the public accounts committee, that we should be analysing the effectiveness of an expenditure of the funds that we approve during our budgeted estimates. I think we are moving in the right direction. The programme that the government has introduced is an excellent one. It is endeavouring to have each programme of the government actually scrutinized and analysed to be sure that it is doing an effective job.

There is some basis of judgement as to whether it should be continued or not, or cut down, or whatever the case might be. But it is difficult to get the co-operation of departments in introducing this changed approach to government operation. In the past it has really been a matter of continuing more of the same. And the programme budgeting is one of trying to really take a new look each time as to whether what we have been doing is the right thing, or whether we could have been doing something more effectively.

Some departments have really been moving quite rapidly to deal with this. I was really pleased to see the report of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) last year. It was the only report that came out which tried to show there was more value given by the operation in that department because it was run more effectively. It was run more effectively. It would be nice to see in another year other departments, such as perhaps that of Correctional Services, showing what has been achieved for the taxpayer's dollar, showing some criteria which indicate the progress that is being made in utilizing the funds granted to the best of the ministers and the department's ability.

We now have accounting classifications that make it very difficult for us as members of the Legislature to analyse the expenditures. In business there is usually a fair-sized item under "miscellaneous," but in this government we call it maintenance. In "maintenance" I find almost anything goes, and it is really hard to determine just all the items. We were just shaken at the expenditures that go into our maintenance category as we were analysing The Department of Education accounts recently. We are certainly going to have to study our accounting reporting methods to see if we cannot make it easier for people to understand what has been done and what has been accomplished in expenditures.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is really encouraging that we are moving as a government toward studying our productivity, our effectiveness. I suggest that the reports of the programme budgeting committee

should be made public so that we can get the benefit of the opinions of citizens who are interested in how we are spending our money, and have suggestions for how it can be spent more effectively. We should be providing, through these reports, criteria as to how we are going to be judging the effectiveness of our schools, of our correctional services, of our highways, and the moneys we are spending in these directions.

Some people suggest, for example, that we can easily produce the cost of maintenance per lane-mile in The Department of Transportation and Communications. But perhaps we should be looking at the cost of movement per people-mile, per person-mile, or per-ton mile, and looking at the effectiveness of the total transportation programme rather than just looking at an isolated means of providing the transportation. This type of development of evaluation systems is vital to the business we have here. And we must not forget that this is one of the biggest businesses we have in the whole country—a $5 billion business. And it is time that we moved more rapidly toward the introduction of new techniques and new bases of carrying out our responsibilities as legislators in judging not only the wisdom and the programmes we want to introduce but judging the manner in which the programmes have been carried out.

I regret personally that this government's budget has had so little in it to give us real confidence.

For example, the programme to stimulate employment neglects the real opportunities where we can have larger pools of capital, pools of management encouraged to come together to achieve and carry out the ideas of entrepreneurs around this province.

Secondly, I am disappointed that we have not taken a new approach to the meeting of our housing needs in this province. We have been getting more of the same, instead of dealing with that basic shortage of services and a shortage of places to build that is so essential to reducing the cost of housing, to eliminating the speculation that impedes and frustrates not only those who want to purchase houses, but those of us who would like to see us proceeding with a major parks programme.

We have done little to solve the frustrations of the citizen with regard to local autonomy; almost everything is heading toward larger control, greater control by the province. It is important we recognize that although we are the most efficient collector of funds on an equitable basis—far more so than any municipality which has had property taxes really as a major source of revenue—we are not the most efficient spender of funds. Those closest to where the funds have to be, where the problems are, are the ones who should have the autonomy to spend it and decision to spend it.

We should assume the responsibility of making sure that they are accountable to the citizens and comparing their performance with those of others so that the citizens know just what they are getting for their money. We should still grant those local groups the right to make the decisions, and make it on an unconditional grant basis so that they are not tied up with the administrative details we now frustrate them with.

The fourth point is we have not done much consolidation of departments. We have had The Department of Transportation and Communications formed as a merger of The Department of Highways and Transport, but there are many other departments which we should be bringing together to eliminate the serious overlap. When you can go to seven different branches and departments to get community grants and not one of them knows what the other is doing, we are in pretty bad shape. It is time we streamlined that.

The last one is, we have heard a lot of talk about the integration of the transportation system we are going to have, but we still have not come up in this budget with a programme of financing and of developing an integrated approach to transportation in this province. I am disappointed that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his budget has failed on these six different important items I have mentioned. I urge the people of this province to take a look at the failure of this government on these very important items in judging the type of government they want to represent them in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this second opportunity of entering into the budget debate. In my observation, two speeches in this House are listened to—sometimes more than two, but certainly these two. One is the Speech from the Throne, the other is the budget speech. In both cases I notice that the members of the opposition seem to listen with a degree of wistfulness, hoping that

something may be said that will meet some of their hopes and expectations.

In my comments which will be interrupted, I expect, by the 6 o'clock break, I want to refer to both these speeches. I view the Throne Speech as an indication of the aspirations of the government; an indication of its intentions toward the people for whom it is responsible and, therefore, even though it is sometimes given rather scant attention, though it is listened to, it is readily forgotten. It is quite important from time to time to revert to it, to discover what is the stated philosophy, and the grounds on which one may examine the performance of the government.

Related to this, of course, is the budget speech which indicates the financial value which has been attached to the promises and indications of the Throne Speech. I will then make fairly constant reference and quote directly from these speeches.

A sense of rediscovery and reappraisal reaches to the foundation of our society. This, if it were true, and I trust it is, would be a very happy indication of a sense of responsibility. There are those whose view of politics becomes increasingly cynical. There are those who speak of politics as some sort of a game, an amiable exchange within a highly protected society, a kind of ivory tower.

There are those who feel that what goes on in this place is of little importance and of no lasting worth; a waste of many pages of Hansard; a waste of the time of the people who are here, and a betrayal of the expectations of the community which sent us here in the first place. I have not yet reached that stage of frustration. I still have some element of trust that what goes on in this House has some significance.

I still believe in Parliament as I know it but I am insistent, Mr. Speaker, that we re-examine on a very regular and very thorough basis, what does go on within this House and what goes on within the communities which we represent. We do need a reappraisal and rediscovery of the foundations of society in general and, Mr. Speaker, with the utmost deference may I say, we need reappraisal, rediscovery of the processes of this House.

Allow me, as a comparative newcomer, to indicate some areas in which I am very frequently ill at ease. If one were to mention a certain word, which I shall not, the bells would now have to ring, I think, to bring members in for this discussion.

I cannot quite see whether there are 21 people here or not. I do realize that many people are engaged in very important other exercises of their duty, and cannot always spend their time within the House.

While we are in the House, it seems to me that very often our speeches are unduly long, our attitudes are very often trivial, and I must say that from time to time I shudder when I see children coming into the House, into the galleries, to watch our performance. I think all of us, both government members and opposition members, need to re-examine our own sense of responsibility for the exercise of our duty and for the way we spend our time and the taxpayers' money.

Much of what goes on in this House is shockingly puerile. I must say from time to time I sympathize with the attempts, sometimes not very professional, of the Speaker to control the members of this House in their activity. I commend the Speaker who is now engaged in supervising the procedures of the House, but he does exercise in an amazing way a degree of control which must at times test his patience and test his skill.

Well, the Speech from the Throne talks about the pressures which are upon us, the mounting pressures of the 1970s which will differ markedly from those of past decades. One of the pressures, Mr. Speaker, upon our society is the pressure of the demand of our young people, a demand which I thoroughly endorse, a demand for the end of what in England we call "humbug." By "humbug" I mean wordiness which is not followed by appropriate and related action. Young people today are very discerning, they are often demanding, as they have a right to be. They demand, Mr. Speaker, in my view, of those whom they elect, a much higher degree of sensitivity to the needs of the community. I therefore listen with pleasure and have reread with joy that the government will continue to be perceptive and sensitive to the needs of the people and responsive to the requirements of responsible democracy.

Responsiveness is the urgent need of our day. I might be accused of exaggeration but I will run that risk. If I said the whole democratic process is under the most serious scrutiny, and if we, who call ourselves democrats, whether of the Conservative or of the New type—I am not running away from the word socialist, I have been a

socialist since 1923—I hear the word "shame." I am proud of my political belief and my political affiliation. The party which I represent to me promises the greatest hope of understanding of social justice and the meeting of the basic needs of the majority of our people.

No matter what our political persuasion may be in this House, I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that all of us realize if we do not mend our ways—all of us—we invite increasing cynicism on the part of young people, increasing public confrontation, increasing disrespect for law and order, and an invitation to violence or to some form of totalitarian control of our society.

I speak now in no narrow, partisan sense. I am too old for that sort of stupid game. I speak less as a politician than as a concerned citizen when I urge those who have been elected by the people to accept a much higher degree of responsibility for our public actions and our public statements. If it is true that the government is becoming increasingly sensitive, I trust that the next promise will be kept: the promise to listen closely to the problems of the people and to act swiftly to meet them. I underline the words "to listen" and "to act" and, coupled with the second one, the term "swiftly."

It might not be inappropriate in a rather less than crowded House to turn one's mind to Hamlet's soliloquy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We are listening.

Mr. Bolton: Thank you. Let the record show that my good friend the Leader of the Opposition is listening and so indicates.

Part of Hamlet's soliloquy talks about "the law's delays." Delays of our government—of our form of government, if you wish—are almost incredible. They do, however, have historic precedent. I intend no slight to the new Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) if I draw my illustration from that particular field but not in his years. They go back much further.

I want to illustrate my point about delay by a quotation which I shall find very shortly. I know what I am about to read has the approval of the Minister of Correctional Services because I have heard him use the same terms. Let me quote:

> With regard to the question of the treatment of inebriates, drunkards as such are not criminals. It is absolutely wrong to treat them as criminals, and to so treat them has not justification. Drunkenness is to be treated as a disease.

When was this said? It was said in the Ontario Supreme Court in 1896 and now comes to us with some willingness to act. Let me give you another illustration of how governments delay while people suffer. My reference is the Kingston Penitentiary, where they had a rule of actually unbroken silence. There is a report here of a prisoner aged 11 years, who on Christmas eve was given 12 strokes with the rawhide for talking French in his cell. The table shows that his offences were of the most trifling description, the sort to expect from a child of 10 or 11—like staring, winking, laughing. He was stripped of his shirt, publicly lashed 57 times in eight and a half months. Later on, also in Kingston, an eight-year-old child received the lash within a week of his arrival and no fewer than 47 corporal punishments in nine months, all for offences of the most childish character.

This is reported, and the same rules that existed then stayed on the books after this observation was appealed—for 93 years. We are speeding up a little in these days, but yet not by any means fast enough. In every other area of activity, time is being compressed, speed is being required, but in terms of recognition of human need and rapid response to human need in these areas we act very far from swiftly.

Mr. Speaker, I notice it is now six minutes to 6; would this be an appropriate time to ask to adjourn the debate or shall I go on a little longer?

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps the hon. member should continue. There are six minutes; he can say quite a lot in six minutes—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Seven minutes.

Mr. Speaker: —unless he particularly wishes to break it at this time.

Mr. Bolton: I will then continue. I did not know if there might be other business before 6 that you might wish to enter into.

In terms of my expectation of swift action, I awaited with anxiety and keen interest what might be said in the budget. I knew, as all of us knew, of certain matters of very urgent concern within the community. I knew how many were unemployed, how many who were ill housed, how many who were paying far too much rent for the house they were able to discover. So I awaited with interest

the swift reaction that might be indicated in the budget speech about the problems of unemployment and housing. In my naiveté I was even drawn to the headlines which spoke about the massive attack on unemployment, the massive housing programme.

Mr. Speaker, the nature of my training has not made me particularly clever at being judgemental. Most of my training has tended toward the field of conciliation for the past 10 years as a pastor of theology. Part of the course I used to give had to do with counselling and adopting the non-judgement attitude. Therefore, I shall be very happy when the time comes for the New Democratic Party to be the government rather than the opposition. Of course, I am not happy about constantly criticizing, but I have no hesitation in criticizing what seems to me a shocking pretence, that something really was going to be done about these two grave problems that affect so many thousands of our people. I was not proud, by no means, to be associated, even in opposition, with that kind of cynical pretence to our people. I think the government started off very badly indeed, in its newness reverting to old tactics.

Here was no sensitivity; here was no swift response to human need; here was the most calculated pretence, which fooled some people, until the ink had dried on the headlines of a few newspapers and the stark reality became apparent. This was just an empty statement, a hollow pretence at dealing with an urgent situation. This, Mr. Speaker, I think is indefensible and one of the clearest indications of what is going to become apparent that there must be a change in the government of the Province of Ontario.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Wishful thinking.

Mr. Bolton: Listen closely; act swiftly. Another promise made in the Throne Speech and, of course, associated with the budget was the willingness to expand and nourish individual initiative and private responsibility. I am thoroughly in accord with every effort to maintain individual initiative and private responsibility that is associated with corporate responsibility. I would like to see evidence that there is recognition of the fact that individual initiative depends upon a degree of freedom that is not yet accorded to the majority of our people.

There is no real political freedom where there is not economic freedom. We have a long way to go yet before the ideals expressed in the Throne Speech are realized, and I cannot see much evidence they will be realized in terms of being offered to us by the present government.

Mr. Speaker, it now being almost 6 of the clock, to use our antique mode of expression, may I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to move the adjournment, although it is very close to 6. I will accept it as 6.

Mr. Bolton moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

(*see page 2293*)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

8. *Mr. Shulman*—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Attorney General inform the House for what purpose $18,531.29 was paid to Hickling-Johnston Ltd. in 1970? Will the Minister make available the reports given to his department by Hickling-Johnston.

Answer by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General:

8. The sum of $18,531.29 was paid in the fiscal year 1969-70 by the Ontario Provincial Police to Hickling-Johnston Ltd. in connection with the following assignments and studies:

(a) Aptitudes and Abilities Measurements Study of a group of non-commissioned officers. Cost: $1,600.00.

The results of these studies are used for promotional purposes in administrative positions within the Ontario Provincial Police.

(b) Study and review of Performance Appraisal Programme and development of a Rating Manual for the Ontario Provincial Police Force. Cost: $3,682.15.

As an outcome of this study, a new Performance Rating Manual for the Ontario Provincial Police force was implemented in the spring of 1970.

(c) Study of manpower requirements and utilization for the Ontario Provincial Police. Cost: $11,421.84.

This study evaluates manpower utilization within the Ontario Provincial Police force and provides supporting material for additional requirements for the fiscal year 1970-1971.

(d) Study of the application of "Management by Objectives" principles in the administration of the Ontario Provincial Police and development of the organization and staffing for the planning, programming, budgeting system of the force. Cost: $1,827.30.

As a result of this study, a management committee and a programme analysis group were established within the organization of the Ontario Provincial Police.

The reports relate solely to the internal management of the Ontario Provincial Police, contain results of evaluation and appraisal of individual members of the force and other matters of a highly confidential nature.

It would not best serve the public interest to make such reports public.

9. *Mr. Shulman*—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Health advise the House for what purpose $7,440.17 was paid to Hickling-Johnston Ltd. in 1971 and will he table a copy of their report?

Answer by the Minister of Health:

No payments were made to Hickling-Johnston Limited in 1971 by The Department of Health.

12. *Mr. Trotter*—Inquiry of the ministry: What was the cost to the government of Ontario in order to host the Provincial Municipal Conference which was held in the Centennial Centre and Inn on the Park, on April 22, 23 and 24th, 1970?

Answer by the ministry: $76,522.00.

13. *Mr. Trotter*—Inquiry of the ministry: In view of the fact that the Ontario Health Services Insurance Plan now covers most medical services, will the minister investigate the credibility of student accident insurance policies issued by Mutual of Omaha by the authority of the board of education for the city of Toronto? As the coverage given by such policies has decreased significantly since October 1, 1969, would the minister not think it reasonable that such policies should be forbidden by the board of education for the city of Toronto or sold for a reduced premium?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

A school board is authorized by paragraph 36 of section 35 of The Schools Administration Act to "provide, by contract with an insurer under The Insurance Act, accident and life insurance for pupils, the cost of which is to be paid on a voluntary basis by the parents or guardians".

If parents and guardians of pupils are of the opinion that the premium is excessive, having regard to the risk insured, the demand for such coverage will, undoubtedly, decline to the point where the board will no longer provide the coverage. On the other hand, if the parents or guardians wish such insurance, they should be entitled to have it if the school board concerned agrees to provide for it.

14. *Mr. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Inquiry of the ministry: 1. How many patients are

there in the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia. 2. How many members of staff are there at this hospital school. 3. How many of these members of staff are there in each of the following categories: office; maintenance and grounds; housekeeping and laundry; food services; drivers; residential counsellors; child care workers; school principal and teachers; doctors; nurses and nursing aides; psychologists; recreation specialists; social workers; occupational, physical and speech therapists; dental personnel. 4. Is the staff of the travelling clinic included in the official statistics as part of the staff of Orillia. 5. What is the size of the travelling clinic staff. 6. How many days a year does the travelling clinic spend on the road. 7. Are trained "child-care workers" still being used on food services at Orillia, and if so, how many of the staff are involved.

Answer by the Minister of Health:

(1) Orillia—1,951; Muskoka unit—368.

(2) Orillia—1,285; Muskoka unit—253.

(3)

	Orillia	*Muskoka unit*
Office	64	13
Maintenance and grounds	74	22
Housekeeping and laundry	129	36
Food services	125	22
Drivers	14	3
Residential counsellors	445	122
Child care workers	nil	nil
School principal and teachers	37	1
Social workers	7	nil
Occupational, physical and speech therapists	3	nil
Dental personnel	4	nil
Doctors	11	nil
Nurses	43	nil
Nurse aids	175	14
Psychologists	1	nil
	(3 Psychometrist)	
Recreation personnel	22	1

(4) Yes.

(5) 3—Psychologist, medical doctor, social worker.

(6) Approximately 100 days.

(7) Ward staff are not used in any of the food preparation or food distribution duties. Ward staff are involved in a number of areas in assisting with the serving of the food, supervision of the children at mealtime, and eating with them. Ward staff are also involved in some areas in assisting with the removal of plates and silverware after the meal.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 3, 1971

Exposure draft of new University of Toronto Act, statement by Mr. White 2279

Forest fire situation in Ontario, statement by Mr. Brunelle 2279

Government's position re Spadina Expressway, statement by Mr. Davis 2279

Extension of Spadina Expressway to Eglinton, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Singer, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. T. Reid 2281

Postponement of federal-provincial constitutional conference, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 2284

Developing plans for second Toronto region airport, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon 2284

Recommendations to Ottawa on off-track betting legislation and regulations, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. T. P. Reid 2285

Cancellations sought by CNR on various important internal routes, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Martel 2287

Permits issued to quarry in Niagara Escarpment area, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Good, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer, Mr. Sargent 2288

Certain regional municipalities making non-essential expenditures, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Good 2290

Tabling letter re Old Fort William expenditures, question to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 2292

Loans to Lake Erie commercial fishermen, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Spence, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Makarchuk 2292

Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Wishart 2293

Presenting annual report, Department of Highways, Mr. Yaremko 2293

Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 2293

Resolution from standing human resources committee re Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Villeneuve 2293

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Apps, concluded 2294

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Bolton 2312

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Bolton, agreed to 2323

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2323

Appendix, answers to questions on the order paper, Nos. 8, 9, 12, 13, 14 2324

No. 56

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 3, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South may continue.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before 6 o'clock I made some reference to the promise in the Throne Speech that the minister would listen closely to the problems of the people and he would act swiftly to resolve them. The art of listening is a very difficult one. As many other people said before, there must have been some reason why we were given two ears and only one mouth: to listen twice as hard as we speak. The art of listening requires a real willingness to understand the problems of those to whom we should be listening.

In the light of that promise I want to refer to a later statement that has to do with the rural part of our community; again I quote from the Throne Speech:

> The government is concerned about the problems encountered by the people of rural Ontario as our countryside changes in response to population pressures, technology, urbanization and recreational demands. Steps will be taken to resolve the difficulties relating to farm assessment and inequities in property taxation. To help relieve these inequities the government will continue its efforts, in co-operation with its municipal partners, to lighten the burden of real estate taxes. The capital grants programme of The Department of Agriculture and Food will be expanded to more adequately reflect requirements of Ontario farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I must seriously challenge any suggestion that the farmers of Ontario have really been listened to. For example, the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food were brought down in this House before the Ontario Federation of Agriculture had a chance to make their presentation to the government. Many other things suggest that the government is going on its merry way with what passes for an agricultural policy without seriously listening to the very important complaints and problems which the farmers are presenting to us. I must cite, for example, the many demonstrations organized in protest about farm prices that occurred throughout the province. I shall refer, too, to the very serious problem relating to marketing as between Ontario and Quebec.

We are concerned in this party, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Ontario, which has a perfect right to support its own industry and needs to support the farm enterprise, is yet pursuing a path that is not in the best interests of this province, because there is real danger of interprovincial antagonism not very far short of warfare. We were required to enter into a very hasty enactment of a bill which will be very seriously tested in relation to this so-called chicken and egg war.

Earlier in the Throne Speech, reference was made to individual rights; certainly individuals have rights and individual provinces have rights. I do think we need to recognize the fact that provincialism as such can be an indication of a narrow concern, and not only in the field of agriculture, but elsewhere. This is particularly true in the budget report, which bears sufficient evidence to make us worry about the independent line that Ontario seems to be taking with regard to funding for social services in regard to individual agricultural policy.

One wonders if reference to individualism has not lost sight of its own meaning. The individual is an undivided person, one who has integrity, who achieves his true personality in the community with others. This is as true of the province as of individuals. Rugged individualism that ignores the rights of neighbours or its function in the community is a very dangerous principle, and it seems to me we in the province are tending to pursue the policy of a rugged provincial individualism that threatens the federation of our country. This, I think, is something that needs very careful examination.

The Throne Speech said that we live in a new age and indicated the fact that we have

new problems. One of the things we must recognize is that we are in a world that is now a global village. The act of one individual affects all other individuals. The act of one province influences the rest of the country. The actions of this country influence the world. I would like to see much clearer evidence that we are listening to the demands of one world and understanding the needs of each part of that world.

We in this very highly privileged province are listening to the demands and needs of the rest of the country. I am proud to live in Ontario. I have not associated myself with a certain jingle that requires an answer to where else one might prefer to be. At times I prefer to be where there is better employment opportunity, better housing and better understanding of the nature of some human problems. But I am yet proud to be in the Province of Ontario, a province to which I came as an immigrant many years ago, a province with great opportunity.

It is very important for us to realize that we cannot be arrogant and insular, either personally or as a province. Part of our listening should bring to us a realization of being asked to understand afresh the nature of our provincial and personal responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, I believe Bernard Shaw said, "Consistency is the tyrany of fools." But I say we should be reasonably consistent. Earlier in my comments I referred to the fact that many speeches in this House are far too long—I do not suggest they are far too dull. But this suggests we are not disciplining ourselves enough about the amount of time we spend in discussions. To be consistent therefore, I should not speak much longer.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Keep it up. Keep it up.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): You are doing well.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bolton. I am glad to have that sentiment endorsed by the hon. members of the so-called official opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is unworthy.

Mr. Bolton: Since the Leader of the Oppotion so kindly has asked me—and I regret it if I have hurt his feelings now—

Mr. Nixon: Again.

Mr. Pilkey: Tell him about Brant.

Mr. Bolton: —but you see while he listened this afternoon, he is now reading the newspaper and this hurts my feelings.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that in some attempt to be consistent I will bring my remarks to a close, hoping that the length of the speech is not indicative of the depth of it. And I have attempted to underline a certain philosophy of political responsibility. In this I am very serious indeed. We need greater responsiveness. We need a greater sense of urgency. Reference has been made to listening carefully and responding swiftly. Time is very short. We need to be alert. We need to have a sense of urgency.

An hon. member: The hon. member is talking about the Tories, of course.

Mr. Bolton: I am very happy to agree with my distinguished colleague. But again to be consistent I must say it is true of all of us, the need for this sense of urgency.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): That puts the member for Hamilton East in his place.

Mr. Bolton: Not precisely.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Bolton: If I made that comment to my colleague it is because I believe he will soon be in the position of being a member of the government. His response would therefore be graver even than it is now in opposition. Therefore I pass that comment to him.

May I revert to the Throne Speech? This will be my closing. The demands and pressures upon all of us during the 1970s will differ markedly from those of past decades, including the almost three decades of the present government.

The men and women of Ontario are establishing fresh values in regard to the quality of their lives, to attain for their children a legacy which goes far beyond older criteria of attaining personal material goods.

We are in an era of a new understanding of life values. I hope all the members of this House, those who are here now and those who may return, whether they sit on this side of the House or the other, recognize the urgency of legislative responsibility. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) for drawing up such a fine budget—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Do not get carried away.

Mr. Morningstar: —which will stimulate the economy, create new jobs, and meet the province's social needs.

Mr. Pilkey: How many new jobs?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Who wrote that?

Mr. Morningstar: In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is a budget meticulously designed to meet not only the needs of the people of this province—

Mr. Pilkey: Did you say "ridiculously designed"?

Mr. Morningstar: —to the greatest possible degree, with the available financial resources, it is also a budget designed to assist our people during these extremely difficult times of strained economics and unemployment.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Tell us about regional problems in Niagara.

Mr. Morningstar: I know that the hon. members of the official opposition will wince at this, but I sincerely wish that this government's concern over the present state of the economy, as reflected in the budget, were being echoed by the federal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Pilkey: One hundred and twenty five million for corporations.

Mr. Morningstar: Unfortunately that has not been the case to this time.

Ontario's budget, Mr. Speaker, will do a great many things for those people and those sectors of our society whcih need it most. It will help the small businessman through the five per cent tax credit for job-creating investment—

Mr. Pilkey: It will crush them. Crush them.

Mr. Morningstar: —and every taxpayer by increasing government support to school boards from 51 to 55 per cent.

Mr. Pilkey: Big deal!

Mr. Morningstar: Municipalities will gain more local autonomy through planned revised system of—

Mr. MacDonald: This is a fanciful effort.

Mr. Morningstar: —unconditional grants.

Mr. Pilkey: We heard about local autonomy today.

Mr. Morningstar: Social needs will be met through the setting aside of $20 million for hiring additional staff for mentally retarded children's hospitals, the inclusion of nursing homes and home care services under OHSIP, and increased spending on pollution control facilities.

The $45 million housing programme, Mr. Speaker, will serve the dual purpose of providing more accommodation and of creating new jobs.

Mr. Pilkey: The member has got to be kidding.

Mr. Morningstar: This, Mr. Speaker, is a budget that reflects the realities of the day.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The only thing that impresses are the histrionics.

Mr. Morningstar: Unlike Ottawa, this government is not indifferent to the economic and social needs of its people.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Morningstar: The great city of Welland where I come from will benefit—

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Morningstar: Thank you, gentlemen—will benefit greatly from the government's intention, as announced in the budget, to allot $1.1 million in the form of grants, in lieu of taxes on Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Mr. Pilkey: In lieu of taxes?

Mr. Morningstar: Although the provincial government naturally does not pay municipal taxes, it provides a grant as to what its fair share should be, so that in effect, Welland will gain additional tax revenue from Niagara college.

The recently innovated provincial incentive programme will also—

Mr. Gisborn: One more pat on the back and the member will fall over.

Mr. Morningstar: —greatly benefit the Welland area.

Mr. MacDonald: The people will not believe the member.

Mr. Morningstar: It will mean an additional $43,000 to the city—

Mr. Pilkey: Did the member say $43,000?

Mr. Morningstar: —which can be spent on projects it would not normally be able to undertake. Most of the money will be used towards building up our park system.

Mr. Speaker, in April, during the Throne debate, I concentrated on how labour is helped by this government. Now I would like to concentrate on an equally important area—

Mr. Pilkey: Let us not carry that one too far.

Mr. Morningstar: —how the elderly benefit from the many welfare programmes established by this government. I feel that some of our senior citizens may not be fully aware of all the services available to them and—

Mr. Pilkey: Yes, starving to death.

Mr. Morningstar: —I want to use this opportunity to outline these programmes.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Page 4.

Mr. Gisborn: The hon. member will be on for two or three hours.

Mr. Morningstar: Needy Ontario residents in chronic hospitals, nursing homes and homes for the aged will now be eligible for a $10 increase in their monthly comfort allowance.

Mr. Pilkey: The whole thing is going to add up to nothing.

Mr. Morningstar: The extension in the allowance from $15 to $25 will cover approximately 18,000 persons.

The Department of Social and Family Services will also subsidize any additional funds required by a home for the aged for the care of residents receiving the federal government's guaranteed income supplement. In addition, it will pay for the dental services, dentures, artificial limbs, glasses for clothing of needy persons in chronic hospitals.

To the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond), that is wonderful.

Mr. Peacock: The member for Ontario had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Morningstar: Elderly persons' centres in Ontario will be able to expand existing programmes and develop new ones for senior citizens in the community. With the help of more provincial financing—

Mr. Pilkey: Do not give too much credit to the member for Ontario.

Mr. Morningstar: —the present centres, and new ones to be built, will now be eligible for grants of up to $15,000 a year from the province. The previous ceiling was only $5,000 per year per centre and these grants could cover only programme costs and not operating expenses.

Mr. Pilkey: There is benevolence for you.

Mr. Morningstar: Now wages, salaries and staff benefits, meals on wheels, refreshments, crafts, transportation, operating and maintenance costs will all be included, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peacock: Page 5.

Mr. Morningstar: This expansion means that centres can initiate programmes for the elderly in their neighbourhoods. Prior to this change, some centres may have had the funds to pay for the special programme costs of a new service, but could not cover the additional costs in terms of staffing, transportation and other administrative costs.

More private non-profit groups will be able to build homes for the aged as well as homes for unwed mothers and youth institutions under the new alternative to capital financing introduced in February by The Department of Social and Family Services.

Mr. Pilkey: They are even leaving. They are leaving.

Mr. Morningstar: Previously, homes operated by private charitable groups could receive a capital grant of $5,000 per bed from the department to help cover the cost of constructing, furnishing and equipping a home.

Under the new regulation, groups are being given the choice of taking $5,000 per bed or arranging their own financing by borrowing and having the department assist them in repaying the debt. The homes will calculate what their operating costs would be including, for the first time, the cost of paying off the principal and interest of the loan.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Hear, hear!

Mr. Morningstar: Great government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): All three of the member's supporters are applauding.

Mr. Morningstar: They will continue to receive the operating grants of 80 per cent of the net costs, up to $9 per day, but they can also now receive payments from the province for approved debt retirement costs over the $9 per day with respect to persons in need.

This alternative method of financing will mean that the government will be able to build as many—

Mr. Nixon: Just one member of the cabinet left to listen.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They are not here to listen.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): There are only two of you over there.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): You leave me alone.

Mr. Nixon: You brute.

Mr. Morningstar: —as 20 new homes for the aged this year, whereas, previously, only half that number would have been possible.

Mr. Stokes: How many in the north?

Mr. Morningstar: I am very pleased for the north and for the south that the success of the pilot—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member cannot see that far, can he?

Mr. Morningstar: —vacation care programme in homes for the aged—

Mr. Peacock: Page 6.

Mr. Nixon: What is this stuff?

Mr. Morningstar: —in the regional municipality of Niagara is being adopted on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Nixon: There is another one. Watch him; he knows.

Mr. Morningstar: Throughout the summer and fall of 1970, 19 elderly men and women took advantage of the vacation care programme at Dorchester Manor, Linhaven, Northland Manor and Sunset Haven homes for the aged. Eleven of the vacationers stayed for two weeks and—

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I told you the member made that speech before.

Mr. Nixon: He just picked that speech out of the Tory barrel.

Mr. Morningstar: —eight of them for one month.

Mr. Pilkey: Big deal.

Mr. Peacock: Page 7.

Mr. Morningstar: Great programme.

Mr. Nixon: Is that the end?

Mr. Morningstar: Vacationers and their relatives were both very pleased—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Did the member read that?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): If the member would listen, he would learn something.

Mr. Morningstar: —with the programme.

Mr. Pilkey: That is better than they are doing in Renfrew:

Mr. Morningstar: The elderly person benefited by becoming better acquainted with the programmes and services in a home for the aged and from making friends his own age. It also made it possible for a family taking care of an older person to have a holiday on which they could not take an older relative. That happens very often.

So far this year the government has given $18,574 toward a modern, central laundry at Sunset Haven—

Mr. Nixon: Has the member got a room reserved there?

Mr. Morningstar: —home for the aged. This new facility will provide efficient laundry service to over 500 residents of Sunset Haven—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Of Sunset Haven.

Mr. Morningstar: —Dorchester Manor—

Mr. Nixon: The member has the vice-regal suite reserved at Sunset Haven.

Mr. Morningstar: —in Niagara Falls and Northland Manor in Port Colborne.

Thousands of senior citizens are benefiting from the new regulations concerning social assistance in Ontario. The lifting of the ceiling this year from $2,000 to $2,250 for single persons and from $3,500 to $3,750 for married persons has greatly increased the number of persons entitled to premium-free medical and hospital insurance.

Mr. Nixon: Speak up.

Mr. Morningstar: The current total is 85,000.

Mr. Nixon: Go over that last paragraph again. Bring in the rest of the speech.

Mr. Morningstar: Ladies and gentlemen, the planned Senior Citizens' Week is further proof of both this government's concern over the welfare of the elderly as well as of its appreciation of their contribution over the years to this province's development.

Mr. Nixon: Hear, hear.

Mr. Morningstar: This week will stimulate general interest in and knowledge of aging, the elderly, and all existing programmes for and projects by and with our senior citizens.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Speaker, it is programmes like these and a great many others that have made Ontario one of the most desirable places to live on this continent. Needless to say, all these programmes have been brought about by the Conservative government which has served this province exceptionally well for the past 28 years. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we shall continue to serve the people of this province for many more years to come.

The vast variety of our programmes affect every sector of our province, every area, every person. My own area of Welland has been no exception. Vast physical changes are being brought about at this very moment by the construction of the 8.3-mile channel relocation on the Welland Canal. I strongly urge visitors to Niagara Falls, the Lake Erie resort areas and other peninsula points to include Welland in their plans so that they can see the mighty undertaking required in re-aligning the canal so that a straighter, shorter and wider route can be provided between Port Robinson and Ramey's Bend at Port Colborne, Ontario.

In the city of Welland there are observation areas at East Main Street and at Townline Road where the new cut and tunnel construction for the carrying of railway and vehicular traffic under the relocated channel can be viewed—all welcome developments. Since this gigantic project is just about midway between Niagara Falls and Lake Erie it can be reached after only a few minutes' drive from popular tourist areas and will be found to be a most interesting and highly rewarding experience.

The Department of Transportation and Communications of this province is vitally involved in the tunnel projects and in the new construction necessitated by the change in the canal route. In fact, the department has been most active in carrying out general improvements to provide better access to the Welland area, not the least of which is the new north-south provincial Highway 406, which is about to be opened in its entirety between Welland and St. Catharines.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): What are you going to do with that bridge over the old canal? That is going to be a headache.

Mr. Morningstar: We are looking after that.

Mr. Young: What are you going to do with it?

Mr. Morningstar: Oh, no, we look after people.

An hon. member: You fellows do not look after people the way he does.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Morningstar: All these improvements, Mr. Speaker, have had my earnest attention and I am happy to state that the department has been very co-operative, particularly in respect to the representations on tunnel plans in which as a member I have acted jointly with Welland's city council and other community organizations in order that local requirements receive the best possible attention.

Along with canal relocation there have been other significant projects testifying to Welland's continuing growth and development. Last year the Union Carbide Company brought a $10 million expansion to its graphite division on stream, and at Atlas Steel a costly modernization programme is being vigorously pursued.

The Welland County General Hospital having pressed its new Centennial Wing, built at a cost of $2.8 million, into service last year is now preparing to proceed with marked expansion of its emergency and physiotherapy departments. It has established a street clinic for the treatment of persons requiring help because of drug usage.

Mr. Pilkey: What is this, a nomination speech?

Mr. Morningstar: A feature of the new wing opened last year is the provision of a

division of nuclear medicine, indicating the hospital's interest in staying abreast of modern techniques.

Indeed, in all directions there is much evidence of activity that keeps Welland a vibrant community. Modern school construction is being maintained by the building of a new $2.3 million secondary school and at Confederation School, which has the distinction of being the largest French-language secondary school in the province, a $2 million expansion is under way.

A recommendation has been made for an additional 50 family units to be added to the 146 Ontario Housing Corporation rental units already established. Real estate sales are up by at least 20 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: All your neighbours are trying to leave.

Mr. Morningstar: The day-care programme, Colonel Kennedy, has been instituted at the homes for the aged and several developers are working on plans for malls and new shopping centres.

Mr. MacDonald: The member has driven out the only cabinet minister here.

Mr. Morningstar: Within a year it is expected that a new modern detention centre will be built a few miles north of Welland to replace the county jails of Lincoln and Welland. This project's cost is estimated at $3,400,000.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Morningstar: Right. Looking out for our people. Mr. Speaker, Welland is an interesting place to visit at any time, but particularly during Rose Festival Week, which this year will be held June 18 to 27.

Mr. Pilkey: Speak into the microphone!

Mr. Morningstar: Many special events are planned, including a rodeo and sports festivals. One of the finest and most colourful parades in Ontario is always a highlight and this year the celebration will be providing a special welcome to a representative group of citizens from Sorel, Quebec.

Sorel is Welland's twin city and it is the turn of the fine people from the Quebec municipality to come to Welland in the bi-yearly exchange of visits between the two communities.

And the young of the Welland area have not sat idle, Mr. Speaker. They have established a fine programme for Welland's young people. It is called Youth for Action. This organization provides special interest classes, a centre where young people can congregate, and a job placement bureau. Not only does it aim at finding jobs for people in the programme, it also is seeking to create jobs where work appears to be needed.

It is programmes like this which reflect the commitment of our young people today to improving society, and I believe we should all highly commend them for this dedication.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Morningstar: Thank you very much, opposition.

An hon. member: They never learn.

Mr. Morningstar: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say how much I appreciate this opportunity of expressing my views to you and the hon. members of this House. I can only add that I consider it a great privilege and an honour to sit in this Legislature and be a part of a government which is striving so well to serve the best interests of all our people of the Province of Ontario, the province of opportunity.

Thank you very much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I certainly have to admit that following as I do my good friend from Welland (Mr. Morningstar), is a very hard act to follow and I do not think I will even attempt it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, Mr. Speaker, I do want to offer my usual congratulations to you, sir, and want to also pay tribute to the new members of the cabinet and, of course, to the new Premier (Mr. Davis) on his election.

I am not going to be very long tonight—yes, I knew the members would like that—but there are a few matters that I want to draw to the attention of the government. The first one has to do with a strictly provincial issue. The other one is basically federal; however, it really does affect my area in quite a dramatic way and so, since this is the only forum open to me, I want to make a few comments about it.

However, before I do I want to say that in our view in this party the next election is

certainly going to be a very interesting one. I think the issues are going to be rather clear cut. There are many issues around really—regional government, high cost of education, waste—all of this boils down to one thing really, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact that this government has been in office too long.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): No!

Mr. Gaunt: It has become too insensitive to the needs of the people. The Premier will not want to fight on that ground, of course. He will want to choose his own ground and if he cannot really seize on an issue he will manufacture one, I am sure. But no matter what he does, Mr. Speaker, he is going down to defeat and the Liberals will replace him after the next election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: That is all right. The hon. members can have their day in court. We will win it when it really counts.

The Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), during the leadership campaign, said that only good solid reform legislation would keep the party in power after 27 years. When one looks at the order paper it reads like the death wish of a government about to give up the ghost. There is practically no legislation at all.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The hon. member should be making that speech in Ottawa.

Mr. Gaunt: And never since I came into this Legislature, which is almost nine years ago now, have I seen such a dull and near-nonexistent legislative programme this late in the session. It is just as if the government had given up entirely and is prepared to take the electorate's decision with resignation and passivity.

The Premier has cast himself in the role of a repairman, rather than a leader. He tried to repair the education crisis by appointing the Deputy Minister of Education to head up a commission to look for waste in the system he built.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): If he could repair blowouts, he would look after the hon. member too.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I might say something very kind about my friend from Grey South.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member would be the only one who would.

Mr. Gaunt: He is the last person in the world who should be talking about blowouts. The vexing problem of foreign investment and control of the economy got some attention to the extent that a conference is going to be held on the subject later this month. It is not by all appearaces, so far, going to be an earth-shaking exercise.

The Premier witnessed the Throne Speech erupt into a blaze of newspaper headlines, proclaiming that the new housing programme would provide a potential of 132,000 jobs during this year, only to see the whole thing collapse in a shambles a few days later when the government could not produce any statistics to indicate how many of the 132,000 would be new jobs. Indeed, it ended up that the programme was just a pipedream lacking any real substance or basis. In fact, it appears that the programme will be lucky to produce even 15,000 new jobs.

Well, then came the budget, presented with all the bombast the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) could muster. The main thrust of the budget contained a diatribe against Ottawa. The same old story—when in trouble, shift the focus. Do anything to get the people thinking about things other than the shortcomings of the government.

Also there were powerful new incentives for business expansion to cure unemployment; at least, so it was said. The incentive was in the form of a five per cent tax to firms buying new equipment. It was proposed the loss in revenue would be something around $125 million.

However, as the details began to unfold a few days later, it became obvious that 85 per cent of the machinery on which the grants would be paid would have been purchased anyway. Some purchases will be made outside the province, thus creating jobs elsewhere, and some equipment, when installed, will actually reduce the number of jobs so that the net gain in employment is very likely to be small if it exists at all.

The Premier sat by and watched another programme descend into disaster. As a matter of fact, the Premier has a great propensity for attracting disaster; a short while later the Niagara Escarpment debates broke out with the Premier finally agreeing to appoint a royal commission to check into the whole affair.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): We can sure tell you did not write that speech. That is not your thinking.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I repeat, the Premier seems to attract disaster. He is in hot water most of the time.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): You would almost think he went to university to get into hot water.

Mr. Gaunt: He seems to invite most of the disaster most of the time, at least, on the theory that when one is always in hot water, one is bound to be clean. Well, I am sure the Premier will have better luck as leader of the opposition, a position he will be assuming come the fall.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That leaves you in third place.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have been saying that for 25 years.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact, that is rather perspicacious of you.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He is a very perspicacious fellow.

Mr. Gaunt: I would say a word about the recent report of the Litter Control Council. The report was handed to the minister recently and was made public last week.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You are not going to try to take credit for that, too? You know the federation was away ahead of you on the chiropractors.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I am wondering how the chiropractors got injected into this debate. Well, my colleagues have, on occasion, delivered to me a few accolades that, perhaps, were deserved or were not deserved—

Mr. Nixon: We call him the adjuster.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Downsview cannot stand it any more.

Mr. Gaunt: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the litter report.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Are you in favour of the Spadina Expressway?

Mr. Gaunt: I suppose that when one looks at the composition of that particular committee, it was not exactly an unbiased committee. There were eight industry representatives out of 12, so it is only natural that the industry members would engage in some special pleading, which of course they did. Perhaps it is the kind of report that is ironclad safe during an election year.

As the minister said himself, the real guts of the report are in the alternatives. With respect to the alternatives, the minister is right back where he started because there was no agreement on any of the alternatives. As far as the basic plan is concerned it was a very obvious thing, and it is not hard to understand how complete agreement was reached with respect to it. After all, who can be against additional receptacles for litter, a well-founded educational campaign to encourage people not to litter, extra enforcements so that any person found littering is liable to a fine upon conviction of not more than $100? Who can be against those things? These are motherhood aspects of the problem which could get universal agreement.

I recognize that the litter problem can best be met by reuse, recycling, and reclamation of all waste in special plants built for that purpose. In this regard it is encouraging to note that a prototype plant to do this is being designed for the city of Kingston. I am sure the hon. minister is well aware of this development. It is being constructed on a grant of $15,000 from the glass-container council. The capital cost of the plant costing $1 million is to be shared by the industry and the federal and provincial governments. This is a breakthrough which is certainly welcome.

As a final observation, I just want to say, in view of my past interest in the matter, that I think it is fairly obvious now that the government is not going to ban the disposable bottle.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Are you not going to tell us about chiropractors before you finish?

Mr. Gaunt: However, the debate surrounding this particular issue has served its purpose. I will not enjoy the success with the disposable bottle that I enjoyed with the inclusion of the chiropractors, I am sure. But I will take one victory at a time. That is all we can do.

Mr. Yakabuski: We thought the hon. member had.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member for York North has not had one yet.

Mr. Gaunt: I feel that the debate surrounding the problem has been very useful. I think it has made the government and industry and the general public more conscious of the overall problem. I feel the moves by the industry in particular are in direct response to the expressed concern.

Mr. Yakabuski: He used to be such a fine fellow.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to say a word about the CNR and the discontinuance of rail service to the part of western Ontario which I have the privilege to represent.

Mr. Yakabuski: That is shameful.

Mr. W. Hodgson: We have the same problem in York North as the CNR too.

Mr. Gaunt: I just want to cast this issue and put it into its proper perspective, and I think I can best do that by reading to you a letter I received from one of my constituents with respect to this matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Another of these "Dear Murray" letters?

Mr. Gaunt: No, as a matter of fact it is not. It is "Dear Mr. Gaunt."

Mr. W. Hodgson: That letter belongs to the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent).

Mr. Yakabuski: I thought it was only the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) who read letters from books.

Mr. Gaunt: The letter says, Mr. Speaker:

> I am a university student who is extremely concerned and frustrated about the public transportation system in midwestern Ontario. My home town is in Kincardine. During the school year I am at Queen's University in Kingston and in the summer I work at the Midwestern Regional Children's Centre near Palmerston. Like many others who either are unable to own a car or do not want to drive their car to a particular place, I am forced to rely on public means of transportation if I desire to go somewhere.
>
> For many years I travelled by train because it was less expensive than by bus, and it also followed a more direct route. Although I did not use it frequently I was assured by the fact that it was there when I needed it. Last November the train service was cut off because of insufficient numbers of people who were using it. Therefore in order to travel I had to turn to the bus service.
>
> For a short period of time there was a direct bus from Kincardine to Toronto and from there connections could be made to other places. Then it was discontinued and instead I had to travel through either London or Owen Sound to reach Kincardine. Both are out of the way and are inconvenient, and, needing transportation, I preferred the Owen Sound route as it was shorter and not so expensive.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You can always stop for a drink there too.

Mr. Gaunt: It goes on:

> It is approximately 165 miles by bus from Kincardine via Owen Sound to Toronto and 226 miles via London. Last week I was informed by our bus agent in Kincardine that the Owen Sound route would be cut off June 8. This leaves the people who wish to travel by public means only one choice. They must travel down to London before they can go anywhere.

The writer goes on to say that the personal aspect is as I have set it out, but there are other implications as well having to do with the development of the area and so on. About a year ago the CNR applied for discontinuance—actually, it was not quite a year ago, I guess, Mr. Speaker—applied for a discontinuance of passenger service in the northern part of western Ontario.

The Canadian Transportation Commission held a hearing in Owen Sound and the CNR was granted its request on the basis that the company was losing large sums of money and there was alternative service by way of bus transportation. There is no doubt that the CN was losing money, although it was not clearly as large as was made out because of the very complex and complicated way the CN has of figuring these things out. They use what they call a regressional cost analysis formula which, in my view, makes the loss much worse than it actually is.

Be that as it may, let us look at the matter of alternative service. The bus companies were running regular seven-days-a week runs into the larger cities. This, the commission said, would handle all the traffic. Let us look at what happened. The buses have now cut service and, for the most part, buses are only running on weekends.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): That is terrible.

Mr. Gaunt: Up Friday night, back Sunday night.

Mr. Yakabuski: It is the old story—use it or lose it.

Mr. Gaunt: The rest of the week, there is nothing. Let me read you just a short comparison of what one person found in

comparing bus and train service. I agree in part with what my hon. friend from Renfrew South says.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, surely not?

Mr. Gaunt: Part of the problem is the uneven service, or at least the uneven passenger usage. On the weekends it is quite high and during the week it is quite low. Averaged out over the entire week, I suppose the figure is, comparatively speaking, rather low. This is a problem undoubtedly. But I want to give for a moment, a comparison which was given to me by a person who had the opportunity of taking the bus. She compares it to the train in her letter and with respect to comfort and to washrooms and to price, to being on time and meeting a schedule, the train is superior in all aspects.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member never spoke to the federal minister (Mr. Jamieson) about this, did he?

Mr. Gaunt: In studying the CN and its operation, one is bound to come to a number of conclusions. First of all, in my view—just before I go into that, I want to go back just slightly and make some comment about the CTC hearings. As far as I am concerned, the commission, right from the outset, was looking for a convenient hook to hang its hat on and let the railways get out from under their obligation to provide the passenger service to the northern part of western Ontario. It was, in my view, a ploy, a neat one, and it worked.

As far as I was concerned, I felt that the decision of the hearings was made before the actual hearing took place.

Mr. Sargent: And the government bought the whole deal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: Where was the provincial government?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Where was the federal government?

Mr. Gaunt: First of all, in my view, Mr. Speaker, there was a deliberate attempt to downgrade the passenger service in order to try to eliminate it. Basically, the railroad has taken a "we dont care" attitude.

Mr. Evans: That is the federal government.

Mr. Gaunt: The CNR suffers from a too many chiefs and not enough Indians psychosis. Too many chiefs who have degrees and little else; they know practically nothing about railroads.

Let me give you an example. During a series of storms this past winter, the work crew at the passenger locomotive roundhouse in Toronto was sent home because there were no locomotives in for repair. At the same time, the freight train locomotive roundhouse in Toronto had more work than the staff could handle. The men from the passenger locomotive roundhouse, instead of being sent home, should have been moved in to help the freight locomotive division get going again.

Mr. Yakabuski: Probably the union problem there! That would be the union problem!

Mr. Gaunt: However, the people in the ivory tower said, "No go." In my view, this reflects the complete bankruptcy of railroad management talent. There is something seriously wrong with an organization that is so top heavy it cannot even straighten that. I propose several things.

No. 1: The Canadian Transportation Act should be amended immediately to provide for a railroad to apply for a maximum subsidy instead of just continuance. As the Act now stands, a railroad company has to apply for discontinuance if it wants to get the maximum subsidy, and the CTC may grant discontinuance when, in fact, the railroad just wanted the maximum subsidy and was prepared to continue the service with the subsidy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is exactly why Pickersgill is the chairman.

Mr. Gaunt: This part of the Act is not acceptable, in my view, and should be changed.

Secondly, the government of Canada should stop writing a blank cheque for the CN without asking for a full reporting of what the CN does with the money. They came in again this year and asked for $299 million and got it. As a taxpayer I do not feel obliged to foot that kind of bill, when I know the value of that money is declining steadily. The management is in a perpetual state of decay, so much so that many of the middle management bosses have retired at 60 and the others worth their salt can hardly wait for their pension time to arrive. To say the least, the company management has managerial leprosy and unless the CTC and the

governments get a little cement in their collective spines, the public is going to suffer the consequences.

Thirdly—and perhaps this is a personal matter with me—I feel the CN should be made to stop using that ridiculous and certainly untrue ad on which it is spending close to a million dollars, I am told, to tell people the CN is building the Canadian dream. They have pictures of freight trains—mark you, there are no passenger trains—I can understand that—rolling along carrying the freight which is undoubtedly fattening the pockets and filling the coffers of the company.

Along comes the announcer and says, "CN is building the Canadian dream." In my view, that is nonsense. The truth of the matter is that the CN is destroying the Canadian dream. It is more like a nightmare than a dream, and it is high time the CN stopped insulting people with their own money.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): They should get rid of Jack Pickersgill for a start.

Mr. Gaunt: Fourthly, the province should complete its transportation needs study as quickly as possible and, hopefully, that study will indicate a need for the restoration of some type of limited train services, perhaps only on weekends, or maybe on weekends with one train during the week. Alternatively, perhaps the province can work out some system with the bus lines to provide some service to those parts of the province and not cut them off entirely from any type of public transportation. People who are most seriously affected are the older people who do not like to drive, or who do drive but would much prefer to take public transportation.

The railways, in my humble opinion, have completely disregarded the public interest in this regard. I do note, however, some encouraging signs of late. I notice that the transport committee in Ottawa has decided that it is going to conduct an investigation in southwestern Ontario and, I gather, northwestern Ontario. It is going to question the officials of both railways to bring to light some of the problems concerning the passenger and freight service in that part of the country. I view that as an encouraging sign.

I also view as an encouraging sign the fact that the Canadian Transport Commission, in the matter of the applications of CPR and CNR for discontinuance for passenger service with respect to the Toronto-Havelock line and with respect to the Toronto-Markham runs, has ordered that both companies continue these runs in the public interest. In my view, I think this is to be applauded and I feel it represents a reversal of the previous policy. I feel that the Canadian Transport Commission—and perhaps the provincial government here could assist in persuading that body to do so, to take the position that the Canadian Transport Commission should review the matter of discontinuance with respect to the part of western Ontario which I represent. The whole area, the Stratford-Owen Sound-Kincardine-Goderich axis in the northern part of western Ontario. I feel that with this apparent reversal in the policy of the Canadian Transport Commission, perhaps they would view with some sympathy a review of the circumstances which led them initially to order that the passenger service to that part of the country be discontinued. I would hope that the province here would take a position on that matter.

The minister this afternoon indicated that he would have to think about that before he would make any commitment but I do hope that he does take the position I have outlined and force the Canadian Transport Commission to review the whole matter in light of the most recent circumstances which have taken place.

Mr. Sargent: Here he comes now.

Mr. Gaunt: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: The expressway king.

Mr. Gaunt: —in winding up this debate, on my part, I want to say that the amendment which was proposed by my leader a while back is an amendment that deserves the attention and study of all member of the House. It really sets out the basic needs of the province, it points out the weaknesses of the government in very precise terms and I certainly commend it to all members of the House. I am sure that if they all exhibit the good sense I know they possess, they will be voting for the amendment of this party.

An hon. member: Very well put.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The inadequacies of this budget are so many in number and so far-reaching in their consequences that it is a little difficult to know where to make a start in making a contribution to this budget debate.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): What is wrong with the beginning?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, we will set a context and begin at the beginning in a moment. But the point I want to make at the outset is that, budgetwise, Ontario is not a province like the others. Because of fiscal matters, because of our size, because of our basic wealth and because of our proportion of the industrial capacity of Canada, our budget has an impact on this nation second only to that of the budget at Ottawa.

I would be the first to concede that Ontario's budgetary problems have been complicated, even bedevilled, by the perverse nature of many federal economic, fiscal and monetary policies—even more so by the uncertainty of federal policies on tax reform, shared-cost programmes and a more appropriate division of revenues for all levels of government.

Because of all these important considerations, I would like to make a start, if the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications will permit, with a brief review of the national context—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Feel free to go ahead.

Mr MacDonald: —within which the provinces, including Ontario, have been obliged to operate this year's budgeting.

These are critical times for Canada. Our constitution, our economic and fiscal problems are the subjects of growing dissatisfaction in every region of this country. So much so that the bonds of Canadian unity are being stretched closer to breaking point with every passing year. In considering the problems that contribute to the troubled conditions of the Canadian nation, there is a tendency to view in isolation the question of French-English relations, or of Quebec's place in Confederation. But these are not isolated problems, they are part and parcel of the whole complex of social and economic questions which we have not resolved satisfactorily. I want to take two or three of the main areas and deal with them as a means of illustrating my point.

The first one: the federal government has been engaged on a crusade against inflation. Virtually every other consideration is being sacrificed to what the Trudeau government deemed to be a satisfactory effort and achievement in this connection. The result has been a deliberate and a massive under-use of our human and physical resources. Some of this may have been unavoidable. Modern governments have simply not so far learned how to grapple with the extreme difficulties of an appropriate trade-off between inflation and unemployment. But the full consequences of federal policies have not only been unnecessary, and avoidable but they have been disastrous upon their impact upon the nation and its people.

The chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, for example, Mr. Speaker, has estimated that the annual loss to the Canadian economy resulting from this crusade against inflation amounted to about $4 billion. Four billion dollars a year. That monetary figure, of course, reflects nothing of the human suffering of the two to three million Canadians whose families have been directly involved in the three quarters of a million unemployed.

Sometimes English-speaking Canadians are puzzled, even exasperated, by the degree of unrest in the Province of Quebec today. But when one bears in mind that, with the exception of the Atlantic provinces and, ironically, certain areas of British Columbia in recent times, Quebec has suffered the highest level of chronic unemployment, a higher level than any other part of this country. Surely the reason for the profound dissatisfaction in Quebec is self-evident if one deals with that point and that point only. By his economic policy, Trudeau, elected as the architect of Canadian unity, has done more than any other person to bolster French-Canadian disillusionment with Confederation.

Let me go now to a second area. One of the strongest bonds of unity for any nation is the assurance that, no matter where a citizen lives, he will have something approaching equality of economic opportunity, and social services. Despite greater efforts to equalize economic opportunities in Canada, the regional disparities in Canada persist. Indeed many of the indices seem to suggest that they are widening, rather than narowing.

Dissatisfaction with the situation is heightened by growing uncertainty regarding the shared-cost programmes which have been conceived and designed to establish equality of services for all Canadians, wherever they be living, from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

That atmosphere of uncertainty has always existed to some degree, but the Trudeau government added to it shortly after the 1968 election, with the warning that at some point in the relatively near future the federal government might withdraw from Medicare and

leave the whole responsibility to the provinces. It has been added to again by the Trudeau government's recent efforts to impose arbitrary percentage ceilings on shared expenditures, a procedure which implicitly denies any responsibility to reduce the disparities that now exist across this country in the fundamental services. They are yawning in their nature in many instances.

As a result of this accumulative uncertainty, the inevitable is now happening—demand by some provinces, including Ontario, that shared-cost programmes should be ended and fiscal equivalents be given in their stead. The provinces are fearful of being drawn into further programmes because of federal initiative and then left to bear a growing proportion of the cost.

But, Mr. Speaker, the net result of this whole approach is a balkanization of Canada's effort in providing basic services, a trend away from building one Canada, with an equality of services coupled with an equality of economic opportunity. If Quebec, because of its unique social and cultural values and background, the background of French Canada, has special problems in this connection, so have all provinces in varying degrees. Unfortunately, the approach of both the federal government and now, regretfully, the Ontario government is intensifying these problems and the basic unity of the country is being undermined in the process. I want to come back to that point a little later.

Let me go on now to the third area on which I would like to invite consideration. This is the unresolved conflict of tax-sharing and tax reform. For 10 years now, Canada has been actively engaged in working out a more realistic matching of the constitutional responsibilities of the provinces and the federal government—and, indeed, of the municipal governments—and of matching those responsibilities with the financial capacity to fulfil them. We seem to be no closer to resolving that basic need today.

Meanwhile, the people are losing confidence not only in the capacity of the government to meet their obligations but also in our capacity to resolve this impasse so as to be able to do a more effective job. The "fathers of re-Confederation" have failed this nation with consequences which are now involving a deepening concern about the nation's capacity to do what is necessary in order to ensure its very survival

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize all Canada shares in varying degrees in the concern arising from the failure in these three major areas: Of unemployment arising from economic policies; of the uncertainty and now the tendency to withdraw from shared-cost programmes; of the complex of tax-sharing and tax reform. We all share in it, and if the focal point of our national crisis appears to be in Quebec at this stage in our history, it is simply because the dissatisfactions there are intensified by the added explosive ingredient of French-Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, having attempted to place the so-called Quebec problem in the broader context of the social and economic policies which have done so much to create it, let me say that it is my belief that English-speaking Canada today is dangerously unaware of the growing threat of the separatist strength in the Province of Quebec.

Just let me, to begin with, recall the basic facts which were revealed by the Quebec election just about a year ago. The Parti Quebecois, openly and frankly committed to taking Quebec out of Confederation, received 24 per cent of the popular vote. The fact that these votes were denied a proportionate number of seats in the Quebec National Assembly has tended to lull the rest of Canada into a false sense of security. But let us remember that the undemocratic nature of this kind of situation within the Province of Quebec has added to the popular appeal of the separatist forces. It is, in the view of both the Parti Quebecois supporters who use the argument and many people who hear it, another proof that the existing situation is grossly unfair.

But, Mr. Speaker, even the 24 per cent of the popular vote is deceiving. Fully 90 per cent of the English-speaking population in Quebec voted solidly for the Bourassa government, which simply means that among the French-Canadian element of the Quebec population, the Parti Quebecois received almost as much support as did the Liberals. In addition to that, as we all know—and I suspect as do hon. members on the other side of the House as much as anybody—a considerable part of the voter support that went to Union Nationale was strongly separatist in its inclinations.

A further point—when one examines the nature of the Liberal support, as compared with that of the Parti Quebecois, the Liberals attracted all of the old-guard bourgeois—the business world—whereas Levesque tended to attract the younger, the more dynamic, creative and imaginative groups in society, along with the politically active

sections of the trade union movement. Indeed, some analysts contend that the majority of the French-speaking population in Quebec, under 35 years of age—a distinct majority of those under 35 years of age—have already opted for separatism. In short, the Parti Quebecois has already gone far in winning the generation of the future.

Following on that election, there was the traumatic experience of the FLQ crisis last fall. There are reasons to believe that nobody —and least of all, once again, people in English-speaking Canada—realized the impact of those developments last fall. Those hon. members who have read the exchange of letters between Peter Newman, the new editor of Maclean's Magazine, and Claude Ryan in the recent issue of that magazine have got some glimpse of the impact and of the long-term consequences.

Even Peter Newman, as an English-speaking Canadian, observed that many in Quebec today, quite apart from the little handful who happened to be in the FLQ—a relatively inconsequential little group—feel that dissent is possible, and I use Peter Newman's phraseology, "only at the point of a bayonet." This is the impact left by what happened last fall. As for Claude Ryan, he frankly admits that in the next provincial election in Quebec he may have no alternative but to vote for Levesque and the Parti Quebecois, not because he is a separatist but because there is no other option for those who believe in—and these are his words, "democracy, liberty, justice, and peace".

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): He does not believe in socialism either.

Mr. MacDonald: Claude Ryan?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): How does the member know what we have talked about? He has not been listening.

Mr. T. P. Reid: One only has to listen with about half an ear.

Mr. Peacock: The member has been using half an ear.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Therefore, he grasped about half.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind this Legislature that Claude Ryan has long been one of the few Canadians accepted in both English- and French-speaking Canada as a person who could accurately interpret the views and aspirations of Canada's two founding peoples to each other. He was a strong anti-separatist, a committed federalist. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, for the very serious consideration of the hon. members of the Ontario Legislature, that if we are losing the Claude Ryans from the cause of Canadian federalism, then this nation, as we have known it, is farther down the road to dissolution than we have realized.

Just in passing, for those who feel that I may be presenting an unduly pessimistic picture and, incidentally, coming from a person who is an incorrigible optimist on virtually every other issue that I speak about—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Being in that party the member has to be.

Mr. MacDonald: For those who feel that I may be presenting an unduly pessimistic picture, it is interesting to note that George Hees has recently launched a personal crusade to waken English-speaking Canada to what is happening in Quebec. Speaking as a former chairman of the Montreal Stock Exchange who has a large circle of friends in the business world, and contending that the views he is now expressing are respresentative of a growing cross-section of the population in the Province of Quebec, he estimated—I heard him last night on the radio programme, or Monday night it was—that in his view popular support for the forces of separatism in Quebec today is at least at the 30 per cent level. As the situation is now developing, said he, the Parti Quebecois may well win the government of Quebec in the second election hence and, therefore, Quebec, will by the democratic process move out of Confederation.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Does the hon. member regard George Hees as an authority?

Mr. MacDonald: No, I do not, except that I find it rather significant that George Hees should be adding his voice on this issue at this particular time. I normally do not look upon George Hees as a bible of authoritative statement any more than, for example, the Reader's Digest—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Or the member for Sarnia.

Mr. MacDonald: Or the member for Sarnia. The hon. member is right, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Bullbrook: That was an unhappy addition.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's intervention was as unhappy as they normally are at the present time.

Mr. Bullbrook: You and I for 48 hours have had a wonderful affair, really.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): A short love affair.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may get back to the topic and not be involved in these digressions, whether or not the assessment of the Quebec situation that I have given to you is unduly pessimistic, I suggest, is not the question on which hon. members of this Legislature should focus too much attention.

There is simply too much evidence to be dismissed; too much evidence confirming the need for a greater concern among English-speaking Canadians as to exactly what is happening in that part of French Canada.

The important point on which our attentions should be focused is that now is the time, before it is too late—and I still am assuming that it is not yet too late—for us to strive to create the conditions which will persuade Canadians of all provinces that for them, the best possible future in this imperfect world, lies in a new federal union for all of Canada.

Now is the time for a ringing declaration of faith in the future of a united Canada, a future which will assure the fulfilment, rather than the frustration of the needs and the aspirations of all its people. More important, ringing declarations of faith by themselves are not going to be adequate; they must be backed up with action to make all that possible. We simply cannot afford to drift any longer in the kind of deadlock, or impasse, which has characterized the last two or three years of our constitutional review.

Mr. Bullbrook: Hear, hear

Mr. MacDonald: And that, Mr. Speaker, is why in my view the federal-provincial conference in Victoria is of fateful consequence to the future of this nation. We simply dare not continue to engage in a sterile constitutional debate.

There must be a resolution of such technical, though vitally important, matters as Canada's capacity to amend its own constitution —a sort of a relic of the colonial days. That issue must be resolved, not because it accomplishes anything in itself other than to get rid of that relic of colonialism, but because it makes it possible to proceed without delay at this conference, to grapple effectively with the whole range of social, economic, fiscal and taxation matters which face this nation.

We cannot continue to muddle through any longer without jeopardizing, not only the future of Canada, but its very capacity to survive. I for one no longer minimize the very real threat to a dismemberment of this nation brought about by the unresolved constitutional, socio-economic and fiscal problems. The threat of Quebec separatism is but the most sensational manifestation of our past failures.

If I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by the growing threat of separatism in Quebec, let me say that I am no less disturbed by a growing tendecy to what I would describe as English-Canadian separatism. Hardly a day, as far as I am concerned, hardly a day and certainly never a week, passes without running into somebody whose exasperated reaction to the so-called Quebec problem is: "Well, if Quebec wants to go, let them go." Indeed, it is often phrased in even stronger language than that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be a fleeting emotional satisfaction in that kind of short-sighted outburst but acceptance of a divorce between the two founding peoples of this nation would not solve any of our problems; indeed, it would create greater ones by comparison, greater ones which would be infinitely more unmanageable than the ones we have at the present time. I am profoundly convinced that French Canada would be worse off once the first euphoric hour of so-called liberation had passed, but so would English Canada be worse off; indeed, we would be a sort of a Pakistan, with east and west. British Columbia and the Prairies and the Atlantic provinces would have less will and even less capacity to withstand the forces of absorption from the United States. And what would happen to Ontario, God knows.

Now, I for one unashamedly repudiate that prospect, not out of any sense of anti-Americanism, but out of a sense of plain, old-fashioned loyalty to the conviction that there is a place on the northern half of this continent to build an independent nation, to strengthen a united independent nation. A united nation in which French and English Canadians can resolve anew their determination to work out their destiny together. May I say to my friend, the member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte) and even to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) having done that —because that is the first requirement; without that we have no nation—I hope we can move

forward to a franker acknowledgement of the existence and the important role of the many new Canadians who make up a growing proportion of our population. Certainly they have a place in the second century of this nation, which should be acknowledged constitutionally, in my view, in the same way as the two founding people's position was acknowledged in the creation of the constitution in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, all of what I have said merely sets the context within which I would like to look briefly, but in some detail, at Ontario's role in the restructuring of this nation. Ontario's role in Confederation has always been a critically important one for many obvious geographical and historical reasons, but never more so than now. It is precisely for this reason that I am not only opposed to but distressed by the change in tone and substance of Ontario's whole approach to resolving the problems we face in this nation.

I trust that I have said enough to indicate clearly that I recognize many of our basic difficulties lie in federal policy. It is the supreme irony of recent Canadian history that Pierre Elliott Trudeau, elected as the Prime Minister believed to be the best able to maintain one Canada, has not even achieved a façade of greater unity because of his rigid concept of federalism. And behind whatever façade there is, the forces of disunity fester even more publicly. All the more reason, therefore, why the constructive role of Ontario is needed to carry this nation through into a post-Trudeau era.

Given the circumstances of the years from 1963 to 1970, the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) sensed what was needed to compensate for the inadequacies of federal policies.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That is the only time the member has agreed with him.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I agree with him whenever he is right. As a matter of fact, maybe the best example of his sensing this is after years of drift, this government took the initiative in calling the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference; so at least we got at the problem instead of drifting. But that is only an example of the manner in which the then Premier used the contribution of Ontario to help move this nation toward a reconciliation of English and French Canada, toward a resolution of the constitutional problems in all of their legal and fiscal ramifications.

I would like to believe that had the former Premier remained at the helm, Ontario would have sensed anew the needs of these years, as we move into the nineteen seventies, and continued to play the statesman-like role which created for him a position of towering stature among the provincial premiers. But he has gone and in his place we have a new Premier who is much less certain of touch; a Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) with the capacity of political belligerence that knows no bounds, particularly when he looks in the direction of Ottawa; and a Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) whose concept of political relationship approximates that of street gang warfare.

The high promise of this "new" government, that it would follow in the footsteps of its predecessor, is a dream that has already turned into a nightmare. Ontario has already forsaken the previous Premier's tradition; it has regressed. It has gone back to the Hepburns and the Drews, with all of the sterile political barracking at the federal government. This government has been painfully consistent: if there is unemployment, blame Ottawa. Admittedly some of the blame rests there, but in the political shouting match, they hope to be able to distract the Ontario voters' attention from the pitifully inadequate policies of job creation right here in the Province of Ontario. If there is a problem of interprovincial marketing of farm products, rush in with legislation, even while the resolution of existing legislation is scheduled for Supreme Court adjudication, and thereby create and provoke an escalation of interprovincial trade warfare that makes a mockery of their interest in building greater national unity.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Indeed, if there is any problem—

An hon. member: You are oversimplifying.

Mr. MacDonald: —real or imagined, at this point, this is the paramount consideration.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is oversimplifying now. He was doing very well up to now, very well indeed.

Mr. MacDonald: The only other consideration that is equally paramount is that any government that provokes retaliatory efforts when it is five to 10 times as vulnerable as the Province of Quebec is a little stupid as well as being ill-advised.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Where is the member going to start?

Mr. MacDonald: Now, if there is any problem—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What does the member know about it?

Mr. Pilkey: I know the game.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member does not.

Mr. MacDonald: —real or imagined, this government can be counted upon to reduce it to the lowest common denominator of political brawling. As a result, it destroys rather than creates the kind of atmosphere in which rational solutions can be sought and found. Gone completely is the Ontario role of the Sixties, of cooling the situation when the atmosphere becomes heated. There is a deliberate effort to heat the situation, day in and day out. Ontario is now the provocateur rampant in federal-provincial relations and, indeed, in interprovincial relations as is evidenced by its marketing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge as to whether or not this posture of the so-called new Davis government is going to be restricted to public statements designed to meet the political needs of a government facing a provincial election. That was obviously a good part of the gambit of the Hepburns and the Drews in the past. If so, this government deserves to be beaten on this ground alone, because they are failing this province and this nation and they are playing recklessly with the future of a nation whose bonds of unity are getting even more tenuous.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nonsense

Mr. MacDonald: That is the tragedy of it.

But there is an even greater concern. If this same belligerent, unconstructive approach is carried into the federal-provincial conference at Victoria, the results could be disastrous. The bonds of Canadian unity are strained enough. The approach of the federal government, with its outmoded economic policies and its rigid concept of federalism, creates enough basic difficulties.

If Ontario adds to the discordant voices and forces now tearing at this nation, then there will be none of that sense of purpose and direction which Ontario did so much to create in the constitutional review proceedings of the 1960s. And if that happens, Victoria could become a milestone along the road to the dissolution of Canada.

That is the context. The Minister of Transportation and Communications intervened and said: "Where am I going to start?" That is where I want to start. I want to start with the whole impact on Canada of what Ontario is doing at the present time, because I think it may have a decisive consequence in terms of the next federal-provincial conference. But having done that, I want to come back home, because there are other aspects which should be examined in more detail.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do not spoil a good speech. The member has done very well.

Mr. MacDonald: The strips taken off the government were about that wide. Now they are going to be about this wide, so just wait for a moment.

Mr. Pilkey: He has done very well too.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me go back to this basic problem of unemployment.

Mr. Pilkey: The government is in its last term.

Mr. MacDonald: This government foresaw the consequences of the policies we have had at Ottawa—these perverse, iniquitous, economic policies which even now Liberal cabinet ministers cannot take and they are resigning either from the cabinet or even from the party. This government foresaw them.

Indeed, the minister whose face I am gazing into at this point attended federal-provincial conferences in November of 1969, preceding his budget of a year ago. In his budget he clearly predicted that the federal policies had too much over-kill—that it was creating a problem, the cure was even worse than the disease.

But having foreseen the problem, Mr. Speaker, the government is doubly culpable, because surely if they foresaw the problem, then the obligation on them was to have done something to have coped with the consequences. But what did they do?

There was an echoing silence throughout the summer and the fall. Not until the latter stages, almost the lame duck weeks, of the Robarts regime did the then Premier make an announcement that the government was going to move to cope with the unemployment problem. He announced the 1,800 jobs that were going to be made available in cutting the dead elms.

Apparently, even they were so shocked by the inadequacies of that, that within a week or 10 days, it was increased to 3,800 jobs and then, when the new government came in, the new Prime Minister announced a package of job-creation policies which added up to some 12,000 jobs in the Province of Ontario—12,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker—at a time when there were over 200,000 people out of work—less than a six per cent reaction to the jobless, recognizing the fact that even when you move to create jobs, they are not going to be created overnight.

I think it is interesting to contrast what can be done if the government has the will; and all you have got to do is to go one west to Manitoba. You had a government there that had economists who foresaw precisely what was going to be the unemployment in Manitoba, so they worked out programmes last summer. They announced them last fall and by the end of the winter when they had 25,000 unemployed in that smaller province of Manitoba they had created job opportunities to the extent of 10,000—a 40 per cent reaction to the unemployed.

Compare it with your less than six per cent in the Province of Ontario and the net result is that for each of the last three months, while unemployment levels in the Province of Ontario have continued to go up, unemployment levels have consistently gone down in Manitoba because of the impact of the policies in which they took the initiative. We could have done this in the Province of Ontario—and do not say that it is a new government.

It is all one government—the Robarts-Davis regime—which is responsible for the span of this winter on the unemployment programme; and the names of MacNaughton and McKeough and Welch and both Lawrences, all of them were in both cabinets, so they have to share the responsibility for this complete failure of the Robarts regime and for the pitiful inadequacy of what ultimately came out in the policy.

But then we move toward the Throne Speech, or to the opening of this session—and this is a point, Mr. Speaker, which I think should be driven home to this province: This government had become aware of the fact that its public image was one of great unconcern with regard to unemployment so they started out talking and hitting at the unemployment issue all the time.

Indeed, one of the first things they did was to schedule an emergency debate on unemployment, which started in the first working week of the session. For three days, we listened to four cabinet ministers who got up and berated Ottawa, launched their political tirade against Ottawa, and then, Mr. Speaker, the debate just drifted off into limbo and we have heard nothing of it since. It is uncompleted—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier did not enter the debate. Apparently the government thought it had served its purpose of trying to create an image of concern where there had been unconcern on the whole issue. But if you want a documentation as to the inadequacies of the government's approach—as has already been pointed out so many times in the debate—all you have got to do is to go to the Throne Speech and to the budget.

In the Throne Speech, massive employment opportunities were going to be created by this massive housing programme. And we discover when it is analyzed that last year's 78,000 homes are going to be increased this year by the government's own admission to only 85,000 homes. And the irony of it, Mr. Speaker, is that as far back as last January CMHC, in predicting the housing prospects in Canada for this year, estimated that in the Province of Ontario there would be approximately 90,000 homes built.

So the net impact of this government's budget is to reduce what CMHC thought to be the prospects of home construction in this province by some 5,000, from 90,000 down to 85,000. And then to tie that to the figure of 132,000 jobs for people was a propaganda fraud. There will be 15,000 or 20,000 new jobs at best. Most of the 132,000 jobs were continuing jobs.

But the government really outdid itself when it got to the budget. They talked about the needs for tax reductions. They had been lamenting, the crocodile tears had been rolling down their cheeks for months now, about the plight of the lower income groups and the senior citizens and so on; their desperate need for something of a tax reduction. But when they sat down, tore their hearts and examined the situation, the only place in which they could give the tax reduction was directed to the corporate sector—$125 million.

The proposition that we had proposed for example, of a one per cent cut in the sales tax, would have been shared by everybody and would have poured $150 million into the

economy of the province to liven it. But all the government added—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Tell that to Manitoba.

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, take a look at their taxes.

Mr. MacDonald: Manitoba has done something. Do not pick holes in what Manitoba has done. Manitoba has got at least a context of action, and weighing that, the minister may pick on a few things and dispute them, but they have done a job. Indeed, they have done as much to create jobs as the whole of the Province of Ontario with a budget of approximately eight times that of Manitoba. So your intervention is a pretty idle one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, but it is not right about lowering taxes. Take a look at Manitoba. They put them up.

Mr. MacDonald: Look how they lowered the taxes on Medicare, for example. What has this government done? It has added the taxes all down the line. It took the money it got from Ottawa and it is using it for other purposes so that it has established a flat-rate tax across the board there.

I am not going to get drawn off on this, but if the hon. minister wants to debate on any platform of his own choosing the taxation policies of the government of Manitoba and this one, I will be delighted to do it at any time that is mutually convenient.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member introduced Manitoba into the debate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The minister should take him up on that invitation.

Mr. Peacock: The minister brought about more tax increases than any other member of this government—hospitals, motor vehicles, fuel, gasoline—

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. The minister's tax increases two years ago were the biggest single bite that has ever been taken in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is quite wrong and he knows it.

Mr. MacDonald: We will get back to that when we get into the Treasury. However, that is another estimate at another time.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to come back and emphasize is that the government's excuse for picking and focusing so exclusively on this $125 million tax saving to the corporate sector alone, was that it was going to be related to a rebate on investment for machinery and equipment. This, supposedly, was going to create more jobs. Well, it will be interesting to see.

I notice the Minister of Revenue, after three weeks of cogitation, is getting more and more belligerent about the evidence he is going to produce as to what this tax rebate will do. But everybody who knows anything about the modern industrial world knows that if one says to industry, "We are going to give you a tax incentive to replace the industry, the machinery, you know have" the net effect is likely to be fewer jobs rather than more jobs. That is the usual consequence of modern, technologically improved machinery.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is not altogether true.

Mr. MacDonald: In substance, it is true. Once again, this is what you are going to do —and then there is the phoney propaganda. The government juxtaposes with this tax consession and its alleged job creation, the proposition that the Province of Ontario needs 150,000 news jobs each year. They are implying slyly—they will not defend it if its political out, of course, because they cannot—that this tax reduction was going to make some sizable contribution to a creation of jobs, the total we need being 150,000.

Well, the whole thing became a propaganda façade that has collapsed. I do not know which is worse, quite frankly, the economic policies of Ottawa which are so wrong, or the economic policies of this government which are so hopelessly inadequate as to add up to the same consequences. They have done nothing about unemployment. Ottawa has created it; this government deplores it and does nothing about it. That is what it adds up to.

Let me go on to the second area which is important in Ontario because of its consequences in Canada, and this is a whole question of shared-cost programmes. This government is now making a demand for fiscal equivalents. Interestingly enough, Mr. Trudeau —I saw him directly myself on the TV programme—said, "Fine. Fiscal equivalents have always been open to every province." So he is about to call the government's bluff. Will the government take them? Will the govern-

ment take them when it had considered the consequences for the whole of this nation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It should not have any effect. It should not change it.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It should not change a thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense. It is going to destroy one of the major bonds of unity in this country—a national effort shared in by the provinces to create common standards of service at comparable costs, comparable burdens, for the people all across this country. It is all the more vital because of the fact that our economic policies to cope with economic disparities simply have not been effective. Therefore, it is necessary that we have some common standard of social services for the people across this country as a cushion against these economic disparities.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does the member not think it is about time Ottawa stopped redistributing Ontario's wealth?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, look, I am not going to get into that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the kind of petty parochialism that I expect out of Exeter, but not from a man who has been away from Exeter for a little time now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think it is. A lot of people do, too.

Mr. MacDonald: But not from you.

An hon. member: The member is an apologist.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The member will find out. Apologist nothing. He is on the way out if he sticks with that issue. He is going to have to go back and work for a living.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That will be a new experience for him, to work for a living.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not quite fair.

Mr. MacDonald: Did somebody say something that was unkind?

An hon. member: He stuck his nose up, too.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us take a look at the details of exactly what this government is proposing to do. It wants the fiscal equivalent for four shared-cost programmes. Those four shared-cost programmes this year, Mr. Speaker, will be for Medicare, $205.5 million; for post-secondary education, $176.7 million; for welfare programmes under the Canada Assistance Plan, $187.8 million; and $425 million for hospital insurance. Very close to, around $1 billion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Precisely.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you go back to 1968, let us take one of these programmes—hospital insurance. In 1968, hospital insurance grants to this province were $284.7 million, and the returned revenue from each point of the tax was $22.2 million, so if we had got fiscal equivalent back in 1968 instead of getting a grant from Ottawa, it would have required 13 points. In this current fiscal year, do you know what those 13 points would yield? Each point is worth now $37.5 million—

Mr. Nixon: The minister would not have had a fiscal nightmare.

Mr. MacDonald: —for a total of $487.5 million, which is $62.5 million more than you are actually going to get out of the grants. In short, Mr. Speaker, what this government is suggesting, if that were across the whole board of the billion dollars instead of about a quarter of the billion dollars which is involved in the hospital grant in 1968 analysis, this government would be getting something like $250 or $300 million more from Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The fallacy is that there are more than 13 points involved now.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean, there are more than 13 points involved now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is closer to 18, 17 or 18.

Mr. Nixon: Seventeen or over?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, what the government was suggesting, and what the provincial Treasurer was suggesting, would increase the tax abatement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Seventeen plus.

Mr. Nixon: But you would not accept it at 17, you said it was not good enough.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We did say that, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: What the provincial Treasurer was suggesting was that we would take it up to about 54 or 56 points.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, that is not correct.

Mr. MacDonald: You simply cannot, as the biggest, most powerful and the richest province in this nation, go around prating about building unity in this country and at the same time deploring the fact that there are hidden equalization payments.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course there are hidden equalization payments, where in heaven's name have you been? How naïve that you suddenly should awaken to the fact that there are hidden equalization payments. But those hidden equalization payments, providing equal services across this nation, are part of the fabric of Canadian unity.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If they are applied fairly, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: What does the minister mean, get them fairly? It is raised fairly across this nation, and if the wealth is in the Province of Ontario, in the corporate head offices of companies that get their wealth from all across this nation, he should get out of his little parochial office down in Exeter and face the facts.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When it continues the hon. member will wonder where it went to. That is the way he would do it.

Mr. MacDonald: The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is this, in a way that is going to be fascinating for the political scientists to study, when John Robarts was running this government, all of these parochial tendencies of the MacNaughton and McKeoughs and the others were there, but they were in check. Today they are unleashed.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When did the hon. member ever see them in check?

Mr. MacDonald: They have been in check—

Mr. Pilkey: They were in check.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is rebelling at that suggestion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But my friend sees what he wants to see.

Mr. MacDonald: They were in check to the point that this province was able to create a role of constructive statesmanship, instead of political barracking with the federal government and with neighbouring provinces. That is the extent to which they are now out of check, because obviously the new Prime Minister has not got control.

He is so insecure in his position that he bows to every push from whatever direction it may come. That is the reason why, tragically, Ontario is not playing its role in the 1970s the way it did in the 1960s and why the consequences for Canada can be so disastrous.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member must not make the mistake of betting on that.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The minister wants to talk to those boys.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me go, Mr. Speaker, to the final area that I want to examine a bit in the context of the Ontario budget—I have already done it—namely, the question of the division of revenues and tax reform. They are sort of a single, complex but very important aspect of it.

We have talked about this division of revenues, the fiscal mismatching, for 10 years now in this country. What I would like to see, some time soon, is a deliberate effort on the part of this government to grapple with the problem.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of solving the problem. If the provinces have too much responsibility to be handled by the moneys they have, you either reduce the responsibilities, or you increase the money, or you do a combination of both—and by increasing the money I mean get a better share of the revenues.

On occasion I have heard spokesmen for this government say that there may be responsibilities—indeed, I think I heard the Prime Minister say this just a week or so ago, there may be responsibilities—which should be handed to Ottawa. When are we going to get down to the nitty gritty of it and decide which responsibilities might be handed back to Ottawa? And indeed in so doing this, it might be in the best interests of the people of Canada; Ottawa might conceivably, in some services, be the better government to handle it.

Conversely there are some services that the province is obviously the better one to handle it, but I have the impression, a growing

impression, that the whole thrust of this government is, "we are going to hang on to all the empire we have." We talk about sharing and a redivision of responsibilities, but there is never a specific suggestion.

And I repeat, we have drifted for too long until we are bogged down in an impasse of constitutional review. I am now thinking of constitutional review in its social and economic and taxation ramifications, not just the review of the amended formula, or something of that consequence.

I do not know what is on the agenda, if anything, at Victoria, to come to grips with some answer to the fiscal mismatch which is a point of obsession on the part of this government—and with a fair degree of validity, I do not deny it.

Let us go to the tax reform. On reform there has been a lot of criticism, but let us remind ourselves of the vital tie-in between tax reform and again, the unity, and therefore the survival of this nation. In volume two, page 17 of the Carter commission report, if it is not too provocative to recall that document to this government, they have a quote which reads as follows:

> A social and political system cannot be strong and enduring when the people become convinced that its tax structure does not distribute the tax burden fairly among all citizens.

You just cannot dispute the basic validity of that, and the fact that it is not distributed fairly. The Carter report, the Smith report—but we have had them for two or three years and what have we done in moving to do something about the tax reforms, on the part of this government as well as in the government at Ottawa? Perhaps we are getting close to some action. There is a budget coming down on June 18.

Oh, the government has tried. It came out with a bold programme in 1969 that it has been backing away from ever since. It has been making excuses for the backing-away process that has gone on. I acknowledge that this government has produced five or six taxation studies and these taxation studies have been circulated, I suppose, among the economists and the political scientists and they have been read at Ottawa—how much impact have they made? In some of them there are some new and interesting ideas. For example, I think some of the proposals in the discussions om small business had some merit and should be taken a look at, but the point is, the whole thrust—in terms that the people of this nation can grasp—of what this government wants from the government at Ottawa is, at best, blurred.

We have listened to the former Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), in the days before he became an aspiring leader, going up and down across this province making speeches on behalf of the mining interests and how the incentive of this great industry was going to be destroyed if you got some measure of equity in taxes. In short, there was a thrust against equity in the taxation structure, and that was the whole thrust, that was the whole nature of the thrust from this government. Now we have men like Eric Kierans who get out of the cabinet and describe the mining industry in this country as being "the robber barons of the twentieth century, comparable to the railroad barons of yesteryear" for whom the taxation favouritism created literally billions of dollars.

Here in the Province of Ontario, less than two per cent of the wealth produced in the mines comes into the revenues, yet this government goes around leading the case for the mining interests. How can you say you are in favour of tax reform? I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are about eight areas where this government should have been hitting sharply, not buried in tombs of study.

Maybe they have done it behind the scenes. I hope they have because I presume we have got pretty close to the point where any of your influence is now going to be lost; the budget must be in the process of its final drafting. But what are those eight areas? The first one is that the new taxation legislation in Ottawa should be based on tax credits instead of tax exemptions. Since the exemptions provide greater benefits to those in higher incomes, a system of tax credits with attention to marital status, the dependents, the daycare services, would be much more equitable.

Now I concede that this government has done some talking on the theory of this, and it thinks it has done some implementing in its endless succession of tax rebates which are the product of pressure from wherever the pain gets unbearable, and particularly when the political needs of a pre-election period get in an added assist.

Second, a comprehensive income concept to be adopted with all forms of income included and subjected to a graduated scale of income tax based on the ability-to-pay proposition.

Third, a capital gains tax to be taxed at full rates the same way as salary and wages and

other form of income, with exemptions and particular arrangements to prevent undue hardship for the family farm and the home-owner. In other words, get back to the basic proposition that a buck is a buck because, Mr. Speaker, a buck is a buck, and this government has lost an appreciation of that basic fact if it is interested in tax equity.

Fourth, strict limits on corporation capital cost allowances, advertising, entertainment and convention expenses.

Fifth, adequate assurances of sharing revenue increases with the provincial governments. Fair enough.

Sixth, the same treatment for employment expenses to be allowed for wages and salary earners as are now allowed for the self-employed.

Seventh, natural resources industries to be taxed on the same basis as other industries; not all of the elements of favouritism with the result that you have a misdirection of resources and if Kierans is even half right in his basic thesis of the hour, a misdirection into areas of economic development, where you have the least possible job creation because they are capital intensive.

Finally, eighth, the continuation of progressive top rates in the income-tax schedule which should enable a lowering of the rate at the bottom of the scale.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are eight key points that thrust right into the proposition of tax equity and if this government has really been pressing those points—I know in some instances they are opposed—but even in those where they are in favour, supposedly, if they have been pressing it with Ottawa I have a horrible feeling that the message has not registered, not only because Ottawa is insensitive, but because there has not been enough of a job done to drive the point home.

Well, the net result of all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that not only is the overall role of Ontario, one of this government, one which is not serving the interests of the people of the province, but it is one which is not serving the interests of this nation. It is not fulfilling the traditional critically important role of Ontario in the restructuring of Confederation.

And it is for that reason that I would add a plea from this side of the House that when we get to vote we vote no confidence in this government. We vote no confidence because in voting no confidence we are voting in the interests of the people of the Province of Ontario but, equally important, we are voting in the interests of the whole of this nation. This government has outlived its usefulness, it is a spent force; it has no capacity or imagination to grapple with the problem. The people are catching on, so let us get out to the hustings.

Indeed, we would be out to the hustings now if it were not for the fact that even the government has realized how badly its Throne and its Budget Speeches bombed and that it has got to wait until fall in the hope that they can recoup the situation somewhat. But it is not going to do them any good, so let us vote no confidence as an evidence of what the people of the Province of Ontario really believe at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the hon. member for York South for his very fine oration. He said he would be one hour and he was exactly one hour. That is the old pro at work again and I am sorry to see him in second place—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do not worry about me.

Mr. Sargent: —but he is like the best man at a wedding: he will never get a chance to prove it. I do want to say that the House would always miss his talent and he is a credit to his party.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched, with dismay, the actions of this government in the past few months but, progressively, they are showing their true colours. The provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) was in North Bay this week and he was telling them—of all people—he was telling the elected officials that they were of poor quality. This is typical of the arrogance of these people, to go to an elected groups of mayors and reeves across the province and tell them that they did not raise up to expectations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Very high standards the Treasurer has.

Mr. Sargent: And we have this coming from a man who, four years ago, was one of the members of his party in disrepute in the back row called the Chicago gang. He was the most vocal and laughing, boisterous boy of the party. He reminded you of the story of the guy that is always laughing. He is always laughing, Mr. Speaker; he belonged to a wife-swapping club but he was not even married.

This is the type of braggadocio this guy is going across the province with, spreading with the provincial Treasurer the beauties of regional government. And now the hey-day is coming back to them. Well, we have budgeting for a—he is leaving the House and I think he should leave because his ears are going to burn pretty soon—budgeting for another financial nightmare! They are budgeting for a half-a-billion dollar deficit.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Very erudite!

Mr. Sargent: Well, I tell the minister, it may not be very erudite for a wealthy feed merchant to—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member would make much more selling gimmicks.

Mr. Sargent: —possibly make a deal with the leading candidate for the premiership, that if he got the leadership, he would support him and he would like to get back the portfolio of Highways. Possibly, in the area of raising funds for the party he could, in a most lucrative way, be in The Department of Highways to raise funds for the party. Now—

Mr. Nixon: He made the Premier promise to cancel the expressway.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know if this is a deal or not, but it figures.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Does the member's left hand know what his right hand is doing?

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking off the cuff and both the cuffs are—I have got to hide them, that is all. We have with this government, Mr. Speaker, government spending to the point now that it has risen from 35 to 38 per cent of the gross national product as against the average of 26 per cent of the GNP in the United States. And now, to show today the floundering efforts of this government—almost bankrupt when they have to budget for a half-a-million-dollar deficit—

Mr. Nixon: Billion!

Mr. Sargent: Half-a-billion-dollar deficit—they try to pass out the fact that they cannot afford to finance the $1 billion project, the Spadina Expressway. In answer to my leader, asking the alternative, the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) has no alternative.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the new Minister of Highways and Transport then was the one who guaranteed to Toronto that this planned expressway could be a reality. By his direction and his advice, this concept came into being and he alone is the author of the misfortune in Metro today.

Mr. Nixon: That is $250 million down the drain.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, $250 million by his advice.

Mr. Nixon: He never could have stayed in the seed business.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that by the decision of the government today to dispose of this programme, their formula for highway grants is out the window. The Metro chairman says today that the decision is a disaster.

The Star tonight says:

> Speaking to reporters at City Hall minutes after the Queen's Park anouncement, with his hands shaking in anger as he read from his notes, Mr. Campbell said it was the most serious decision, with the most serious consequences he has ever known a provincial government to make.

What do I think? As an out-of-town member I look with dismay at the spending in this area. I say this in all fairness; as one flies over this great city—it is a great city, one of the finest and the most progressive in the world—as one flies over this in a plane you see the great expanse of highway across the top of this city. You see the two arms—the Don Valley down this way and you see the arm down this way, and you see the arm coming halfway down and stop. I think it is a tragedy.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): But think how much more we would have spent in this area.

Mr. Sargent: I agree, but the whole theme of the Prime Minister's speech today was taken from the book called "Super Highway Hoax." The theme of this book—and I have read it—is cities should be for people, but circumstances do alter cases. There is need for access to the heart of this city, regardless of what members of this party think. As an individual, I think, in all fairness, we have the figure given tonight in the paper that 800,000 cars are trying to get into this area. I am in favour of the money that has been spent not being wasted.

Mr. Nixon: That makes sense, certainly.

Mr. Sargent: For this minister to sit here and talk to his other erring minister and to disagree with what I am saying is typical of what they are. But he cost the taxpayers God knows how many hundreds of million dollars through his lack of proper planning.

An hon. member: The member is not talking about Hydro.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Nixon: His baby.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He has got to go.

Mr. Sargent: If he had any decency he would acknowledge he laid a great big egg that cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Gisborn: The member does not mean he is indecent.

Mr. Sargent: And Mr. Rotenberg said tonight—

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Who is he?

Mr. Nixon: The member ought to know. He is one of his boys.

Mr. Sargent: Rotenberg said that the transit and expressway facilities were being built as a single project. If the cost of all that tunnelling and other construction work there were applied to the subway alone, it would shoot the subway cost sky high. Rotenberg said that he will recommend to Metro council that the province refund all the money spent on planning and building the expressway so far, and he has a good right to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: They will have a few cabinet meetings over that.

Mr. Sargent: He said that he will also ask the province to pay all the costs of future—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some comfort in this.

Mr. Sargent: Hear this—

Mr. Nixon: The hon. minister has made a mistake.

Mr. Sargent: —all the cost of future rapid transit, and he has good reason to say that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was not talking to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: I am surprised that the hon. minister could still talk. He will accommodate himself to anything, I guess.

Mr. B. Newman: He will be resigning in the morning.

Mr. Sargent: North York controller Paul Godfrey said the cabinet members have got to be out of their skulls stopping the expressway at Lawrence Avenue. Godfrey, a member of the Metro council, emphasized that he was a strong Conservative and warned that the provincial Conservatives can kiss away most of their Metro seats if they pull a stunt like this.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Tell that to the member behind you. Is the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) out of his skull?

Mr. Sargent: He said the North York residents have suffered for years while waiting for the Spadina route to be completed. Mr. Frederick G. Gardiner—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My Liberal opponent, is he out of his skull?

Mr. Sargent: —Metro's first chairman, said 800,000 cars are registered in Metro and the number is increasing by 50,000 to 60,000 a year. Where on earth are these cars going to go if there is not an expressway like the Spadina?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): All made in Oshawa.

Mr. Sargent: Finally, North York Controller Paul Hunt called the decision simply incredible: He said he was just stunned. And further, Scarborough Mayor Robert White saw the cabinet's decision as a death knell for the Scarborough Expressway.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear. That is an excellent decision.

Mr. Sargent: "If they are going to stop one, how are they going to approve ours," he said.

Mr. Lewis: They will not. And you are right—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I say in regard to this minister—who can sit there and smirk and laugh at wasting $130 million by his advice to Metro—I say, "There but for the grace of God goes God." How can he possibly retain his seat in this House?

Mr. Speaker, we have another case of disregard for the people of this province. Some 2,500, 2,000 or 3,000 people are going to lose their jobs by July 18, in the offtrack betting farce that is going on. If it is a reality that we do close the tracks, the government will lose possibly $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year. No one, at this point, Mr. Speaker, can tell how many millions of dollars are being lost by betting today in Ontario because, when a man places a bet in an offtrack betting place, there is no record on the part of this government or anybody that that bet has been placed. There is no record it gets to the track. By having an offtrack betting operation, you have a licence to steal.

The Toronto Star said Saturday that there are 230 places of this nature in Metro Toronto, as of this date. So now we have 230 places which are not licensed by this government, and are not responsible to anybody. No one knows what happens to the money they take in, whether it gets to the track or where it goes. The government of this province—the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has a responsibility not only to the people of this province but to all the employers that are going to lose their jobs if this goes down the pipe. For almost a year, these jockey clubs and racing associations across the country have been urging that offtrack betting be conducted under government supervision—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The only logical thing.

Mr. Sargent: —as is done at the tracks, with the government and the racetracks getting their share.

The minister knows, and Mr. Addison of the Ontario Jockey Club told me, that Mr. Turner has passed the ball to our Attorney General and said it is your baby, you settle it the way you want to.

The minister today, in reply to my question in the House, said he was incensed at my questioning him on this matter, or something to that effect. He rejected the fact that I would say something. But I would like to say to the minister—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I am with you there.

Mr. Sargent: What was that?

An hon. member: Pay no attention.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to suggest to the minister that many of us have been approached by the offtrack betting people to go along with their way of thinking, and I would further suggest it is a great matter of concern in the minds of people as to why this minister and this government are not making up their minds, because we are talking about many millions of dollars.

The fact is that the money does not get to the track and one could say, realistically, why should it get to the track? Is there any reason why it should get to the track? But as my colleague from Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) said today and the member for Downsview said recently, offtrack betting should be run like the Liquor Control Board. There is no reason why we could not have computerized offtrack betting operations in Kingston, Peterborough, Owen Sound, Ottawa, run directly to the track. Put Windsor in there too. The province's take would be greatly increased and the people would get a square deal and know their money was going in the proper way.

Mr. Peacock: Who pays the $7 million for computer programming?

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is a matter of mechanics. I mean, there is a lot of money around to pay for it. If I had a contract, I would be glad to raise the money.

Mr. Peacock: The Toronto Daily Star also asked that question.

Mr. Sargent: That is a very basic, elementary question.

Mr. Singer: If we are going to make $100 million a year, we can afford a $7 million investment.

Mr. Sargent: I think that is a stupid question for a usually intelligent guy.

Mr. Peacock: Let the Jockey Club handle all the computer terminals.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General today rejected the fact that he had till Just 11 to come up with a definite statement of policy. Milt Dunnell, who is usually a pretty reliable newsman, stated that the minister met with them on May 11 and the arrangement was that the minister was going to state government policy, to deineate your position by June 11. At this point, the Premier repeatedly said, "He has no policy on that."

At this point, the minister has no policy on it, and I think it is pretty ridiculous that this government currently is in bed with the racketeers. That is the only way we can look

at it. We have millions of dollars being spent; no one knows where the money is going. There was no record of the money; so what else is the answer? Though the fact has come to mind in this article that on many occasions, when people have placed a bet and have won big sums of money, when they go to collect their money, the betting place says: "Sorry. Your money did not get to the track. We will give you your bet back." Repeatedly this is happening and the minister is looking out the window. I think it is a serious situation in that we have another case of this government, Mr. Speaker, not doing the job on behalf of the people. All the millions of dollars invested in racing would go down the drain. In fact, the Jockey Club is looking now to selling out all its interest and if it turns it into real estate its stocks will go way up and the harness-racing people will go down the drain.

Some weeks ago I stood in this place and I was critical of this government not going to bat for the people of Ontario in working with Ottawa. There is an old saying in business, "If you cannot lick them, join them." Well, I cannot see this government joining Ottawa, but I can say that there is an area of collaboration in every business, a matter of getting together to get things done on behalf of the people you represent.

I was taken to task because I criticized the fact that we had hundreds of millions of dollars being given away in foreign aid by Ottawa. A lot of that was our money. I felt that interest-free loans in the amount of $400 million should not be given to foreign countries. There is no reciprocal trade agreements on these deals. They are just straight giveaway loans of 50 years at no interest.

My point was this, Mr. Speaker, no one seems to want to listen to this and the fact is that if the people of Canada had the same opportunity to get money from Ottawa at no interest for schools, our schools would cost us half-price across this country. The shocking thing is that this government will not go to Ottawa and say, "We want the same deal of money at no interest as you are giving to your foreign aid programme across the world." And as a business man this is good business.

The logic of the thing is, this government goes to Germany to borrow money; we are borrowing money from Germany yet we are maintaining an army over there at hundreds of millions of dollars, to keep the peace for Germany. That is the complete stupidity of the whole operation. Mr. Speaker, today we have unemployment rampant in our part of the country, but we are hearing that they are shortly going to import 1,100 Jamaicans from Jamaica to pick celery, to pick asparagus, soft fruits and apples, and last year the programme was that they kept them here for 6½ months.

I think, going along with the mayors and reeves at the conference yesterday in North Bay, that this government should—whoever is in charge of this new government, maybe the Premier—should go to Ottawa and say, "Let us put the people who are on welfare in this province to work first, before we employ 1,100 Jamaicans." I think it is a bit much insofar as the unemployment picture is concerned. I agree with the mayors and reeves that no man should get welfare if there is a job for him to do. But this government, I think, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before, could have a make-work programme to put people to work to give them the dignity of a job.

I am getting rather tired of suggesting to the Minister of Trade and Development, that I have got the complete files now on my approaches to modular housing people in the States. I have got my brochures here. They are putting up modular housing now, putting people to work building homes and factories on the assembly lines like you are building cars.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a fellow that wants to do it and ODC will not give him a loan.

Mr. Sargent: They will not give him a loan? I have the same trouble in my area. But people are getting these houses, lovely three-bedroom houses for $51 a month. And I am going to approach the minister and the Premier to send a deputation down to inspect this programme. I say it is shocking that they have no regard to work on a modular housing plan or putting people back to work.

Mr. Peacock: Have you seen the Chapel Glen modular that OHC is building? The speed with which they are completing that?

Mr. Singer: Oh, they are fast.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Have you made up your mind they are fast?

Mr. Sargent: My colleague from Downsview has given me the annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, of The Department of Highways of Ontario, tabled today. It has in it a beautiful—spaghetti junction,

would you call this? This would cost possibly hundreds of millions of dollars—$150 million anyway it would have cost. "The modern highway is one of the major lifelines of our society. Supplying the need for more and for improved and safer roads and highways is the continuing challenge facing The Ontario Department of Highways."

Mr. Singer: Mind you, only your government could have tabled both on the same day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There's a difference between a highway and an expressway.

Mr. Singer: What is that—$80 million worth?

Mr. Gaunt: The government's sense of timing is really remarkable.

Mr. Singer: They are just brilliant—a good group.

Mr. MacDonald: They are almost as confused as the Liberals.

Mr. Sargent: Last year we saw Stelco announcing—

Mr. Lewis: Today was especially hard. Tomorrow they will be united again.

Mr. Sargent: —to their stockholders a 68 per cent increase in profits.

Mr. Singer: We must have a great lengthy speech on the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Sargent: And they came up a month later with a 10 per cent increase in the price of steel, and this week we saw Dofasco and Stelco, come up with a 5 per cent increase in the price of steel, and Bell Telephone are increasing their rates.

The disturbing factor to me is that this government is doing nothing about these matters increasing the cost of living. I can tell the members opposite that when the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) is the Premier of this province he will have the affairs of the consumers at heart. He will go to bat for them and stop this nonsense and the continual price increase, because someone has to start running the store and quit running for election all the time. Mr. Speaker, before I close—I would like to adjourn the debate, if I may—by taking—

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Do it now.

Mr. Singer: He has two minutes yet.

Mr. Sargent: Thanks, the member for Dufferin-Simcoe is very kind. I have got directions from my whip to keep going until 10:30 p.m., so to hell with him.

The concern that the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) has and I have is that the former Minister of Correctional Services has a great disregard for the needs of the small businessman, and whether he likes it or not, I say to the Minister of Trade and Development, he has never traded anything more than hockey player cards. There is a great need for someone to do something about small business—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a good line! The member must have got it from Mr. Stanfield.

An hon. member: He has not developed anything yet.

Mr. Sargent: If he said it, it must be great.

Ninety-five per cent of all business in this country is in small business, whether you like it or not. Will the minister tell me how many small businessmen loans he is putting through this department? They are gradually going down the pipe and I think it is high time that this minister did something positive and announced the policy of loans to small businessmen.

Mr. Sargent moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 3, 1971

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Morningstar, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Sargent 2329

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sargent, agreed to 2357

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2357

No. 57

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, June 4, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from St. Brigid's Separate School in Toronto, and in the west gallery, students from the Colonel John Butler School in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Bosanquet Central School in Thedford, and John G. Althouse Public School in Islington. At 11 o'clock this morning, in the east gallery there will be students from the Holy Name Separate School of Hornepayne, and at 12 noon in the east gallery, students from the French River Public School, French River.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

WAGE SETTLEMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Has he undertaken some special studies as to the problems that face the building trades industry, the construction industry, this summer, based on the failure of the building trades unions in Toronto and, I believe, Hamilton to accept the settlements that had been established on the basis of a 20 per cent yearly increase by the building trades in other centres?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, we have been watching the situation closely and from day to day, matters do change in this particular area. Unfortunately, the agreement that was made tentatively between the provincial trades council and the employer associations for an extension of one year, premised on the wage increase only, has not worked out fully.

It is, in some cases, working out and we are having meetings every day. I think this is a situation where one does not panic. I think that things will resolve themselves. I will say this, that insofar as any study or any changes are concerned that might be made with respect to bringing in compulsory arbitration, this is out of the question insofar as I personally am concerned.

I have studied the situation in British Columbia and in Quebec and there are varying factors that deal with legislation in those particular provinces. I think, quite frankly, that the thing will resolve itself.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the minister feel that last year's legislation—which was designed to bring a broader co-operation among the building trades across the province with the management in the construction business—is he satisfied that that bill is having any positive effect at all? Or, in fact, is that first flurry of co-operation completely lost as we find the building trades breaking up into municipal groups once again?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Again, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the provisions of Bill 167 which might have aided the situation—in other words, the accreditation sections—have not been taken advantage of currently. I believe there are now four applications in for accreditation; but I believe the fact that both sides felt they would be able to come to some agreement on the extension of the contract for one year, more or less precluded these accreditation applications. They were relying on this particular agreement between them and, perhaps, they have not taken full advantage of the provisions of Bill 167.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary; the minister says he has four applications. How many have been received in the past and have been approved, or have any been received and approved?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there have been only four applications for accreditation and these have been very recent.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary; the minister says applications now?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Nixon: None have been approved?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No; they have not been approved, because they are in the process of being.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A very bad law.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister tell us what the differences are between the parties at this moment?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there are so many different locals and so many different problems involved that I could not possibly isolate the differences insofar as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary to the minister, in view of the locals' present circumstances, does he think that the government might change its policy towards provincial-wide accreditation rather than on a regional basis?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we do want to give the present provisions full opportunity to be taken advantage of and there are no considerations yet given for changing them.

MOBILE HOME DEVELOPMENT TO REPLACE PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development: Has his department any policy, either directly or in conjunction with The Department of Municipal Affairs, to foster the development of mobile home development in this province as one of the alternatives to public housing, which has been the major thrust of the government's programme?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with my officials on a number of occasions and they are preparing a report for me as to their views on the mobile home situation. It has come up on a couple of occasions and I want to brief myself on it. At this particular time, I am not prepared to say what our policy will be in this respect.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary; Is the minister aware actually that the Ontario Municipal Board has so far been the most operative government agency in restricting the development of mobile home parks, admittedly, responding to complaints from the community? Is it a part of the minister's survey that he will review this matter in conjunction with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who really has a good deal of the power in this matter to make it go forward or else to keep it stopped?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think the supplementary was really answered in my first answer.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Are you undertaking a review in conjunction with the Municipal Affairs Department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the methods by which the various ministers of the government co-ordinate their efforts and with which departments, and so forth, I think is a matter of government policy. Whatever is necessary to be done to give this all the attention that it needs and deserves, will be done, whether it is with Municipal Affairs or with other ministers it will be done within the government.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: It is probably a hopeless thing to ask—he would not know the answer to this either—but other jurisdictions are considering the approving of 15-year mortgages for mobile homes; has the minister considered that in this area? Is he doing anything about it? The former minister said it was in the hopper; what is this minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that in reply to the questions from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: I still do not know what the answer is. What is the answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps the hon. member will read Hansard; or if he will spend a couple of hours with me, I will try to clarify those things for him—

Mr. Sargent: I spent many hours on this. What is the answer?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): In 1966 I asked a supplementary on it—five years ago—and there has been no answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): No-action minister—that is him.

Mr. Sargent: And the Chair knows it, too.

WORKER LAYOFFS AT TWO PLANTS

Mr. Lewis: Initially, a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. To what extent has his department been involved in the layoff of 110 workers at the Uniroyal plant in Kitchener, Ontario, and the substitution of those jobs with a plant in the United States, in Chicago?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. There are about 68 or 70 plant closures and terminations, Mr. Speaker, and to have the particular facts of each one is most difficult, but I will get the information for him.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, are there now 68 or 70 plant closings in process in Ontario? Has the minister a breakdown of those which are branch plants, in the classic definition of the term?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I do not have a breakdown, but I will undertake to get one.

Mr. Lewis: Right. By way of another question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, has the minister's department participated in the layoff of Northern Electric at Bramalea and the substitution of jobs in Canada with those of jobs in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, we have on that one, sir. I recall reading about that one but again, for the information of the Legislature, the notices for these particular plant closings are given, they are checked through our department, committees are set up and the circumstances change from day to day through these committees and working with Canada Manpower. So, to have an up-to-date report on any particular plant, one would have to get the particulars as of that date.

Mr. Nixon: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In connection with about 68 or 70 closings, does the minister know how many jobs or how many people are affected by the closings?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will take that as notice, sir, but I think it is around 3,200.

Mr. Pilkey: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Right. Is the minister notified of every termination or plant shutdown? Is it possible that there are a number of other plants that could be shutting down without the government being notified?

Hon. Mr. Carton: To my knowledge, sir, we are notified of every closing. They have been most co-operative in their advising us. It is possible, I presume, that a plant could close, but we would hear about it eventually and I would like to think that they are following the Act and the spirit of the Act, and if we find out otherwise, of course, we will step in.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: By way of—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate whether talks are being held with The Department of Trade and Development to examine whether the closings are necessary or whether other items may be manufactured in the plants or some alternative employment be provided in that area?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, in isolated cases they are, Mr. Speaker. Bear in mind that some of the closures may be bankruptcies. Some of the closures could have to do with —for example, Canadian Acme Screw and Gear—with the falling off of the business. There are very many reasons for these plant closures.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a further question: Could the minister table in the House a full assessment of all the closings in process; the numbers of workers affected; the branch plant implications; the economic justification, if any, given by the firms that are closing; and precisely what effort has been made by his department, The Department of Trade and Development, and Manpower for retraining and relocation of the workers involved? Is it possible to do that on a plant-by-plant basis?

Mr. Nixon: Could we have it by Monday?

Mr. Lewis: By Monday?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Take it as notice.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will take this as notice, Mr. Speaker. It can be done, but not by Monday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Since he is in active negotiation with the committees, I would assume the minister would have the information at his fingertips.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I do, Mr. Speaker, but I am anticipating my estimates this coming week and there are other matters involved.

Mr. Lewis: Right. A further question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour. How is it that his department has granted the right for overtime permits to the Ford plant at Talbotville to the extent of 56 hours a week for the entire work force, given the levels of unemployment in the surrounding region and a previous ministerial undertaking that overtime work permits would not hereafter be extended?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will check into that, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of that.

OHC METHODS OF DETERMINING HOUSING NEEDS IN TORONTO

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker: I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. When will the minister abandon the outmoded fashion of questionnaires to determine housing needs and begin to rely on the research and work done by many in the field to assess demands?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the minister has not been depending on such questionnaires.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: If the minister has not been depending on the questionnaires then what substance does he give to the announcement of Mr. Goyette, of the Ontario Housing Corporation, that 12,000 people are still on the list by virtue of the assessment of need in Metropolitan Toronto? Seven thousand have not as yet even replied or been located. Will his department follow those 7,000 families up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will follow them up, Mr. Speaker, where it is indicated that those cases should be followed up. The hon. member will appreciate that a lot of people put their names on the list but find other accommodation, and if we spend a tremendous amount of time doing that we would be reducing the amount of time being put into building accommodation. As a matter of fact, the fact that it is 7,000 or 12,000 is not going to affect our drive to construct the units which I told this House are our target, and still are —between 20,000 and 30,000 units. So that will look after any of those people who at the moment are not registered and any of those who will register in the future and looking after any particular needs, having regard for the experience of OHC.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean the people who are doing the follow-up on his surveys are building his houses; is that what the minister is suggesting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is not what I said at all. As a matter of fact, there is a tremendous amount of energy going into attempting to find out precisely the kind of people and the number of people who are in need of housing. In my view, the corporation is doing a tremendous job carrying on such a registry. The fact they have issued a report, reporting to the authorities in Metro just what the situation is, is evidence of their interest in finding out just how many people are looking for this kind of housing.

LOAN TO McCLELLAND AND STEWART

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier, really for confirmation, as it were. I take it now that the federal government has turned down any participation in the million-dollar loan to McClelland and Stewart that the province will, in fact, go ahead with that money independently?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the province is going ahead anyway.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Lewis: A further question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Has the Premier available now the position papers from the Province of Ontario to be presented to the Dominion-provincial conference later this month?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are still going on. The discussions held by ministers of this government with ministers from other provinces and the federal government last Monday and Tuesday resolved some of the works but not completely.

There was an understanding that, until they had moved further along, these discussions would remain confidential. So I am not in a position, at this moment, to expand upon this as it relates to the present discussions.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the agenda itself a public document or has it been agreed that there will be discussions on the fourth day as requested?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has not been an agreement yet as to discussions on the fourth day. Consideration is being given to convening another conference some time shortly after the meetings in Victoria, in light of the federal budget coming out on June 18, to consider tax and economic matters. This, Mr. Speaker, has not been finalized as yet.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Did Ontario put that forward as an alternative proposal, which I think is a good one?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is fair to state that Ontario had some hand in the initiation of this approach.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Do I understand from the Prime Minister that the fourth day is still an optional proposition, with the alternative of some time later?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the fourth day really had never been determined. The Prime Minister of Canada, I believe as I read his statements, indicated that he was prepared to stay for an extra day to discuss the economic and unemployment situation. Whether there have been any confirmations from the other provinces, quite frankly, I do not know. But at this point consideration is being given to the advisability and, I think, probability, of convening another conference related to economic and unemployment situations after the presentation of the federal budget.

Mr. MacDonald: With regard to the agenda, Mr. Speaker—a final supplementary question—am I correct in assuming there will be no discussion at all of economic issues on the first three days of the conference?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, at this moment, I would think that will turn out to be the case.

RAPID TRANSIT MEETING WITH METRO TORONTO

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Given the events of the last 24 hours, has the Premier established the time of meeting with the principals of Metropolitan Toronto to discuss the alternative rapid transit proposal of the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, no time has been set—

Mr. Sargent: That will be after the election.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but the representatives of the government will be ready to meet with Metro officials, I would believe some time next week.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier, at that time, be making specific proposals to Metro by way of alternatives? Will the Premier be spelling out in detail the amounts of money involved and perhaps the alternative route which he must surely have discussed when under cabinet consideration?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there will obviously be discussion of economic considerations and the Minister of Transportation and Communications will very shortly have an announcement, as it relates to the provincial policy that will have application right across the province as well as in Metro.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the initiative at the municipal level or at the provincial level now to proceed with programmes of rapid transit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, the initiative is with the local municipalities. The province is prepared to discuss, to assist financially and to enter into any sort of dialogue with them, but the initial determinations will emanate from the municipalities.

Mr. Nixon: Is the Premier aware of some doubts on this obvious matter, as he calls it, in the minds of some municipal officials, who feel that the initiative has now been taken by the province and who are looking for a continuation of that initiative?

A second supplementary: Is the Premier giving any consideration to the view, expressed by at least one high-ranking alderman in Toronto, that the municipal share already expended in the development of the Spadina

roadway should be refunded by the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not read all the press this morning yet—

Mr. Nixon: I presume the government will be paying the full cost of the cloverleafs at Highway 401 and Lawrence?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition really should presume anything. It is sometimes very unwise. I must state that I have not really read all the material that was probably available in respect to the reaction to the announcement yesterday; so I cannot comment on what certain people have said.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier better read what Rotenberg said.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will there be an avenue for the pretty sophisticated citizens groups, the Stop Spadina groups and so forth, to make presentations to government about alternative corridors for rapid transit? By way of elaboration for a moment, Mr. Speaker, they obviously made an impression on the Ontario Municipal Board and on the cabinet in terms of their alternative propositions. Can that come before government as well as simply discussing it with the municipal officials?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as far as government is concerned we are quite prepared to have the input that would be helpful from any source. I question whether there will be a structured avenue, if one is to use that term, but certainly if there is any information or any suggestion, I am sure the municipalities and the government both will be quite prepared to take a look at it.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Have the Premier and his—I am sorry.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party was pursuing this field.

Mr. Lewis: One supplementary: Have the Premier and cabinet come to a decision on the appropriateness of an alternative route to extending the Lawrence-Eglinton portion of the existing expressway development into downtown Toronto by way of rapid transit, a position which has been put by a great many as an alternative?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet has not predetermined any alternative route; this is a matter that must be discussed. As I say, Metro itself may have some suggestions to make. Certainly we are not predetermining it.

Mr. Nixon: The government is not making any suggestions?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would it be fair to ask the Premier if the Spadina Review Corporation headed by Mr. Robinette carried more weight with his cabinet than the autonomy of the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am the last one who needs to defend one J. J. Robinette, but he really did not head that particular organization.

Mr. Nixon: Oh!

Hon. Mr. Davis: If memory serves me correctly, he was its counsel, and there is, as some of the member's colleagues across the House will explain to him, a very distinct difference.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Sargent: He did not answer my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: I ask the Premier if the Spadina Review Corporation carried more weight than the autonomy of the city of Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been answered.

Mr. Sargent: He did not answer me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia is on his feet with a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: An intended Liberal candidate—fairly prominent.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary to the Premier: Recognizing that there are other communities in Ontario than Toronto and that his statement of policy has significant impact on their internal transportation systems, and having regard to existing franchises by contract and private bills—some up to 10 and 15 years—what assurance is

he going to be able to give the public of the communities and the Province of Ontario that additional capital and current grants to these bus transportation systems just do not make people like Skinner richer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, any policy that is developed by this government will not be determined on the basis of making any franchise holder wealthier.

Mr. Bullbrook: No platitudes, please. By way of supplementary, can the Premier say that the government will be concerned with the position of the public in the municipality in connection with their existing franchise arrangements, so that these additional funds do not eventually find themselves only for the benefit of franchise holders, but for the public in the community at large?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, all policies of this government are directed toward the benefit of the public, and that includes that.

Mr. Bullbrook: No platitudes, no platitudes. By way of further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: That will be the last supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: —do I understand the Premier correctly that we have his undertaking in this connection?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sarnia is a very perceptive individual. He knows exactly what I have said and he can read into it that which he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And probably will.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not sure if I liked that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a previous question.

DECREASE IN PUBLIC HOUSING STARTS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on May 27, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) asked the following question:

> Can the minister inform me why the public housing starts in Ontario this year from January to the end of April are running at a lower rate than last year?

And in a supplementary:

> Can the minister explain to be specific why there are only 2,531 public housing starts in Ontario this year from January to April comparing an annual rate of 9,568 last year?

The production of public housing starts, Mr. Speaker, in the first four months of this year are not running at a lower rate than last year when the corporation established a record of 9,568 starts.

In the four-month period this year there were 2,531 starts compared with 2,528 last year. Indeed, the preliminary figures from January to May 31 indicate 3,934 starts, compared with 3,392 last year. OHC certainly anticipates meeting its target of a minimum of 11,000 social housing starts this year as most of the starts occur in the summer and fall.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel—A supplementary? The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): A supplementary for the hon. minister: In planning these new housing units, is the minister thinking in terms of more adequate play space and recreation space for the children in those areas vis-à-vis the old areas where this sort of provision has too often been ignored?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not only, sir, are we planning in that manner, but we are reviewing all of the existing projects and doing what we can to increase the recreational space, and so on, which the hon. member is referring to.

As a matter of fact, if I recall, OHC was anxious to do this but there was some delay in getting federal government approval. Some time ago federal government approved of this and OHC is now following a policy of reviewing all of those areas and, indeed, providing as much recreational space as possible in the existing ones.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Following on the minister's answer, why then has it taken since January, 1971, to this date to process the application for a grant for recreational purposes by the Windsor West citizen's organization, representing the housing tenants in the Bloomfield and St. Joseph project in Windsor, who

still have not received an answer from the corporation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South has a question.

RUMOURED MERGER OF CANADAIR AND DE HAVILLAND

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development regarding the 4,000 employees in de Havilland aircraft plant: Could he confirm whether or not it is just a rumour that this plant might move to Montreal, or could he at least clarify the situation? I understand that this was only rumour, but could he confirm one way or the other?

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Kennedy: Is there anything to report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we had a very fruitful meeting with the officials of de Havilland yesterday.

There is now a process of rationalization in the aviation and avionics industry right across North America. I have been assured by the de Havilland people that, in their view, there was no evidence that there is any intention to phase out the operations of de Havilland. At the present time they have been carrying on some discussions with the federal ministry and they feel they are getting very sympathetic hearing.

There are some plans afoot, as I say, to rationalize the industry, but there is no evidence, in their view, that de Havilland will in fact be phased out at all.

As a matter of fact de Havilland—and I think it is just as well to mention this at this time—de Havilland, I am advised by those who know, probably has the most sophisticated staff in respect of STOL aircraft in North America, and it would be unlikely—indeed, it would be very unwise—not to take advantage of this fact and do anything which would jeopardize the holding-together of this very sophisticated organization.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, we have assured the de Havilland people, and they are very happy with this assurance, that we will stay with it and keep on top of the situation and give them whatever assistance is deemed necessary at any time they feel we can be of any help.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, surely de Havilland, over the last two or three years—I differ rather strongly, I think, with the minister on figures—has been phasing out steadily? Surely the peak employment at de Havilland was over 3,500 and has dropped down now to 1,200 and virtually every second week men are laid off, because of the market?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is about 2,800 now, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: The de Havilland plant—the minister is not confusing it with Douglas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am talking about de Havilland.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, will this government participate financially in the awarding of a STOL contract to de Havilland in order to keep the plant in operation? Surely that is the last hope for the de Havilland plant?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is not the last hope for the de Havilland. I could go into great detail because I have had a pretty good crash programme and education as to what is going on in the industry—

Mr. Lewis: So did I, a few months ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it would be better at this time with the negotiations going on with the federal government—and with the de Havilland people feeling fairly happy with the present discussions with the federal government, particularly in view of the assurance I have given to de Havilland and am giving to the House here—that Ontario will stay with the situation and do whatever is indicated is necessary by the de Havilland people—

Mr. Sargent: Why did the Premier say it would take them 10 years to do it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —or appears to be necessary to make sure that, in fact, it is not phased out, or it means that there will not be a job loss.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

INCREASE IN COSTS OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

With the knowledge that the tax rate for the support of the Niagara regional government is going to go up an average of 35 per cent next year, is the minister undertaking any further review of the costs of the regional government?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Last year?

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Is he going to undertake any further review of the financial arrangements that have been undertaken with specific regional governments such as Niagara?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday was that the costs in Niagara went up 34 per cent last year—1970.

Mr. Nixon: And they are presumably going up again this year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They are presumed to go up again but not that much. What we are endeavouring to do is this. They have requested certain additional assistance from us involving regional government. I announced some time ago we had established a task force within the department to assist these regions and to examine the operations. That is going on there and in the other regions, for example, in York as well.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister indicate what the projected increase in costs will be for this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: All of the budgets from the municipalities in the Niagara region are not yet available. The ones we have would indicate an overall increase of about 16 per cent beyond last year at this point of time but until all the budgets are in I cannot give any final figure.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: That would be as the hon. minister said, a 50 per cent increase since the implementation of regional government in the costs of that government?

Mr. Sargent: Two years.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Not in regional government, no. In the overall costs of both the regional government and the individual municipalities.

Mr. Sargent: Sure, what caused it?

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister undertaking any further local government reviews, as they have come to be called? For example, is he going to, or has he given approval to, a Brant county-city of Brantford local government review?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I have not.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: Can he indicate what the holdup is in that since his predecessor gave an undertaking that such a review would be forthcoming?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I do not think my predecessor gave an undertaking as to a specific time.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I think there are letters—

Hon. Mr. Bales: But there have been certain requests that they would like to discuss the matter as to the feasibility of it with me but—

Mr. Nixon: A long way past that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —not for a specific one. It has been suggested that it is time for a regional government review there. We have to bear in mind that there is one taking place in the Haldimand and Norfolk area, close at hand. That report, I think, should be available later this year.

Mr. Nixon: A year from now! A further supplementary: To make this clear then, can the minister tell the House that there is no approved request from either the city of Brantford or the county of Brant for a co-operative study on local government to be funded by The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have not approved a local study review in reference to Brantford or Brant county. There has been discussion of one, but I have not authorized one since I went to the department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Is there any analysis of the value of the additional services now being provided by regional government to the taxpayers so they can see if the total taxes, or total tax increase, is giving them a benefit or not giving them a benefit in these regional governments that are now in operation? A qualitative analysis of the additional services so that the taxpayers can

determine whether they are getting value for the additional costs that are now being incurred by the regional governments over the previous governments?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that is why I established a committee within my department to review these matters, not only in the department but with the officials of the municipalities as well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

USE OF CORN IN ALCOHOLIC SPIRITS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough): Could the minister inform me how many tons of corn are used in the manufacture of alcoholic spirits in the Province of Ontario? Could the minister—

An hon. member: Ask the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He wants to know how much corn liquor is made in the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier—

Mr. Sargent: Come on, the Premier must pay attention now.

USE OF RECYCLED PAPER

Mr. Burr: I have a question of the Premier regarding the recent decision of the government of the city of New York to purchase for its offices recycled paper from a manufacturer who, in turn, has agreed to buy the city of New York's waste paper for recycling. Will the Premier consider setting an example for Canadian governments at all levels, by deciding to make a significant use of recycled paper?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I am not sure as to the availability or the quantity of recycled paper. I will certainly look into it.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): There is lots of paper. Just the Premier's speeches alone would keep three manufacturers going.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could observe this, Mr. Speaker—that certainly the material emanating from across the House here needs to be recycled, except it is such a pollutant I would hate to have it recycled.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Premier could build the Spadina Expressway with his speeches.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought it was a very good statement. Some of the member's colleagues agreed with it. I know it was upsetting, but they did agree with it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Lewis: About every second one agreed with the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, one could sort of count heads.

Mr. Lewis: It is like a checkerboard; those on the white spaces agree, those on the black spaces disagree.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Sargent: The member caught him at the election, too.

Mr. MacDonald: Par for the course.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member know how many Liberal associations opposed the Spadina Expressway?

Mr. Lewis: Did the Premier see the statement of Mr. Givens, their new minister of urban affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Lewis: The enlightened Phil Givens! A very happy prospect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe he will go to the federal House.

Mr. Lewis: That is an idea.

Mr. Ruston: The Provincial Secretary!

SALE OF KEG BEER FOR HOME CONSUMPTION

Mr. B. Newman: A question of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: Give him a hearing aid over there.

Mr. B. Newman: What has happened to the study undertaken by the department concerning the sale of keg beer for home consumption—a question asked of the department well over one year ago?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the placing of the question, but I shall also take—

Mr. Ruston: He was not the minister then.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): The member can buy keg beer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the question as notice and report to the hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you. Last March I had asked that of the then Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) and he undertook to provide us with an answer. We are still awaiting the answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the hon. member short of beer. I can send him over some.

OPP TREATMENT OF HITCHHIKERS

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): To the Minister of Justice—Mr. Speaker, there is much too much banter in this chamber this morning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is Friday. It has been a long week.

Mr. Lawlor: In going down last Saturday to make a minuscule contribution to the winning of that marvelous victory in Brantford I picked up numerous hitchhikers along the way—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Lawlor: The question—thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would have forgotten. How does the Minister of Justice square the really harrying efforts of the Ontario Provincial Police with respect to hitchhikers against the invitation to these young people to go across the country the best way they can.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My understanding is that there is no law against hitchhiking in this province. There are regulations which prohibit pedestrians on certain of our very busy highways where it is an acknowledged danger to encourage people to pull over to the side of the road to pick up pedestrians. I think that is the difficulty.

Mr. Bullbrook: We regard those regulations as a law in Sarnia.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

LEGISLATION ON TAX ASSESSMENTS

Mr. Deacon: To the Minister of Municipal Affairs: When is the minister going to introduce the legislation promised by his predecessor last year to permanently correct the shift in assessments from industrial to residential which occurred last year in York and Peel as a result of market value assessments?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with this and it will come forward in due course.

Mr. Ruston: In the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

OHC LAND ASSEMBLY

Mr. Makarchuk: A question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Can the minister indicate at this time what land assembly schemes are being undertaken at the moment by Ontario Housing Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think this should be an order for return. There is quite a lot of detail obviously involved in that and I will get the information and put it on the order paper.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): How is Malvern doing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Very well. The hon. member will be sorry that he did not—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

AID FOR FIREFIGHTING FORCES IN ISOLATED COMMUNITIES

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a question of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice. Has the minister given any

thought to providing assistance for small firefighting forces in remote communities, and in unorganized territories, so they might provide themselves with the necessary firefighting equipment, through the fire marshal's office?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I have certainly given it some thought. The isolated communities, the smaller communities, in northern Ontario are a real problem as far as the provision of all of the protective services is concerned.

I would not want to try to mislead the hon. member though. We are giving it a lot of thought—I have asked for a lot of research work to be done on the subject—but so far, I will be honest with you, we have not come up with the answer on how to do it. I would be pleased to have any submission from the hon. member at any time on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

HEARING OF CHARGES IN ACCUSED'S COMMUNITY

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General. Will the minister give some consideration to a scheme involving people charged with offences, who do not live in the community or near the community where they are being charged, whereby the officer who lays the charge has to make a deposition before a justice of the peace so that the charge can be heard in the community of that person? In other words—you see what I am getting at?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I do.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We have many visitors to our particular area who are charged and have to return home. They have the witnesses with them and find it impossible, economically or physically, to return for the trial.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, a lot of consideration has been given to this matter over the years. Again, it is a question of balancing, not only the rights of the subject, but the convenience of the subject.

Again, it is one of those problems which is not very easily solved. In the circumstances the hon. member describes there could still be very great harm done to the accused's position if the court was to rely on a deposition, on a declaration, or on an affidavit of the arresting officer, or prosecuting officer, and still not have the opportunity in court, of cross-examining the officer on that evidence.

So, while that solution has been looked at over the years, it has been rejected over the years as well, because it, in its own way, could prove to be of very great harm to the rights of the accused.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By way of supplementary, realizing all that, does the minister not feel that, on balance, many people plead guilty and do not appear in court, except perhaps through a lawyer, particularly because of the inconvenience of the amount of mileage that they have to cover to appear in court? Does the minister not think, on balance, that it would be more just to do it in the way he outlined rather than leave it the way it is?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Unquestionably, there are cases where somebody feels that they have a very strong case to make, but the balance of convenience for them is to take the easy way out and plead guilty. This is unfortunate, but on balance I would say no, we have rejected that position that the hon. member now suggests to us.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the annual report of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs for the calendar year 1970.

I would like to just say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that the report covers a period of quite significant development in a number of important areas—important to consumers and to business and to our whole financial community. There was a vigorous legislative programme in 1970 which was designed to improve the position of the consumer and the shareholder in the marketplace and to encourage high standards of business practice at the corporate and retail levels. The department undertook a continuing of existing legislation and that has been reflected in the work of committees appointed by the minister to consider problems involving automobile insurance, insurance claims settlement, franchising operations and referral selling in Ontario.

I look forward to the final reports of these committees and to recommendations from them which I would hope we may see fit to implement into legislation quite promptly.

The annual report, Mr. Speaker, points out the effort the department is carrying on to clearly enunciate and forcefully protect consumers' rights in the marketplace while stimulating consumer responsibility on all fronts with the broadened consumer information programmes. And then there is appended to the report, as hon. members will observe, statistical sections which will give a quick opportunity to estimate the growth of the programmes of the department in dealing with various consumer problems throughout the year.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, the report of the private bills committee, as presented to the House yesterday, was deficient to the extent it did not include one decision of the private bills committee regarding an inquiry into matters arising from private bills committee deliberations on Wednesday last regarding Pr16, the City of London bill, and in particular, matters of procedure on section 5 of that bill, and to be given authority through the procedural affairs committee to look into that matter. I would ask that the House give that permission.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Clerk would require a written statement to that effect. I am informed that the committee is meeting in any event on Tuesday and the deficiency or the omission may be dealt with at that time and included in the next report.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, in this respect, I think I must question that, because this committee of which I am the chairman may wish to hear counsel from the city of London, and unless that matter has been referred specifically to our committee at that time, I question whether I have the right as the chairman to summon the counsel for the city of London, who was of course counsel behind the city of London bill. Consequently, I really think that this assembly should now repose this authority in my committee.

Mr. Speaker: I am informed that the item to which the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton has reference was actually not passed or approved at the prior meeting.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It was carried by decision of committee on a motion put by the hon. member for York East in the private bills committee.

Mr. Speaker: In any event, the matter can be dealt with at the meeting on Tuesday.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

EXERCISE OF STATUTORY POWER GRANTED TRIBUNALS

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide Procedures governing the Exercise of Statutory Power granted Tribunals by the Legislature wherein the Rights, Duties or Privileges of Persons are to be decided at or following a hearing.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EXERCISE OR FAILURE TO EXERCISE STATUTORY POWER

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide a single Procedure for the Judicial Review of the exercise or the failure to exercise the Statutory Power.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC INQUIRIES ACT, 1971

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, The Public Inquiries Act, 1971.

Mr. Peacock: A framework of civil liberties built on the abandoned roadbed of the Spadina.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It has a firmer foundation than that.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTE LAW ACT, 1971

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, an Act to amend The Civil Rights Statute Law Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members opposite would like a short explanation of the four bills. Also, they were introduced this morning so that they would have the opportunity to assess them very carefully over the short weekend available to them.

By introducing these four bills Mr. Speaker, at this time, the government of Ontario is placing before the people of this province the most comprehensive programme for the development of individual rights that has been developed within Canada. When these bills are brought into force, they will bring to the people of Ontario a code of administrative law procedure that will be the first of its kind in the Commonwealth.

These bills are not designed for lawyers but are designed to establish and ensure the rights of individuals wherever they come into contact with the many administrative processes of modern-day government within the jurisdiction of this Legislature.

In bringing these bills forward, I want to point out that they are not the sole undertaking of this government. They reflect the approach which has been taken to civil rights in this province since the receipt of the first report of hon. J. C. McRuer on civil rights in Ontario. I would like to recognize the presence of Mr. J. C. McRuer in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion. This monumental contribution to our province was received by my predecessor (Mr. Robarts) as leader of the government.

Together with the then Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), my predecessor immediately embarked on programmes which have established new parameters of individual rights in Ontario. It is now my privilege, together with the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), to carry forward this programme, which represents the virtual accomplishment of approximately 500 of the 549 recommendations presented to the government in the first report of the McRuer commission.

The first steps were taken in 1968, leading toward the enactment of such statutes as The Expropriations Act, The Provincial Courts Act, The Law Enforcement Compensation Act and many others. They introduced concepts which have since been recognized and adopted by other jurisdictions.

The procedure which was developed for our expropriation law was subsequently followed to a very great extent by the federal government. The judicial council, which was first conceived in Canada in The Provincial Courts Act, has now been recognized in form and function by legislation now before the Parliament of Canada.

Two of the bills which we have placed before the Legislature today were first introduced in the 1968-1969 session when the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and The Judicial Review Procedure Act were given first reading. This was done so that our initial concepts might be considered by the public and subjected to constructive comment and criticism which might improve upon these measures. The government was gratified by the response and received a great deal of assistance, all of which has been used in refining these measures to their present form. We are very much indebted to all those groups which took the time to consider these measures and, thereby, contribute to the improvement of the principles.

Dealing with the bills specifically, Mr. Speaker, The Statutory Powers Procedure Act, 1971, is based upon two fundamental principles. The first is the desirability of establishing standard procedures and powers that will ensure fairness and equity for individuals who are affected by decisions of tribunals made after a hearing.

The second principle is the desirability of having fair administrative practices without excessive judicial involvement in the whole process. In our opinion, this bill provides new safeguards while enhancing old safeguards and, at the same time, preventing excessive rigidity.

The Statutory Powers Procedure Act also prescribes minimum rules which will govern the proceedings of all tribunals in Ontario which are authorized by Ontario statutes to make decisions deciding the rights of individuals after a hearing. A person will be ensured that:

1. He has reasonable notice of the hearing;

2. He has reasonable notice of the case to be met;

3. He has a public hearing except in specified circumstances;

4. He may be represented by counsel or an agent;

5. He may examine and cross-examine witnesses;

6. He will have a written decision;

7. He will have reasons for the decision, if required;

8. He will be entitled to reasonable adjournments;

9. He will be entitled to a stay of proceedings pending an appeal.

The bill will also ensure that these tribunals have the ancillary powers and responsibilities so that they will have before them the necessary witnesses, together with the necessary documents. At the same time, all

the rights of individuals who may be caught up in that process will be ensured by appropriate judicial controls vested in our courts.

This will be a continuing responsibility of the government. The bill provides for a statutory committee which will be responsible for continuing the review of all rules of these tribunals. While the committee will not make the rules for the individual tribunals, every tribunal will have to consult with the committee before introducing or amending its rules of procedure. In this way, the government may be assured that the principles adopted by the Legislature will be followed by all of the tribunals and agencies created by government to carry out the processes of the administration and thus ensure that the programme of individual protection will be maintained.

The second bill, The Judicial Review Procedure Act, 1971, has also received a thorough public review since its original introduction at the 1968-1969 session of the Legislature.

We should all recall that the ancient and honourable remedies of mandamus, prohibition and certiorari—it has been a long time since I have resorted to any of those, Mr. Speaker—together with actions for declarations and injunctions, have been the effective and powerful method by which the courts have always reviewed the exercise of power by administrative tribunals in our province. These remedies are vested in our courts and have been the essence of the protection of the individual. It is our intention to maintain these remedies but, at the same time, simplify the procedure by which they may be obtained.

Over the years technicalities relative to these remedies have developed. As a result, it is not unusual for a person seeking relief to find that while he has reached the court, he has used a procedure leading to a remedy which is not appropriate to his case. This has sometimes resulted in the individual having to start his proceedings over again, with all of the attendant delays and annoyances. The essential purpose of The Judicial Review Procedure Act is to introduce an application known simply as an "application for judicial review." By instituting this single motion, the individual or his counsel will be able to apply to the court for any one of the five remedies which previously had to be obtained by its own specialized application. This procedure will not only simplify matters for the individual who requires the relief but will make procedures more effective for the legal profession and the courts. The remedies themselves will become speedier. For that reasons they will become much more effective in providing justice to the individual.

This procedural reform is closely associated with the establishment of the new divisional court which was introduced into our system by an amendment to The Judicature Act at the last session. This new, intermediate court of appeal will come into effect when additional appointments to our bench are forthcoming from the federal government and will be the tribunal through which we hope to find a great refinement in the administrative law of our province. This is exceedingly important at a time when the administrative processes of government are so vital to the individual. Consequently, all of these measures will tie together to improve the administration of justice in this important area.

This control of the courts will not extend over the proper administrative procedures but only protect the individual from abuses. The third Act, The Public Inquiries Act, 1971, introduces several new principles, once again designed to ensure the protection of the rights of the individual.

Safeguards will now be established in law for those persons having a substantial and direct interest in the subject matter of a public inquiry. Such persons will be entitled to call, examine and cross-examine witnesses. At the same time, no finding of misconduct on the part of any persons shall be made unless he has had reasonable notice of the allegation, has had a full opportunity to appear at the inquiry and be heard either in person or by his counsel. While great care has always been taken by commissioners to provide for these rights they will be established in the statute so that they will be clear to all involved.

The powers of a commissioner to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents will also be provided.

But the enforcement of those powers will be vested in the courts to ensure a full judicial review of the circumstances before any action may be taken against an individual who may have breached these requirements. The bill also contains an automatic statutory protection against the self-incrimination of the witness. Public hearings will be ensured by statute, subject only to a discretion being vested in the commissioner, to hold the meetings in private where public security or the intimate financial or personal matters might

outweigh the desirability of the publicity attendant upon the hearings.

Because this bill is utilized as the base of authority for many investigations made under Ontario statute law it has been designed so that various parts may be utilized in cross-references. In this way we can ensure that powers of the more extended nature need not necessarily be given to every inquiry which might be undertaken.

This statute establishes its own rules of procedure and its own specialized provisions for the protection of the individual. The very nature of the public inquiry makes it desirable that this be the case. Once again, there is provision for judicial review of matters which may be taken to the courts under the statute but without prejudicing the public necessity to have the inquiry continue within the terms of the law.

The final bill being presented, Mr. Speaker, The Civil Rights Statute Law Amendment Act, 1971, is a substantial bill. It is a major part of the overall programme undertaken by the government and its predecessor to amend all of the Acts which confer statutory powers. Since Mr. McRuer developed these principles, we have reviewed more than 350 statutes in the light of the following principles:

The nature and scope of the powers;

The persons by whom the power is exercised; the procedure by which it is exercised;

The right of appeal; the opportunity for reconsideration;

The control by the courts of its exercise;

And the provision of compensation for injuries resulting from improper exercise.

In our exhaustive review of the statute law of the province we have made every attempt to recognize these principles and ensure that they are developed and expressed in an appropriate way within our laws.

Members will understand that with over 500 Ontario statutes it has been a somewhat monumental task to review 350 in the time available. As a result, not all yet have been reviewed. However, our review of 350 statutes has resulted in the recommendation of amendments to 92 statutes, all outlined in The Civil Rights Statute Law Amendment Act. The remaining 150 statutes will be reviewed, and appropriate amendments will be introduced to continue our programme of statutory revision directed expressly to the principles of statutory powers as they affect the individual.

The expressed policy of this government is the development of all the rights with which the people of Ontario have been blessed and to ensure that they may be exercised in a manner consistent with the development of the individual. We recognize the theoretical principles reflected in many of our laws. But in the measures represented by these four bills we are bringing to the very first contact with the administration by the individual those rights which are most desirable for his protection. The approach which we have taken will ensure that the individual will not have to maintain his rights but that the system itself will maintain those rights and permit the type of fair administration which will not make any demands upon the individual himself.

We have always respected those entrenched legal rights contained in many of our statutes, but which so often are very much removed from the operating day-to-day environment of the individual. The processes by which these rights must sometimes be established are complicated in the extreme and in some cases may be so far removed from the forum that they are to a large part ineffective. The programme we have embarked upon is designed to make individual rights an established fact within every system for which we are responsible.

As with so many aspects of the administration of justice and law enforcement in our country, Mr. Speaker, we have come to accept them as part of our everyday living. We must always continue to review them and enhance them so that they will be readily available to all of us to provide both the public and private protection which ensures the development of an orderly society.

Perhaps the ultimate compliment which the Legislature might receive from this legislation would be that it becomes such a part of everyday practice and procedure that we would cease to be aware of its existence.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. Lewis: By way of clarification, how quickly does the Premier intend to proceed with these various pieces of legislation? How long will they be on the order paper?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we would like to move ahead with them. Obviously the hon. members opposite will want some time to study them—and it is the intention of the Attorney General to take them to committee—but we do intend to proceed with them as expeditiously as we can.

Mr. Lewis: This month?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

CORPORATIONS INFORMATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, a brief word of introduction.

This bill is a revision of The Corporations Information Act, and its purpose is to include the recommendations of the select committee on company law to require the registration of business names; secondly, to simplify the information required in those returns and, thirdly, to improve the provisions for enforcement and to provide for the filing of annual returns which would be effective on the anniversary date of the incorporation of the company or an amalgamation, and leaving out of account the present option which is afforded to corporations incorporated under the federal Act to substitute that filing for the one which would be required by the province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my thanks to a great Canadian, Mr. Justice McRuer. His approach to the rights of people is a credit to our way of life, and for those in the opposition, sometimes we feel that someone is thinking along the same lines we do, beside the establishment.

Mr. Speaker, about 20 hours ago the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province clearly pinpointed the stupidity of this government in the abandonment of 6½ miles of the Spadina Expressway and of the waste of about $200 million.

At a time when hundreds of thousands of men are out of work—no jobs, 75,000 graduates of the class of 1971 and no one wants them—we meet this proof positive of waste on the part of the government.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Never expected a grit to be consistent.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I guess one can expect a lot of things.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton) was the one who guaranteed to Toronto that the Spadina Expressway would be a reality. By his direction and advice this concept came into being and he alone is the author of Metro's misfortune, not to mention the continuance of chaos in traffic in this city. For years, those of us in the outlying parts of the province have watched the flagrant waste of hundreds of millions of dollars by this government, all tied up in the expensive studies of MTARTS and Toronto-centred plans. These plans alone cost millions of dollars. They build subways we do not need; the University Avenue subway is a $20 million effort that we have to close, because there is not enough money to pay the ticket takers.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I thought the member wanted one in Owen Sound?

Mr. Sargent: We in the outlying parts of the province have been paying our share of these hundreds of millions of dollars and we are getting fed up to the teeth with it. Now we are subjected, Mr. Speaker, to a pretty good example of what actually is going on in the government. This picture in this morning's Globe and Mail is only a portion of what you will see if you fly over this city in an airplane.

As I mentioned last night, we have across the north of this city, Highways 401 and 400; across the south we have the Gardiner Expressway; on the east we have the Don Valley; on the west we have Highway 27. And down the middle we have the Spadina Expressway—and it comes down and it stops dead. Anyone in their right mind would see how idiotic is this whole statement yesterday of the Premier. This arm, built at God knows how many millions of dollars, with the revenue the land has lost over the years, is now going to be abandoned for what? No one knows. Yesterday the Prime Minister pontifically and smugly stated that a subway will be built to link up. I suggest, Mr.

Speaker, to the people of Ontario that he is playing politics, looking to the next election instead of the next generation.

We do not have to be told by the Premier that the cities belong to people and not the automobile. His speech writers have been reading the book called "Super Highway Hoax" and that is the theme in this book. But cut off super highways and expressways only when you have proper approaches to the market, and you have a pocket of two million people sitting here and they cannot get out of the place or get into the place.

I suggest to the Premier that he should take some of his advisers and fly over and have a look from the air to see what is going on. He will see how idiotic the whole thing is. It is inconceivable that this could happen. There is already snarling in the city some 800,000 cars registered in this area, and 60,000 cars are being added every day —or every year. We will have, in two years, about one million cars trying to get access to this area. To say that public transportation will handle the load is garbage. It is unrealistic because you all know that the cars are paying the shot for public transportation.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Right.

Mr. Sargent: This is where your money comes from to do rapid transit, from cars. In the words of Metro chairman Campbell, "My God, it is a disaster"; and he said it is the most serious decision with the most serious consequences he has ever known any government to make. And the Tory fat cats, all with their big black limousines, sit back there and laugh; they think this is great stuff. But they wasted $200 million of our money.

Mr. Boyer: We do not think the member is right. He has been saying these sort of things for years; now he is talking out of the other side of his mouth.

Mr. Sargent: The member is going to the boondocks; he is going to stay back there because he flopped to Hydro.

Mr. Boyer: The member is singing a different tune than he has been singing in this House for years.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying I am against—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The tune will change tomorrow; do not worry.

Mr. Boyer: He changed his tune overnight.

Mr. MacDonald: It is subject to change without notice. They may have a vote on it in the caucus.

Mr. Ruston: Keep on giving it to them, Eddie. Throw it at them!

Mr. Sargent: Fred Gardiner is supposed to be an authority and a friend to this government; its advisers have been leaning on him for years. But let us go back a minute: This govenment was the one that suggested this to the city of Toronto; now it says, "No way; we are cutting you off." Okay. Mr. Gardiner says, "Where on earth are these cars going to go if we do not have a Spadina Expressway?"

An hon. member: They are going to park.

Mr. Sargent: Controller Godfrey of North York says the cabinet has got to be out of its skull.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): They agree over there; they all agree.

Mr. Sargent: He says this will cause the defeat of all Conservative members in Metro Toronto. Well, I am not opposed to that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Boyer: That is the only thing the member is not opposed to.

Mr. Sargent: Controller Hunt says it is incredible.

Mr. B. Newman: You cannot say the other things he said either.

Mr. Sargent: We must know.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What does the member for York Centre say?

Mr. Sargent: Well, I respect his opinion, but I am speaking as a member from the outlying parts of Toronto who has seen $200 million of our money go down the pipe.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: Is he speaking as a Liberal?

Mr. Sargent: Let us go one step further here—

Mr. MacDonald: One other Liberal voice.

Mr. Sargent: The supporting programme through all of this has been in the neighbourhood of $1 billion, and it has been built around this concept; if we take the guts

out of this thing, what have we got left? This government is saying in effect that regional government does not work, that the autonomy of cities does not work, since the members of this government are going to be the fellows who call the tune.

Mr. Ruston: You know what the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said: All the mayors and reeves are idiots.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): I suppose that goes for Phil Givens as well?

Mr. Sargent: Do not worry; he will be here next year with us.

Mr. B. Newman: On the other side.

Mr. Sargent: Yes. But we do not know how much this has cost to date; we will never know how much revenue all this land has lost in tax revenue. What happens to the highway grants formula we have now? It all goes down the pipe. We do not have any more highway grants formula because it was all predicated on this deal. And all along the Ontario Municipal Board has been okaying the whole deal in consortium with cabinet. Since its inception in 1953, the OMB has been party to this hoax.

For the idiots across there, let me give them a—

Mr. B. Newman: Not all of them.

Mr. Sargent: Well, some of them; I can always qualify it my saying some of them.

Mr. Ruston: Most of the idiots are not here this morning; there are hardly any cabinet ministers.

Mr. Sargent: But if we look in the Globe and Mail this morning we see the revealing chronological presentation of the Spadina Expressway from start to finish; it goes back to December, 1953, and different points in time in the development of this project. I have done a tabulation of the amounts in the different releases here, and we are talking of about $300 million, which involves such things as $68 million for drainage at one point and about $100 million for 23 bridges they have built. In total, we have $143 million as of March, 1970, and all along the way, if these figures are right we end up with about $300 million. But we cannot believe what is in the papers any more because the members opposite do not agree with the expressway any more. But Metro has about $60 million involved, and naturally it wants its money back. I will be interested to see if they do get their money back. Everything was going along fine until Mr. John Robinette came into the picture on September 9, 1970—

Mr. Ruston: What are his party politics.

Mr. Sargent: —and the Spadina Review Corporation.

Mr. Lewis: That is Colin Vaughan.

Mr. Sargent: They formed this group, a vociferous group and they have proved to the people of Ontario that their thinking and their objections are more powerful than the autonomy of Metro Toronto council.

Mr. Lewis: And that is as it should be.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe the member is right. I do not say he is wrong, but the whole bit is this: How can a government encourage a development, then let this kind of thing happen and lose $200 million? I am part of it, my people are part of it, Ottawa is part of it, Windsor is part of it, the member for Kent is part of it—we are all part of it. We paid this money, not the fellows in Toronto. It is our money.

What I am saying is that in effect it is a fait accompli now; the minister has cast the die and he is in real trouble. So are all the people with him. But I am going to say that if they think this loss of public funds is bad, if we can ever get under the carpet and see what is happening in the mess of hydro and nuclear power—boy, this is peanuts.

Mr. MacDonald: How do you get under the carpet?

Mr. Sargent: We are going to do that when we get in power. We will have a complete public inquiry and look into the whole thing.

Mr. Lewis: They will be building an expressway from here to Nanticoke.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I advise you not to get inside the cyclotron.

Mr. Sargent: We would like to know some things, but we will never find out. Is the province going to pay back the other $60 million to Metro Toronto for its part that has been wasted in this deal? Will the province pay back to us, prorated across the province, the $200 million in our highways grants that has been wasted? We will not hold our breath until that happens.

Was this really stopped to save the Minister of Trade and Development's (Mr. Grossman) riding? This is what the papers say.

It is a shocking thing that I have to watch $200 million being spent to save a seat for what will we call him?

Mr. Ruston: An incompetent minister.

Mr. Sargent: His actions are imbecilic in this House. He does not have the basic qualities to run a township council and here he is running an empire of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. MacDonald: The member sounds like the Treasurer before the municipal officials.

Mr. Sargent: No, no. I know how this guy operates. I know. I am the critic for this guy. And the Treasurer does not know very much about anything.

Mr. Boyer: You tell us. You are the expert.

Mr. Sargent: This is my job in the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Do all the opposition agree with the hon. member?

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Ruston: He said "we" too.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. minister agrees with what I think of the Treasurer and the Minister of Trade and Development. The taxpayers will back me up, I think, this next election.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Yorkdale concept was built on the assumption that this was going to be a reality. Yorkdale was built on the promise of this road. The $42-million shopping centre was built on the complete proof and promise that this would happen.

No one knows what is going to happen now, in the reneging and the failure to prolong this undertaking. It will be interesting to see what happens there. It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that $200 million has been wasted. I say very respectfully to the House leader that this is a clear-cut case that regional government does not work, when four expressways, by the virtue of this happening yesterday, are automatically cancelled.

I say to you that a great city like Toronto has lost its autonomy. It cannot make its decisions because it is hampered by this glorified county council which cannot get off its butt and do something right once in a while. I say very sincerely this government is operating on a day-to-day basis, floundering around. Who knows what it is going to be doing next week? I want to say that this will be the worst thing that ever happened to the traffic in one of the world's great cities. The traffic is in a snarl now and the government is only complicating the magnitude of the problem.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch here, in Owen Sound, we are fighting to have our access road, Highway 10—it is the worst goat path in Ontario. My offer still stands, to give $1,000 to the minister for his favourite charity if he can show me a worse highway in the Province of Ontario, but he says he does not want to talk about it. It looks like we will have to go the route, asking the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs if we can bring out a $1 million lottery to finance our highways—and we are thinking about that.

The report of 1968 and 1969, Mr. Speaker, takes 12 pages to tell about the needs for the area of Owen Sound. It takes 30 pages to describe the appalling conditions of neglect. It says it is the worst neglected area in the Province of Ontario. Here today I am fighting for the rights of the outlying parts which are getting fed up to the teeth with this waste. I would like to put into the record what this report says about our area. We are fighting for our rights. All I can say to the Premier is this—finalizing this section of my remarks—that his approach, and the approach of this government is discriminatory and it is despicable.

As far as education is concerned in my area, we do not have a college or a university there. My daughter, as I mentioned, went to Centennial College this year and graduated. I spoke of this in the House the other night. Centennial College is more or less where the poor people go.

We have two sets of education in this country. We have the panelled libraries and all the aristocratic people go down to the University of Toronto and Western Ontario with all these sororities and sigma chi and all this malarkey and all the trappings of the elite, while our people—my people—go down to a converted munitions factory. As I was telling the House the other night, this college graduated 500 people down there this time. With the basic facilities they have, I cannot speak too highly about the wonderful education my daughter got there, and on graduation day the fact is the mothers and fathers were clearly the poor people of the area.

Mr. MacDonald: Like the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: My daughter could not get into any college. She could not be enrolled

because she did not have high enough marks. So she went on the recreation course there and I am very proud of the job she has done there. The fact is these wonderful kids graduated. It sounds incredible but across this big hall they have the name of the college, Centennial College, up on a big white piece of paper, silk screened on the wall. The parallel is we have the rich in the universities and we have the poor in the community colleges, and I do not like it, a rich and a poor education in this province.

On top of that, kids from my area are coming down to college here; one man had three children in university. It was costing him $10,000 a year to keep those three kids in university. How does a man take $10,000—he has a business—out of profit and pay income tax, because it is not deductible? How does he do it? Our people are paying a premium to have our kids go to university or college, because we do not have any facilities up there to do it.

But I am saying this, in Maclean's Magazine we have this section, "The Class of 1970-1971, Nobody Wants Them." Seventy-five thousand graduates on the market and nobody wants them. Where do they go? What do they do? What do you tell them? In my daughter's class, no one has got a job to go to. What do they do? How do they work a lifetime and get to this point and nobody wants you? What do you tell these kids then?

I tell you the architect of this whole thing in Ontario is the man who is the Premier of this province. We had a case in Centralia at Huron College. A man phoned me yesterday—he is the clerk of the county of Grey—his daughter wanted to get on a veterinarian assistant course. She had 83 per cent and she tried to enrol there. They would not take her. I phoned Dr. Deutsch. I said, "What goes on? Only three per cent of our kids ever get to university as against six per cent of the rest of the province. We are discriminated against. We want a special break for this kid."

He said, "I cannot do that. I know that three per cent of your people get to university as against six per cent. I know that is a fact." I said, "What do we do?" He said, "Well, I will tell you what the problem is. There are 327 students accredited who applied for this course. We took 27. We told 300 we had no room for them."

What did the 300 kids left out of that course do? And here we are, wasting $200 million on one programme that the government sponsored and finally said no. This government is the architect of all this misfortune of our students and I bleed for these kids. They are beautiful.

They have more moxy or more brains than any of us put together had then. They sit back and they look at me and they say, "Your generation has failed us." We have failed them; we have. Our plant and physical attributes across this province are spending hundreds of billions of dollars in education. Yet we have not looked at the end thing. What are we going to do with them? What are we going to do with the end products?

Mr. Speaker, I am over my time here but I was critical yesterday of the fact that the offtrack betting shops were getting away with murder, the licence to steal. Millions of dollars have been bet with no record of it. The province has no idea how much money is going through the coffers of these people. No one will ever know. You go in and place a bet and it goes down a rat hole and it never goes to the track, as far as I am concerned.

The chief of police says that criminal people are running these things; are associated with them. The minister says he is working in concert with Mr. Turner in Ottawa. I believe him, but why does the government not do something positive to save the jobs of 2,000 people down at the race track, to save the great sport of racing? Because they are going to close it down as of July 18.

Mr. Taylor says it and I agree with him, and our leader in our party has said, we should run the offtrack betting like they run our liquor stores. But in a computerized deal in Peterborough with the results coming by wire straight to Peterborough or to any part of Ontario—to Ottawa, to Windsor—to have these results flashed across the wire. Then people can go and place their bets legitimately through a government office at each one of these places.

Mr. Taylor predicted that the Province of Ontario would take up to $100 million a year in revenue, simply because we would legalize it and supervise it. But we have no plan of action from this government yet.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the member want the government in everything?

Mr. Sargent: That I think is one area where the government should protect the people—there, in that one area. In fact, if I had my way, I would like to see wide-open gambling in this—

Mr. Lawlor: The member picks and chooses what he wants the government to do, does he not?

Mr. MacDonald: When somebody else picks, he criticizes. When he picks it is wisdom.

Mr. Sargent: There is no wisdom over there, Mr. Speaker, while lotteries are running wide open in this province. Last year we had 30,000 lotteries in Ontario, by the admission of the minister, giving away some $22 million. And there is no control here. Why can we not have a provincially run lottery like the Province of Quebec or the State of New York to raise funds for our needed institutions here? Mr. Speaker, closing this budget effort I would like to say that this whole piece has been a flagrant story of waste and stupidity, and it hits the Ontario citizen where it hurts most—in his pocket.

Already, through a series of financial nightmares and skirting with bankruptcy—you are, because you are budgeting for $500 million deficit this year. This is an indictment, I say, Mr. Speaker, of fiscal financing without precedent. In the whole history of this country it is without precedent that a government will budget for a $500 million deficit. I say it points to a dereliction of duty and it could almost have shades of corruption.

Mr. Boyer: Is that a partisan speech?

Mr. MacDonald: You fellows really take it lying down. You are accused of being "in bed with the racketeers," now "shades of corruption," and you do not even react.

Mr. Boyer: That is terrible, is it not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, on April 6 I introduced a resolution concerning The Teachers' Superannuation Act, but because it seems unlikely that it will reach the floor of the House I wish to speak very briefly on it now.

I suggest two changes in the Act that would be obvious improvements for the wives of teachers. At present retired teachers' widows, especially those who are themselves retired teachers, are the victims of a unique form of discrimination. For example, if a woman teacher retires she gets her full pension if her deceased husband has been in any line of work except that of teaching in the elementary or secondary schools of Ontario. If, however, her deceased husband has been a pensioned teacher, she cannot draw half of his pension as any other teacher's wife could. She must choose to receive either her own pension or half of his—which is then called a dependent's allowance.

If the government is unwilling to end this discrimination completely I maintain that the least that should be done is this: Allow a retired woman teacher who has earned a pension of her own and has become entitled through the death of her retired teacher husband to 50 per cent of his pension, to receive all or part of this dependent's allowance provided her own pension and the allowed part of the dependent's allowance do not exceed the greater of the two original pensions involved. Thus one pension would not necessarily be forfeited, as is the case at present.

For an example, Mr. Speaker: Mr. A receives a teacher's pension of $9,000. Mrs. A receives a teacher's pension of $7,000. Mr. A dies. Mrs. A, I maintain, should continue to get her own pension plus $2,000 from the $4,500 dependent's allowance to which any other wife of a teacher, who is not herself a pensioned teacher, would be entitled in full.

A second example: Mr. B receives a teacher's pension of $9,000 and Mrs. B. receives a teacher's pension of $3,000. Mr. B dies. Instead of forfeiting her $3,000 pension in order to get the dependent's allowance of $4,500 from her husband's pension, she would receive both, a total of $7,500.

A second injustice to teachers' wives whether they themselves are teachers or not concerns remarriage. At present, if a teacher's widow remarries she forfeits the dependent's allowance, that is the 50 per cent of her husband's pension. Should her new husband die shortly afterwards, she might be left without any resources of consequence.

I propose that the Act be amended so that the dependent's allowance of a teacher's widow is merely suspended during a remarriage, and that, should she be widowed a second time, she would be able to resume the collection of the dependent's allowance. Although the Ontario Teachers' Federation has several changes it wishes made in the superannuation Act, these two suggestions are such obvious improvements that they cannot be considered controversial, and I urge the government to take immediate action upon them.

I should like to make a few remarks about the Workmen's Compensation Board; and I should like to go on record, Mr. Speaker,

as having a very low opinion of the Workmen's Compensation Board's system of cutting down compensation awards for no apparent reason.

I have in mind a 60-year-old truck driver, Mr. E, with a very fine work record, who sustained a back injury which has left him unable even to dry dishes without taking a rest. This man, who should be getting over $300 a month, is getting about $3 a day.

Another constituent, Mr. S, working in the construction industry, suffered a torn muscle in an on-the-job accident on September 1, 1966, when 63 years of age. His shoulder has never healed despite surgery and repeated periods of treatment at Downsview with all kinds of exercises that often made him ill.

During the week or 10 days after the accident, Mr. S continued at work at the foreman's urging, doing what he could despite his injured arm, heaving cement bags and sand with his right arm alone. This probably contributed to his present condition in which his right hand trembles noticeably.

Since the accident it has been found that he has sugar diabetes. To make matters worse, arthritis has set in. So we have a man who has worked hard all his life, for years on end without missing an hour and enjoying excellent health, who is now useless for any work, except perhaps running an elevator. He therefore joins the thousands of disabled workers who are classified as "fit for light work" and therefore reduced to a pittance by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. S was getting $173.08 every two weeks, but as of July 22, 1969, he was cut to $26.50, Mr. Speaker. Not $26.50 a week. Not $26.50 every two weeks. But $26.50 a month! This is a terrific cut from about $370 a month, which is what $173.08 every two weeks amounts to. How can this be explained?

Mr. S had become eligible for the old age pension just three months before the cut took place. Since the accident, he has had drug bills of $16 a month because of his diabetes, and more recently because of his high blood pressure. Who is to say, Mr. Speaker, that the diabetes was not brought on by the accident, because many doctors believe that diabetes starts as the result of some traumatic shock to the body or to the mind?

I could see some possible reason for cutting the compensation award by the amount of the old age pension. But to cut the pension from $370 down to $26.50 is an act of cruelty, especially as the man is no more able to work than he was a week after the accident—less able in fact.

There are many workers drawing small, life-long pensions for some injury who are still doing a full day's work of hard manual labour. Why should a man who is totally disabled, except for the theoretical light jobs which do not exist, be treated in such a manner?

Mrs. S, although not yet 60, had a spinal operation a few years ago and is unable to do any gainful work, but she is too young for the old age pension. As far as the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned, Mr. and Mrs. S. have $26.50 a month to live on, of which $16 goes for drugs, probably needed as the result of the accident.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the new Minister of Labour will take an interest in this "light work" aspect of workmen's compensation. Those who are classified as being capable of light work usually go through a heartbreaking search for this elusive, so-called light employment. Only a lucky few ever find it, and even then usually through the aid of some compassionate friend or relative.

There is another aspect of the Workmen's Compensation Board that disturbs me. In the case of Mr. S his doctor prescribed physical activity to keep down sugar levels in his blood. Mr. S putters around his house and garden, doing what he can, resting when he needs to.

The other case I mentioned, Mr. E takes a similar attitude that he should keep physically active otherwise his condition will deteriorate. When I first went to visit Mr. E, the truckdriver, about his workmen's compensation problem, he was walking in his garden, steering some kind of machine, a roto-tiller, perhaps. He was stripped to the waist, had a good tan and to my layman's eye looked the picture of strength and health. Actually he was doing this as a form of therapy.

By a strange coincidence, Mr. Speaker, when he appeared before the Workmen's Compensation Board hearing, one of the few questions asked him was about his being able to push a roto-tiller in his garden. I have reached the point where I almost believe that the only way a disabled worker can claim any adequate pension is to get a wheelchair and stay in it.

In what I believe was the first prepared public statement of the new Premier (Mr. Davis) on Monday, March 1, 1971, appeared these words: "The new government will emphasize a greater concern for the individual within our society." Well, one group of individuals in our society for whom greater concern must be shown is the disabled worker whom the Workmen's Compensation Board classifies as fit for nonexistent light work. The few light-work jobs available to workers, whether they are unskilled or semi-skilled or even highly skilled, are already filled by those compassionate employers who give the jobs to heart attack sufferers.

It is my earnest hope that the new Minister of Labour will review some of the procedures and attitudes of the Workmen's Compensation Board and introduce some badly needed changes.

I wish to speak on one more subject only briefly. It concerns youth and drugs. Since the end of World War II, the North American culture has undergone many rapid changes aided, if not actually inspired, by TV. I am confining my remarks concerning these changes to one: The alarming use of drugs by teenagers.

TV has helped to condition us to regard any physical pain or discomfort not as a symptom whose cause should be sought by the family physician, but as a signal to take another pill. The TV tells us that if we do not fall asleep in 15 minutes, we should take a certain kind of drug, all will then be well.

Any TV watcher soon gets the idea that if a person is feeling lonely or depressed, nicotine, alcohol or some other drug will change his mood. We have become not only an affluent society, but also a comfort-loving society, taught to believe that any physical or emotional or mental discomfort can be remedied by an aspirin or a tranquilizer or by some other drug.

Under these circumstances then, is it really so surprising that our children should turn to drugs when they encounter loneliness, failure, rejection or neglect?

Few will deny that there has been a widespread weakening of family life in North America in the twentieth century. In earlier times, each child was usually a useful and needed member of the family. There was a cow to be milked, water to be brought from the well, wood to be gathered for the fire, gardens to be weeded, lawns to be cut, snow to be shovelled, fruit and vegetables to be harvested and preserved, dishes to be washed, daily errands at the corner grocery store.

Today almost all of these chores have been eliminated and today many, perhaps most city children, have no chores whatsoever to perform. They have no feeling they are useful and needed members of the family. They may even get the feeling that they are a nuisance, interfering with the parents' own interests and activities; that they are looked upon by their parents as an impediment to those activities and as a drain on the family purse. In this changing society, it is up to concerned parents to plan family routines and special activities in such a way that each child feels wanted and loved, useful and needed. They are very wise parents, Mr. Speaker, who can find and keep to the vague dividing line between affection and overindulgence, and can promote self-discipline, self-reliance and responsibility in their children without being too strict or too permissive.

In my efforts to understand the problem of drug abuse, and the attempt to rehabilitate those who have become its victims, I have felt it essential to discover the cause if there is to be any hope of finding a cure. Although the details differ in every case history of drug abuse, each seems to have one factor common to the rest. In almost every case with which I am familiar, the troubled teenager had parents, or at least one parent, who either did not care or did not appear to care, and not appearing to care may have as disastrous results as really not caring. In any event, some breakdown of the family ties seemed associated with every drug abuse tragedy.

To sum up then, whether a family has a teenage drug problem will probably be decided years in advance. If it is avoided it will probably be because both parents took ample time to discuss frequently how to help their children feel wanted and loved, useful and needed.

It is not an easy problem with simple, single answers; but I am becoming more and more convinced that success or failure will depend far more on what happens in each family than upon any legislation that may be passed in Ottawa or Toronto or Washington. If legislation can help, it will probably be in the curbing of the drug cult features of our society, starting with TV advertising. I hope that the new minister will give some thought to this approach to the problems which disturb every parent today.

I had one other section, Mr. Speaker, but it is of too great length to enable me to start on it today so I shall take my seat.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise this afternoon and speak to the budget address and the budget of the Province of Ontario. I was disappointed, of course, in many of the provisions and lack of provisions in the budget, particularly in regard to northern Ontario.

There is an event of some consequence, Mr. Speaker, that took place just in the last few months which applied particularly to my riding, but applies to the Province of Ontario as a whole and particularly to northern Ontario. That is the selling of Hydro-electric power to the United States or to a corporation resident in the United States. I refer to the Boise Cascade pulp and paper company which operates pulp mills at Fort Frances, Ontario, and across the river at International Falls, Minnesota.

I discussed this matter in the Legislature and in the committee which deals with Energy and Resources Management which has responsibility for Hydro.

I have had numerous conversations with the minister responsible; I took an active part in opposing the selling of hydro to the American corporation at International Falls. I spent a week attending the hearings of the National Energy Board in Fort Frances at which the company tried to prove that the power was needed and that it should be exported.

I was successful, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in modifying the Ontario government's position in regard to this export of power, and to me this is the whole crux of the matter. The Ontario government gave its approval, by order-in-council, to Ontario Hydro for an increase in the export of hydro-electric power to the Boise Cascade Corporation in International Falls, Minnesota. The original order-in-council, Mr. Speaker, giving this approval did not deal or have any qualifications on the export of power. It was simply the government of Ontario's approval that this power should be exported.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the town of Fort Frances, at great cost to the taxpayers of that town, was fighting the export of this power to International Falls, Minnesota. Various other organizations—the mill unions, the chamber of commerce, myself and others—were also actively opposed to the export of power. However, the government proceeded and pursued a course giving approval to this export of power in spite of the opposition of the local people to the export of power. Our opposition, Mr. Speaker, was based on the one simple fact that we felt that this export of power, which was cheap power for the American companies, would lead to an export of jobs to the American side rather than on the Canadian side.

This fact was borne out in the testimony of the vice-president of the American company when he appeared before the Energy Board. Under questioning, he said that the plans of the Boise Cascade company in International Falls called for the building of a stud mill and perhaps a plywood mill in International Falls, Under questioning by the town's lawyer, he admitted that there was no reason why the stud mill in particular could not be built on the Canadian side. He said that they had sufficient wood to run such a plant in the northern limits, and that it could very well be built on the Canadian side at Fort Frances, Ontario.

The effect of the government's approval therefore, Mr. Speaker, was to maintain the people of Ontario, particularly in northwestern Ontario, particularly in the Rainy River district, as hewers of wood and drawers of water. Instead of manufacturing our raw materials in the Rainy River district where they are found, we are going to export them across the river and provide employment for the Americans using our products.

Not only our wood, Mr. Speaker, but our cheap, electric hydro supply which the American company cannot by any stretch of the imagination produce as cheaply as we export. I might add further, Mr. Speaker, that I am not convinced that we are getting a proper price for that power. I hope that when the commission studying government commissions deals with hydro, they will go into this matter more thoroughly.

It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and it bothers those people who reside in northwestern Ontario, to have had all the studies we have had—the Design for Development, the tourism study, all kinds of studies going on in northwestern Ontario—which are supposed to lead ultimately to plans and programmes for the development of that area. The development, of course, of what we are primarily concerned in is jobs and employment opportunities.

Yet, here the Ontario government is ready and willing to turn around and give approval

for an export of our power to provide employment for Americans on the other side of the border. Now, I am certainly not anti-American but I do not see any reason that we should be exporting our raw products across a river not even 100 yards wide, and have the jobs and the employment opportunities available there.

I think the approval was given by the Ontario government under the aegis of the then Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall). I think he sold the cabinet a bill of goods on the fact that the company was building a kraft mill in Fort Frances and to get them to agree to build the kraft mill in Fort Frances, we will sell them our power across the river. So we were not really satisfied with half a loaf, we were satisfied with a third of a loaf because there are three plants that might be involved in this complex; two are supposedly to be built on the American side and one in Fort Frances.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and disheartened to learn while attending the hearings that the Ontario government was in fact supporting the application of the company for the export of power. Subsequently to that I came to Toronto, I wrote the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, I wrote the then Premier of the province (Mr. Robarts) and I pointed out certain things to him in connection with this export of power, in particular that it would be detrimental to the people of northwestern Ontario and the province as a whole.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I was relatively successful in at least having the province modify its stand. When the hearing resumed this spring, having been adjourned last fall, the Ontario government sent a letter to the chairman of the National Energy Board modifying their approval of the export of power. They stated in that letter that they could not agree to an export of power which would give rise to jobs on the American side, jobs which could very well be provided on the Canadian side.

Well this, of course, Mr. Speaker, was exactly what I had suggested to them. The Liberal Labour Association of the Rainy River district had passed a resolution to this effect, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it was a little late really, because the approval of the Ontario government in any ultimate decision made by the Energy Board has to have and carry a great deal of weight in the final decision.

Even deeper than that, if we extract that particular interest and look at the overall philosophy that this government apparently follows in regard to development, we see that at best their policies are hypocritical. We have a 20-year plan for the development of northwestern Ontario that is supposed to provide what I would say is only a minimum of jobs for the people who now live there, and the children that are growing up there, and yet the government hypocritically, to my mind, turns around and gives approval for the export of power and jobs.

There has to be some rethinking here somewhere, and I suggest that one of the problems is that this government does not keep a tight enough rein on Ontario Hydro. Of all government commissions it is probably the one that is least controlled by this Legislature and by this government, and I suggest to you, sir, that it is time that it did come under the direct purview of this Legislature.

For too many years Ontario Hydro has been riding roughshod over the people of Ontario and particularly in northwestern Ontario. I am sure that my colleague from Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), who is in the House this afternoon, can also give numerous examples of where Hydro has come along and not even expropriated land but has cheerfully gone on its way, disregarding the private rights and liberties of citizens, clearing rights of way, knocking down trees, and generally disturbing the property of private individuals. I say that all the programmes of Ontario Hydro have to be reviewed.

During the estimates of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr), I raised another question with him—and the chairman of Hydro, Mr. Gathercole, was there at the time. My point was that I do not feel that Boise Cascade, which has been exporting power to the American side for some years, should have a part in and reap the benefits of the rate stabilization fund.

This fund is set up to stabilize rates over a period of time and try and keep the rates down as much as possible. But if we are selling power, not on a firm basis, but on an interruptible basis, then I suggest that any company which buys power in that regard, is not entitled, Mr. Speaker, to the benefits of the rate stabilization fund.

It seems to me that that fund is for the benefit of the people of the Province of Ontario, and not for some American corporations who are buying power on an interruptible basis. I hope that the minister will take that into account and so direct Hydro and have a complete review of this matter.

I would hope that in any further applications by any company on the American side or by any American municipality, that the government will take it as policy that the local people who live in Ontario next to the American border town will be consulted and their views will be taken into account.

This was another flagrant instance where the wishes and desires and the general health of the local community in northwestern Ontario were completely ignored by this government. I hope that the town of Fort Frances, through its diligent efforts in safeguarding the welfare of its people, will be brought to the attention of the government and that this situation will not arise again, either in my riding, or anywhere else in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I go on to another topic and that is the background of economic development of northwestern Ontario. I have already touched briefly on the fact that we have a development plan for the proposed programme of development in northwestern Ontario in the next 20 years. A great many people in northwestern Ontario put it—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Not a very ambitious plan, I might say.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It was not indeed, but with this government, the word "imagination" is not one that is prominent in their vocabulary. It was a disappointment to most of us, Mr. Speaker, but even more so than being a disappointment, nothing has been done about it whatsoever and we have been concerned about this in the north.

But I noticed in the paper in the last couple of days that the now Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is undertaking a review of all the development plans across the Province of Ontario, because apparently they do not mesh. Different people have different ideas of how the province should be developed and one development council's ideas do not necessarily agree with another.

I believe it was the Treasurer—it may have been another cabinet minister—who seemed to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the quality of the people on these development councils in the various areas left something to be desired. I can say to you, sir, that this is not the case in northwestern Ontario. I believe that we were one of the first to come forward with a development plan and to assist, so wholeheartedly, the efforts of The Department of Treasury and Economics in coming up with a plan for our region.

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that no matter how unimaginative it is, how far-reaching it is not, nothing has been done to date in regard to the development of northwestern Ontario. We are frustrated is the only word that I can grope for. And we are frustrated particularly because there are so many of these studies going on of northwestern Ontario that it is almost unbelievable. If these studies were all employing people from northwestern Ontario we would not have any employment problems, I can guarantee you that.

We have this development council study. One of the newest ones that we are undertaking right now is the study of tourism. We had a study in 1968 in which there were copious and numerous recommendations as to what should be done in regard to the tourist industry. Very few, if any, of these recommendations were followed up and yet we are now having another study at a cost of some $35,000. The study consists, apparently, of a travelling sideshow that arrives in a community, talks to one person or two people, or maybe a chamber of commerce in that community, which may or may not be directly interested in the tourist industry, arrives in that community for an hour or two and then leaves. They are going to produce a tourism report along with the recommendations written by somebody from southern Ontario once again.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that we are being studied to death and we are not getting any results of any kind out of these studies. With regard to the tourist industry, what has to be done, I think, is very obvious in most cases. What the tourist industry, particularly in northwestern Ontario, needs is cheap and available money. This is what it needs. This is the prime problem. This is not peculiar only to the tourist industry, but perhaps it suffers the most. All of northwestern Ontario suffers from a shortage of capital. While we all strongly feel opposed to any American takeovers, those of us who live in the areas where we do, and who are suffering from lack of employment opportunities, are ready and willing to accept capital with controls on it as long as employment is provided. It is all right for the people of Toronto to shout about foreign control and everything else. It is the old story of being all right, Jack, here in Toronto, but no one in Toronto seems to worry about employment opportunities in northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: They are even going to process our ores down here.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is right. They get very upset down here about Quetico Park in northwestern Ontario, but I do not hear the conservationists yelling too loudly about the Niagara Escarpment and areas in and around Toronto and the Niagara fruit belt. I would suggest that the next crusade of the conservationists should be in maintaining the Niagara fruit belt. I think that this would be something most beneficial for the people of the Province of Ontario.

With regard to tourism I would be happy, Mr. Speaker, to tell the Legislature that The Department of Lands and Forests has agreed to purchase the Long Sault Indian burial mounds which are located in my riding in and around the vicinity of Emo and Barwick, Ontario. These Indian mounds are some of the oldest mounds known to exist in the world. Apparently they outdate the tombs of the pharaohs, and so on, in Egypt. This is something that I have been recommending to the department for some years, and I think it will be a great tourist attraction for the Rainy River district.

In regard to tourism, I have already said, Mr. Speaker, that the main problem is a lack of and easy access to funds for improving camps and expanding. In northwestern Ontario many of our camps, the majority of them, are the type referred to usually as the Ma and Pa type of tourist resort. These are camps that are run by a man and his wife and family. They are not the large kind of conglomerates that we see close to and in the vicinity of Toronto, a short distance north of Toronto. They are small, individually run camps, and they suffer from a lack of funds.

The government made an attempt—a half-hearted attempt—to provide capital for the tourist camps through their performance loans. First of all, the interest rate is not any better than the tourist operator can get at the bank. There is absolutely no saving there at all. Second, it has become a political football. The government is using these performance loans to tourist camp operators as a means of cheap and free publicity and as a smokescreen to prove that they are actually doing something about the tourist industry in the north.

I could read from a letter that I received from a tourist camp operator, but I will just give you the highlight of it, Mr. Speaker. He applied for a performance loan.

In those days it was just a loan from the Ontario Development Corporation. One day the then private member for Kenora announced on a radio programme that this gentleman had in fact received a loan of, I believe, $25,000. The following day the Conservative candidate in my riding announced that this man had received the loan from the Ontario Development Corporation. Everyone seemed to know about this loan except the tourist camp operator who was never informed of it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is the way they do business.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There was no letter, no phone call from the Ontario Development Corporation at all, to the man who applied for the loan, except every Tory in the country was announcing it. The man was so fed up with this kind of approach to a very significant problem that he wrote the Ontario Development Corporation, and the minister I believe, what I would say was a very strongly-worded letter, telling him that he no longer required the loan because he got it as cheap, if not cheaper, at the bank, and that he did not like the procedures the government followed in making this a political football rather than providing aid and assistance to the tourist industry.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce) That is what I call a man of principle.

Mr. Nixon: That is the way they are in the north.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): He probably did not need it very badly anyway.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The problem then, Mr. Speaker, is that this government must provide a large pool of funds, available through the tourist industry at a low rate of interest, for an extended period of time. With that, I would say Mr. Speaker, must go the proviso that the camp be operated for so many years by the person who gets the loan. And I would like to see some control also to the effect that these tourists camps—as least the majority of them—be owned and controlled by Canadians.

You know Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that this money cannot be made available to the tourist industry. I sat here dumbfounded in this Legislature yesterday and listened while the government made a great announcement about the Spadina Expressway—one which I might say I have a certain sympathy for—but when I read the papers and I look at the statistics and I see the amount of money that was wasted, thrown

down the drain, because of the inability of this government to make a decision on Spadina, it makes me cry.

What we in northwestern Ontario could have done with the $60 million that the paper indicates has been wasted on the Spadina Expressway!

What we could have done with that money, the jobs we could have provided, the industries we could have provided! It might have provided money for processing plants for iron ore at Thunder Bay or Atikokan right on the spot.

But no. Because this government waffled—if I may use that term—waffled on whether or not they were going to go through with the Spadina Expressway for so long at least a minimum of $60 million—and estimates run up to $200 million—of taxpayers' money has been wasted. Now if you put that kind of money into the northwestern Ontario economy we would be able to reach the goals and objectives of the development plans for northwestern Ontario within a three-year period.

Mr. Stokes: Not 20!

Mr. T. P. Reid: Twenty? Well you know what the 20 means; that is as good as 100 to the Tories. This government cannot make up its mind to do anything, and I am quite confident that the people of Ontario will realize the indecisions of this government and what it costs them, the taxpayers, in regard to tax money.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about the tourist industry. It is a vital one. It is a necessary one for northwestern Ontario. It is the third largest industry in northwestern Ontario, and in many of our communities it is pretty well the sole industry. It plays a vital part in the economy of northwestern Ontario and in providing jobs for the people who live there. As well as providing investment funds to ensure the continued expansion and upgrading of the tourist industry in northwestern Ontario, there is something else that is vital to the continued good health of that industry. That is, Mr. Speaker, good conservation practice to ensure the continuance of abundant game and fish.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few minutes today talking about conservation, and I might even mention Quetico Park and the fish and game policies of The Department of Lands and Forests of the Ontario government. I would like to say that many people come to our part of the country to enjoy the scenery, the clean lakes, the fresh waters and the fresh air. Many of our tourists come, of course, to fish and hunt. Northwestern Ontario is known as one of the best spots on the continent of North America to hunt and fish. Just about everyone who comes to our area is guaranteed an enjoyable time and certainly they will usually fill their angling licence and hunting licence limits.

However, we must be careful to preserve the game and fish not, of course, just for the tourist industry, but for the people of the province generally and, to use a cliche, for the generations to come. We must ensure that we do not add to the extinction of animals that has taken place over the years and even within the lifetime of some of us. This, of course, requires good game and fish management, particularly on the part of The Department of Lands and Forests. There is, however, the individual responsibility of each individual to take no more than he is allowed by law and to leave the rest; to leave what he cannot use himself.

There is a particular responsibility, of course, on the tourist camp operator to ensure that the guests at his tourist camp take no more than their limit, take no more than they are allowed to fill their game and fish licences.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question of conservation and ecology, and so on, has become a fad today. Many people are on the bandwagon. I think it is something that is worthwhile and I am hoping that it is something that will not pass away. I had the pleasure—I suppose that is the word—to serve on the Quetico Park advisory committee. That committee is still operative. We have now to prepare a management plan for Quetico Park. As you are aware sir, the committee recommended to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), and to the government, in effect, that no more commercial logging be allowed to take place in the 1,760 square miles of Quetico Park.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. Stokes: Provided there was no loss of jobs.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Provided that there was no loss of jobs and no detriment to the economy. I thank my friend from Thunder Bay. I should have remembered that, because I feel that this was the proposal that I put to The Department of Lands and Forests some three years ago.

I suggested that they should move out of Quetico Park, move the commercial lumbering out of Quetico Park and preserve it as a

wilderness area. There has been a great deal of discussion, Mr. Speaker, about the pros and cons of wilderness areas, whether we should have them or whether we should adopt the multiple-use concept and so on.

As I say, I have been in the forefront, I believe, in trying to preserve Quetico Park for as long as it is feasible to do so. I think it is incumbent upon me, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks about my attitude to Quetico Park, because I believe it is my responsibility to inform the people of the Province of Ontario, and in particular my constituents in the Rainy River district, as to my reasons for doing so.

Many of us have heard all the arguments before—of course, those of us who served on the committee have heard them all—but I would like to reiterate some of them with a background to the conservationist practices that I have outlined previously.

There is a book here called, "Why Wilderness?" which is put out by New Press, a Toronto publishing company, and there are various articles in here written by people who have been in the forefront of the desire to save the wilderness areas for generations to come and for the people presently using them.

When we talk about wilderness, of course, it means various things to various people. However, one of the better definitions of wilderness, I think, can be found in this book. It was drawn up by students at the University of Toronto who formed an organization, the Canadian Society for Wilderness Preservation. Their definition goes this way:

> Wilderness is that part of our natural landscape which is sufficiently large and varied to constitute a more or less self-regulatory ecological unit, where man's interference with the land and associated natural communities of plants and animals is minimal and where the beauty and the character of the landscape is such as to have aesthetic, cultural and scientific significance.

I would agree with that definition most heartily, Mr. Speaker.

And I think that wilderness is something worth preserving, because we suffer, perhaps particularly in the north, from a feeling that we have almost too much wilderness, that we can step out our back doors and we are in wilderness. For those of us who live in the north, this is true. It is not true, of course, for those who live in the urban environment, particularly in southern Ontario. They have pretty well all their areas blacktopped or a highway expressway running through them.

It is therefore something that is worth preserving, and we must do so. Because the wilderness, whether we want to believe it or not, is fast disappearing. Anyone who travels in northern Ontario will note the number of roads that are being pushed through the wilderness to lakes for fishing, for tourist camps to be put up, or the roads to mines or to communities where some kind of industry is going on.

Very shortly, Mr. Speaker—and I would predict within about a 10-year period—practically all of northwestern Ontario is going to be criss-crossed with a complete network of roads and there will be very few lakes or areas where there is any semblance of a wilderness state left.

You shake your head, Mr. Speaker. You look perplexed, but I tell you from my own observations and from those of others that this in indeed a fact, and this is why I think it was so necessary that Quetico in particular be preserved.

We are going to run out of wilderness areas and the values that go with them. Unless one has experienced the wilderness, I suppose it is a difficult thing to put into words and to try to convince somebody who looks upon forests in simple economic terms as so many board-feet of lumber or so many tons of kraft paper. There are values inherent in wilderness and these must be preserved.

We suffer, I think, under a delusion that we have unlimited resources and that there is nothing that we can do which will ever result in us running out of these areas. I say to you this afternoon, sir, that this is not true, and it is for this reason that I was for the preservation of Quetico Park as a wilderness area. Those of us who live in the north, as I have said, who can step outside and be in the wilderness, perhaps are sufficiently aware that this is in effect a dwindling resource.

I would attempt, Mr. Speaker, to press upon you the desirability of maintaining wilderness areas, and I would like to read to you from a little poem that was written by Byron. He says:

> There is a pleasure in the pathless woods,
> There is a rapture on the lonely shore,
> There is society where none intrude,
> I love not man the less, but nature more,

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative that we have wilderness areas where a man, with his wife or by himself, can go to seek solitude and to seek isolation from the trials and cares of the everyday life; particularly, Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in an urban environment.

I think I appreciate areas like Quetico Park the more because of the vast amount of time I have to spend in Toronto which, although it is a great city, a beautiful city, is a little short really on sparkling water and green trees.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It will be nice without the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes it will be indeed; but for one raised in the north, it still is not home and never will be.

Mr. Nixon: Those trees have been cut down already at a cost of $70 million.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is okay. We will put them back. It was not us who cut them down.

Mr. Nixon: We should speak to the Premier (Mr. Davis) about making that into an airport.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, Quetico Park is a unique area. It is unique historically, it is unique scientifically, and it is unique aesthetically. It is known as the best canoe country on the North American continent. Surely, for these reasons, it was worth preserving?

I canoe as much as I can in Quetico Park. I have a camp on a lake which borders on Quetico Park and I can tell you that it is a fantastic experience. I only wish that more people could take advantage of it.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine was in my office this week; he is taking a course in clinical psychology. He is a Canadian, but he is doing his internship at Madison, Wisconsin. We were discussing this very problem and he said: "You know, it is a strange thing but many of the people in my building who are also in this course go up to Quetico. They say it is refreshing, relaxing, it renews them," and this of course is the value of wilderness itself.

Mr. Speaker I was struck, when I was in Europe a while ago, that the historical landmarks and the symbols of the culture and history of the various European countries that I was in were summed up in their museums and in their capitals in what one could only call armaments, wars, violence. These were the museum pieces that these countries specialized in. This was their cultural heritage, their tradition, their background, their history.

The museums were full of pictures of great warriors, or pictures of battles, or cannon, or sabres, or guns. The monuments that were erected in various places of the country were raised to commemorate a battle where thousands were killed or where some kind of violence took place. This is their cultural heritage; these are their museums; this is their tradition.

Canada does not have a tradition like that. I suggest to you our tradition, our culture, can be found in an area like Quetico Park. For me, Quetico Park symbolizes the culture and is really what makes me a Canadian.

Now I could quote at great length from this book, "Why Wilderness?" and from some eminent Canadian historians, but the theme that runs through all these things, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that what makes us Canadians, which makes us unique, is the fact that we have this wilderness, that the country is forged out of this wilderness. I am not so sure I like even the word, "forged" because this is a hangup we have as Canadians in that we still look upon wilderness areas as something to be conquered instead of something to live with and appreciate and be part of.

Surely if there is anything the ecologists have taught us in the last two or three years, it is that we are all an integrated part of a system. We are part of a whole. There is a unity there and man alone does not stand outside that unity and see the wilderness, or the earth on which he lives, as something separate and distinct from him. We are a part of the system, an integral part, just as the water, the air, the trees are, and we must preserve these things if we are to preserve ourselves.

I would like to read something written on ecology, and I think it is worth repeating: It says:

> Something will have gone out of us as a people if we ever let the remaining wilderness be destroyed; if we permit the last virgin forest to be turned into comic books and plastic cigarette cases; if we drive the few remaining members of the wild species into zoos or to extinction; if we pollute the last clean air and dirty the last clean streams, and push our paved roads through the last of the silence, so that never again

> will Canadians be free in their own country from the noise, the exhausts, the stinks of human and automotive waste, and so that never again can we have a chance to see ourselves single, separate, vertical and individual in the world, part of the environment of trees and rocks and soil, brother to the other animals, part of the natural world and competent to belong in it.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that perhaps by the way we treat our earth that we are not competent to live in it.

This pretty well sums up, Mr. Speaker, the last part of that quote—the feeling that one gets as one canoes through an area like Quetico Park. There is a feeling of being one with nature, and there is a feeling of accomplishment, because in this day and age of the push button and the automatic dispenser of everything, I think it is necessary that we return to some kind of physical feat in which we use our minds and our bodies and to which we present to our minds and our bodies, a challenge, a challenge of the wilderness, of living with the wilderness and being able to survive in it.

Mr. Stokes: It would help us to learn to live with one another, too.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is it exactly, because believe me, Mr. Speaker, when you get out on a lake at night, or when you are camped by a lake at night and the only illumination you have is a moon or a flickering fire, and you hear the lonely call of a loon you do not hate anybody at that moment, I can tell you. There is a fantastic feeling of peace that comes over one in a situation like that. If I were a doctor or a psychiatrist, I would recommend something like this.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There are a few here I want to ship out there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I can arrange it. I would recommend this for everybody and, particularly to the members of the Legislature who are always under constant pressure from constituents or under constant pressure to get legislation through. It is a fantastically refreshing experience and it is a challenge that will use and require every facet of a person's personality and physical makeup.

There is another quote I would like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a quote from Walden by Henry David Thoreau, entitled "The Wilderness." Thoreau said:

> We need the tonic of wilderness, to wade sometimes in marshes where the bittern and the meadow hen lurk, and hear the booming of the snipe, to smell the whispering sedge where only some wilder and more solitary fowl build her nest, and the mink crawls with its belly close to the ground.
>
> At the same time that we are earnest to explore and learn all things, we require that all things be mysterious and unexplorable; that land and sea be infinitely wild, unsurveyed and unfathomed by us because unfathomable.
>
> We can never have enough of nature. We must be refreshed by the sight of the inexhaustible vigour, vast and titanic features, the seacoast with its wrecks, the wilderness with its living and its decaying trees, the thunder clouds and the rain which lasts three weeks and produces freshets. We need to witness our own limits transgressed, and some life pasturing freely where we never wander.

An admirable sentiment, sir, and I agree with it.

I suggest to you, sir, that there are other areas that should be preserved like Quetico, and they should be preserved before some kind of commercial exploitation takes place that will eventually require some disturbance in the community because it is finally realized that these areas should be preserved. I think it is incumbent upon The Department of Lands and Forests to review its policy in regard to providing these kinds of areas for the people of the Province of Ontario.

In this regard I think that the organizations such as the Algonquin Wildlands League are doing an admirable job in bringing these matters to the attention of the people of the Province of Ontario. I do feel, however, sir, that the Wildlands League, at least in the person of its president—

Mr. Stokes: In spite of the fact that they think the member for Rainy River incompetent to sit on their advisory committee.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am just getting to that. Here comes the shaft.

Mr. Stokes: The but!

Mr. T. P. Reid: In spite of the foregoing remarks, sir, I must take great exception to the letter that was written under the name of Mr. Abbott Conway, president of the Algonquin Wildlands League, in which

he suggested that each and every member of the Quetico advisory committee was incompetent and had a vested interest in maintaining the commercial loggers in Quetico Park.

Mr. Deacon: He certainly knew how to win friends and influence people.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Now I suggest to you, sir, that this was a most foolish thing to do. The letter was sent before the recommendation of the committee was made to the Minister of Lands and Forests and the letter was published far and wide in all the local newspapers here in Toronto, in the newspapers in my area, and I am sure it had radio and television coverage, and it questioned the competence of the chairman and each and every member of that committee. I suggest that if the league or Mr. Conway felt this way, it was incumbent upon them to make these charges before the committee began to meet.

He attacked personally, in a most malicious manner I feel, the integrity of each and every member of that committee, including myself, including the member for Thunder Bay, including the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman). Not only that, but some of their facts were not correct at all.

In his search to find something wrong with each and every one of us, Mr. Conway came up with the fact that one of the members serving on the committee was obviously too old to serve on the committee. Really, Mr. Speaker, it was a most insulting letter.

But what bothers me even more is, the letter having been written, the letter having been given wide publicity, the committee subsequently having the recommendation that no commercial logging be allowed in Quetico Park—which after all was the goal that the Algonquin Wildlands League was after—no apology was forthcoming from Mr. Conway, none that I know of in any case. If there has been, it has not been transmitted to me.

I cannot speak on behalf of the other members of the committee but I think I would express their opinion that they all felt personally insulted, personally annoyed at the kind of charges that were levelled at them, at the insults to their integrity, and I think that it is incumbent upon Mr. Conway to write each and every member of that committee a letter of apology. I would suggest, that as for myself he can save himself the trouble because it did not bother me at all. Having been in the political business for four years now it will take a better man than Mr. Conway to disturb my equilibrium or get under my skin.

But I do feel that these men were serving, and serving the public good, to the best of their ability. If any criticism should have been levelled at the committee, it should have been directed at the minister, because he had the responsibility for the committee. But to personally attack each and every member of the committee, I suggest, was amongst other things bad taste and certainly bad policy, and I hope that Mr. Conway will, in due course, apologize as I would think is only good manners.

Well there are a few other topics I would like to discuss, Mr. Speaker, in this speech, one of which is the health problems in northwestern Ontario; Medicare, of course, and related problems. I would just like to spend a moment reiterating my position and that of my party on Medicare in the Province of Ontario.

This party has been pressing the government for quite some time now to integrate the hospital payments and the medical payments. Our research indicates this would save the province in the neighbourhood of $15 million to $20 million alone in administrative costs. Of course, it would also do away with the inconvenience to the taxpayer of having to fill out two cheques and send two separate envelopes in to pay for what really should be a package health proposal or policy. This is one of our proposals. The other proposal, of course, is that we do away with premiums altogether—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): For Ontario Hospital too?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Pardon me?

Mr. Ferrier: For Ontario Hospital too?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes

Mr Ferrier: That is something new. That has not been the policy.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well I said that; that is my policy.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He is making a quick policy now?

Mr. T. P. Reid: As far as medical payments go, we should do away with premiums altogether and the cost should be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund; if necessary, a percentage point could be added to the

personal income tax of all the people of the province. Again, the savings in administrative costs would be substantial. It seems to me that—

Mr. Ferrier: Would the member spell out how he is going to pay for the schemes?

Mr. Gaunt: We have already outlined that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is unfortunate the member has not been here for the last three years, because we discussed this—

Mr. Ferrier: I was in every session that considered the Health estimates, and I never saw that spelled out for us.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well if he would listen closely; it would be most beneficial to him, if he would listen particularly to the speeches of the leader of the Liberal Party who outlined the policy of this party in regard to premiums some time ago—over a year or two years ago now. I will send my friend from Cochrane a copy of a pamphlet that was printed by the Liberal caucus and disseminated widely, outlining—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): They must have made it in the quiet wooded area.

Mr. Nixon: Right down in Oshawa!

Mr. Pilkey: We got one of them. We got one of these pamphlets. We met with the managers and went through the plant with the worker—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You mean you have a spy in our caucus too?

Mr. Ferrier: I will await delivery of one.

Mr. T. P. Reid: To save time, perhaps the member for Oshawa can provide the member with one. He obviously has got one, and if he has not, the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Rainy River should direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, through you I will endeavour to supply the hon. member with a complete résumé of the Liberal approach to this problem, and I am sure that having read it, and appreciating its reasonableness and balanced approach to this problem, he will probably leave that party and move over here, where I think he likely belongs anyway.

Mr. Pilkey: Good. That will be it.

Mr. Gaunt: Set out about 1969.

Mr. Nixon: Come and join the party. We will consider his application.

Mr. Pilkey: Fifty-cent membership.

Mr. T. P. Reid: To reiterate, Mr. Speaker, our policy is to do away with Medicare premiums, and over the past two years we have reiterated this I would have thought ad nauseam, but perhaps some hon. members have not heard it. But to reiterate, to reiterate—

Mr. Pilkey: You are flexible. The Liberals would keep up day to day.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Flexible, but not viable.

Mr. Pilkey: I never know where they are, from one day to the next.

Mr. Gaunt: We know where we will be after the next election.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: So do we; with the loons!

Mr. Gaunt: Right over there.

Mr. Pilkey: Listening to the loons.

An hon. member: The hon. member will have lots of time to enjoy it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: To reiterate, we will do away with the premiums and pay for the cost of the Medicare scheme out of the general revenues of the Province of Ontario. Surely, this is an eminently reasonable approach to the problem?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You know, when I hear some of the comments and noises coming from the benches opposite, I often think I am on that lake late at night listening to the loons squeal back and forth, Mr. Speaker, except the loons usually sound much better and make a great deal more sense than some of the programmes and policies and interjections coming from that side.

As a matter of fact, after the election maybe we can stock a few lakes with some of the defeated Tory candidates because many of them over there are going to be in need of employment opportunities.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The hon. member is a little bit late with that one.

Mr. Gaunt: They are going down the drain.

Mr. Nixon: We will look after the boys opposite. There will be a vacancy on the parks commission.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would you like me to proceed, Mr. Speaker, or shall I adjourn now and—

Mr. Pilkey: That is a pretty good place to stop.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wishes to adjourn, I shall accept the motion.

Mr. Nixon: We will see what we can do for the member opposite on the Hog Marketing Board.

Mr. T. P. Reid moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that on Monday we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs in the natural resources committee; and they will be followed in the legal administration committee by The Department of Labour.

In the House we will consider the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, with the option of introducing further some of the legislation that will be on the order paper.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Young: What estimates will follow that in the House?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I cannot answer that at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 4, 1971

Failure of building trades unions to accept wage settlements, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. Bullbrook 2361

Mobile home development as alternative to public housing, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sargent 2362

Department involvement in layoffs at Uniroyal plant in Kitchener, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. Makarchuk 2363

Questionnaires to assess need in Metro for OHC housing, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis 2364

Ottawa turndown of participation in McClelland and Stewart loan, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 2364

Ontario position at federal-provincial conference, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 2364

Meeting with Metro principals to discuss alternative rapid transit proposal, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Bullbrook 2365

Decrease in public housing starts, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Young, Mr. Peacock 2367

De Havilland aircraft plant moving to Montreal, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lewis 2368

Further review of costs of regional government, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deacon 2369

Tons of corn used in manufacture of alcoholic spirits, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Spence 2370

New York City decision to purchase recycled paper for office use, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Burr 2370

Study re sale of keg beer for home consumption, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. B. Newman 2370

OPP treatment of young hitchhikers, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lawlor 2371

Legislation to correct shift in assessments from industrial to residential, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Deacon 2371

Land assembly schemes being undertaken by OHC, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Makarchuk 2371

Aid to small firefighting forces in remote communities and unorganized territories, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Stokes 2371

Hearing of charged in accused's community, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. T. P. Reid 2372

Tabling annual report, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart 2372

Deficiency of report of standing private bills committee re City of London bill, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 2373

Procedures governing exercise of statutory power granted tribunals by Legislature wherein rights, duties or privileges of persons are to be decided at or following a hearing, bill to provide, Mr. Davis, first reading 2373

Single procedure for judicial review of exercise or failure to exercise the statutory power, bill to provide, Mr. Davis, first reading 2373

Public Inquiries Act, 1971, bill intituled, Mr. Davis, first reading 2373

Civil Rights Statute Law Act, 1971, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 2373

Corporations Information Act, 1971, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2377

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Burr, Mr. T. P. Reid 2377

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. T. P. Reid, agreed to 2395

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2395

No. 58

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 7, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors in the east gallery today are students from St. Brigid's Separate School in Toronto and from St. Nicholas Separate School in Scarborough. In the west gallery, we have with us students from Alexandra Dunn Public School in Base Borden and from Greenglade Public School in Mississauga.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

The hon. member for Parkdale.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY RIOTS

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), I have a question of the Attorney General: Does the Attorney General intend to obtain a writ of prohibition to stop the federal investigation into the Kingston Penitentiary matter in view of the fact that there are 11 guards on trial as well as prisoners?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that that course of conduct on my part had not occurred to me. We are proceeding with the administration of justice in this province as the result of certain allegations that have been made and police investigations have convinced us that prosecution should take place. Those prosecutions are taking place.

We have had no problems so far with the federal penitentiary investigation. There has been no lack of co-operation and, as far as I know, no conflict between what they are doing and what we are doing.

Mr. Trotter: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there not a danger that evidence could come out at the public inquiry conducted by the federal government that would endanger a fair trial for the 11 guards and 13 convicts who are on trial? The case is being heard before they are being tried.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I certainly think we will cross that bridge when we come to it. I am indebted to the hon. member for bringing that point of view to me. My understanding, of course, is that the federal investigation is not open to the public, that it is taking place in closed session, but, certainly, now that the hon. member has brought it to my attention, I will take cognizance of it and watch it very carefully.

Mr. Trotter: Would the Minister of Justice look into the matter and report back to the House probably by the end of the week?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No; I am talking to the hon. member right now. I do not intend doing anything about it, unless it appears to me that injustices or inequities are taking place. If that happens, certainly, I will make my position known to the federal people.

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES ON PLANT CLOSURES

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour, seeing he is one of the few here. Does the government intend to amend the regulations to The Employment Standards Act, permitting a company that has a collective agreement to opt out of the regulations whereby it no longer would need to give the four-week notice to employees where a plant is closing down?

Hon. G. Carton (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Trotter: There is no truth at all to the rumour that—I might put it this way: Does the minister contemplate amending the regulations in any way, affecting the notice to the workers the plant will close down?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker, there are no changes contemplated.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Parkdale have further questions?

SAFETY OF CHILDREN AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Trotter: Yes, one short one. I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development in regard to Ontario Place. In view of the fact that there have been complaints as to the safety, particularly for children, at Ontario Place, has the minister's department carried out any type of investigation as to the railings, not only on the lakefront, but particularly on the ramp going up to the Cinesphere?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have not had any complaints from the public. I know they had quite a review on it before we finished it up and the railings, as far as I can recall, to the Cinesphere and the ramps leading up to it—indeed all of them—as far as I can see, are perfectly safe. Of course, somebody can always climb over them and fall in, I guess, but if the hon. member has any specific complaint I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Trotter: Is it not true that the railings are rather pliable and a small child can fall through?

Hon. A. Grossman: A small child could fall through if he tried hard.

Mr. Trotter: Is it not wiser for you, after you have had some experience, to take precautions before a tragedy does happen?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He could, but I do not know what else I can do other than put up a completely solid wall which I do not think would be advisable. Certainly, I have no information that there has been an accident so far; I think that at about this hour we probably will have seen our 300,000th visitor to Ontario Place. I have not heard of one unless the hon. member can advise me.

Mr. Trotter: Is it not wiser, after you have had some experience, to take precautions before a tragedy does happen? None of us wants to, but is it not wiser to double check?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what the hon. member means when he says "after experience is it not wiser to take some precautions?" We have taken whatever precautions are deemed necessary. If experience, of course, proves that more precautions are necessary, we will take them.

Mr. Trotter: We will go into that later on.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Trotter: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Is it the Premier's intention at the constitutional conference on June 14 in Victoria to support the Premier of Quebec's policy that the provincial government wants to have priority on policies involving income maintenance?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with what discussions, if any, have been going on between Quebec and the federal government as it relates to social policies in any definitive terms. I do understand there has been some discussion concerning social policies but from our standpoint we have to determine specifically what these suggestions are, and what their impact would be in this province. At this moment, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help the hon. member with anything further than that.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary? If the Premier of Quebec does protest at the conference that he wants control of all social security payments within the province, does the government of Ontario intend to make common cause with him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say that whatever is determined in any area, if I can phrase it this way, if there is to be some determination that certain programmes in one province will be allocated to them, as a matter of principle, I believe that this should be available to all the other provinces on the same basis. As I say, during the next two or three days, I really am not going to speculate on what may or may not happen because the negotiations are relatively confidential. I just do not want to do this until I find out exactly what may transpire.

Mr. Sopha: If I may persist just a little bit further; may I ask the Premier this: Has he made up his mind before going there, whether, in the event that Premier Bourassa puts forward the contention that he wants control of the social security payments in Quebec, he intends at that time to make common cause with him or will the Premier oppose him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to assume that we will not be making common cause. Ontario has never until this time, to my knowledge, made representations about the social programmes. There are one or two of the programmes—take Manpower, for instance, which has been included as a

social programme—where I think one could argue quite legitimately that it is also an educational programme and within the jurisdictional interpretation of the provincial responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, our position as a province over the years has been, certainly recently, that a number of these things could perhaps be accomplished in some form of tax reform. If one is going to get into distribution of powers in one area there should be assessment of distribution of powers throughout the total spectrum. But, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I cannot be much more helpful than that to the hon. member at this point.

Mr. Sopha: I had better go with the Premier to that conference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your leader is coming.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

POLICY ON WELFARE TO SINGLE RECIPIENTS

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), could the Premier tell us if, in order to carry out the new government policy of the transportation of single welfare recipients from one part of the province to another part, there has been any assessment carried out to ascertain if there are more jobs available in one part of the province than, say, in Toronto or Hamilton or any other part?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the speech made by the Minister of Social and Family Services presented some ideas for consideration, one of them being the possibility that for a welfare recipient to receive payment it meant there was no job situation somewhere else.

One of the difficulties and practical implications of this, of course, would be some form of mechanism. I am not sure of this, but I do not think, for instance, that the Canadian Manpower offices, here in Toronto, can say just what job opportunities there may be available in Thunder Bay. I am just guessing at this, but I do not think they can.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is a rather large difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, the Minister of Social and Family Services was presenting several ideas in the speech that he made—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He was talking a lot of rot, and the Premier recognizes that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —related to a number of the problems that we face in welfare today, but there is no—

Mr. Lewis: Provocative, reactionary rot.

Mr. Trotter: Tory rot.

Mr. Lewis: Typical stuff.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no provincial policy at the moment.

Mr. Lewis: It is the latest Tory policy against youth and the unemployed—the attack persists.

Mr. Trotter: In view of the Premier's remarks, is it true then that there is no provincial policy, that the minister was in error?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the full text of the speech, I have only read the news stories. My understanding of what was in the speech is that he was not stating government policy.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a supplementary. Is it correct then that no assessment whatsoever has been made as to the jobs in one part of Ontario, or what the cost would be of transporting a welfare recipient to some other part of the province? There is no policy in regard to this?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): It was provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought I explained this. I said the Minister of Social and Family Services presented in his speech—

Mr. Trotter: It is incredible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you will give me an opportunity I will tell you what happened. He gave a number of possibilities as to how the problem might be approached, one of them being the possibility of requiring an individual to work—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Every one of them was offensive.

Mr. Lewis: And the Premier is embarrassed about it. He is plenty embarrassed about it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Government policy fails —the Premier punishes somebody.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am never embarrassed—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One thing about being the head of this party or this government, Mr. Speaker, the only embarrassment I suffer is from over there. I do not suffer embarrassment from my colleagues at all. The member for Scarborough West should be so lucky.

Mr. Lewis: Who knows?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the Leader of the Opposition would be even luckier. Now where was I?

Mr. Lewis: I know with friends like the Minister of Social and Family Services, who needs—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Could I explain to the member for Parkdale that one of the practical problems involved in such a possible approach is the fact that I believe at this moment there is not that kind of information available, geographically, around the country—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the government not analyse it before it announces policy then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —so that somebody could go into the Manpower office, say in Brampton, and determine whether or not there is a job opportunity in Windsor. I do not think that kind of information is available, in which case this is one of the practical difficulties, and I hope I do not have to repeat it again this afternoon, this was one of a series of thoughts presented by the minister related to this very difficult problem.

Mr. Lewis: The thoughts of Chairman Tom.

Mr. Trotter: Just one more supplementary: I assume then that this was not a policy statement—the minister was just flying a kite. In view of that, does the government intend to follow such a policy or carry out such an assessment as to the cost of transporting people who are on welfare?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Parkdale has been here sufficiently long to know that when government policy is determined it will be announced here in this Legislature, if it is sitting.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Give him a slap on the fingers.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, were there any parts of the hon. minister's speech which can be regarded as government policy, or were they all the thoughts of Chairman Tom?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I have not seen the full text of the remarks, I will endeavour to make a copy available to the hon. member. I shall read it myself and we will determine those areas that are specifically government policy.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That makes more sense than Chairman Mao.

Mr. Lewis: —is the Premier aware of any large numbers of able bodied males who are presently employable and have not taken jobs offered to them in various municipalities throughout Ontario?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): How about Yorkville?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot put specific numbers on it but it has come to the attention of the department that there are a number. I cannot say what percentage or how many, but there are a number, and I cannot give you any more information than that—

Mr. Peacock: Like the young people last week are a number.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as it relates to figures.

Mr. Lewis: Then by way of supplementary, to whose attention has it come and from which municipalities? Can the Premier speculate on the general number involved? It is pretty tough stuff for the Minister of Social and Family Services, without any documentation again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to get this information for the hon. member. I have no reluctance in saying we will endeavour to get this for him—

Mr. Trotter: I do not think it is comparable.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I do not speculate.

Mr. Randall: With friends like the members of the opposition they would all be on welfare.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: May I ask the Prime Minister, when a member of the cabinet engages in kite-flying

efforts on possible new policy, is it not his obligation to work out these mechanisms as to how you might transfer people from one part of the province to another before he begins his kite-flying?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it has been an approach of all people in government to make suggestions from time to time—even I have done it, as have many others—related to possibilities without having all the t's crossed and the i's dotted and so on. This does not preclude any public discussion of it. Public discussion of these issues is very healthy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I think the Premier thought it was far enough removed that there would not be any feedback from Thunder Bay.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, does the Premier know of any jurisdiction in the world other than Russia where this is done?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, very frankly, I have made no assessment as to what the situation is even in Russia, so I could not comment as to all the other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask Trudeau, he knows all about it.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary on this question.

Mr. Pitman: A further supplementary: In view of the fact that in one municipality when work was provided they had many more applicants from welfare rolls than they had jobs to give, I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate whether there has been any attempt to find out how many municipalities have provided working experiences for the people on welfare and what results came of those efforts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot give the hon. member this information. I will endeavour to do so. Perhaps he might like to put it on the order paper and we will try to get it for him.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Parkdale further questions?

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier might get down to some facts instead of general philosophizing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for York South would be confused if we did.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. MacDonald: We would not be confused.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member would be confused. How is he feeling?

Mr. MacDonald: Fine.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, of the 207,000 unemployed in the last month for which figures were available—I believe it was March or February—17,400 were employable single individuals on general welfare. Does the Premier have any knowledge of what percentage of those 17,400 his Minister of Social and Family Services was referring to in his statement last night?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member those figures. I might suggest the leader of the New Democratic Party do a little research and see if something of the same concept—and I would not want to be committed to this, I am just going by memory—but there was some indication of this by the former leader of the federal New Democratic Party, I think in 1963. There was some suggestion of this being a possible approach, but I will do my own research more carefully to see that that is what happened.

Mr. Lewis: I—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the hon. member remember it?

Mr. Lewis: An annihilating report—I will certainly look into it. By way of supplementary: Does the Premier concur with the speculative questions raised by his Minister of Social and Family Services last night, and the implied vilification of the unemployed, and before that, the youth the week before?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that this question is merely supplementary to the previous question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think it is supplementary, but—

Mr. Lewis: It is supplementary and I have a right to an answer.

Mr. Speaker: I indicated to the House that there would be no further supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —no ministers are, nor am I, involved in any vilification of the unemployed or the youth—none whatsoever, implied or otherwise.

Mr. Lewis: Right! By way of supplementary: When is the Premier—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member has had his supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have indicated previously that, in my view, as set forth in the standing orders, there have been a reasonable number of supplementary questions to that particular question. We have spent a considerable number of minutes on that first question and I think there should be no further supplementaries on that particular question.

CONSULTATIONS ON JOBS BETWEEN MINISTERS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I pursue it from different avenues. I am asking a new question, Mr. Speaker, which I think is my right.

Mr. Speaker: I will listen to the question.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know from the Minister of Labour whether his colleague, the Minister of Social and Family Services, consulted with him in advance of the statement yesterday assessing the various job estimates and available positions of the Manpower offices across Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Does the Minister of Labour himself have any knowledge as to the job availability across the province and those which have been turned down by eligible, employable males?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Does this minister intend to fly similar kites on other occasions?

Mr. Randall: No, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. Lewis: It is all right. The member for Don Mills has a nice voice.

May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier? Is the conference on economic nationalism, or on foreign investment, which the Premier is holding on June 23 to 25 open to the public? What are the ground rules?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not open to the public, but there will be a number of people there. The reason it is not open to the general public is partially physical limitations.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the Premier will, therefore, have delegates from individual organizations. He will, no doubt, allow the press and media, but—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The press and the media will be there. Hopefully, it will be fully covered.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But, in other words, we cannot extend a blanket invitation to all the citizens of the province. There just is not enough room.

Mr. Lewis: Those who might wish to attend, as ordinary mortals, cannot attend. The government has managed to find a hall, I gather, with about 350 or 400 places. There was nothing larger available to government in southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There will be 500, including the media.

TERMINATION OF GRANTS FOR HAEMOPHILIAC RESEARCH

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health: Can the Minister of Health explain to the House why he terminated the grants on haemophiliac research at the Ontario Veterinary College?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): No; I cannot, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out the background and reply.

SURVEY OF NIAGARA REGION CONSERVATION AND RECREATION NEEDS

Mr. Lewis: Well, that certainly seems reasonable enough. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management?

Back in April, 1970, he indicated to the Ontario naturalists' convention that a complete survey of conservation and recreation needs in the Niagara region would be conducted last summer in his department. He felt that the study would no doubt lead to

additional recommendations for the acquisition of desirable sites in 1971-1972. Would the minister table his study on the Niagara region and the Niagara Escarpment and would he indicate whether or which desirable sites have flowed from that study?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that study has been completed yet; when it is, I will table it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since the minister is not sure whether or not it has been completed and therefore could table it tomorrow were it to have been completed, could the minister check for us and come back to the House with it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The reason I say I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, is I have not seen a copy of it but it may be available. I will make sure that if it is available, a copy is tabled.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, this survey of the Niagara area was done exclusively by the minister's department, was it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am still not sure. There have been a number of studies, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure if this was a joint study involving Economics, for example, or The Department of Lands and Forests, but I know that there was a somewhat similar study, referred to by the hon. member; whether that is available yet I cannot say with certainty.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have any further questions?

FUNDING OF SPADINA EXPRESSWAY

Mr. Lewis: One last question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Would the Premier be good enough to table the document signed on behalf of the government of Ontario by the then Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) and by Mr. Allen, was it, then head of Metropolitan Toronto, regarding the funding of the Spadina Expressway, the document originating in 1963, I believe?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will think about it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what would give the Premier cause to ponder? Is it not legitimate for public view?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government ponders everything it does. This is one reason we have been so successful.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is a ponderous government.

Mr. Lewis: They are a very ponderous bunch.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We think. We are not intellectually nude.

Mr. Lewis: What?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nude.

Mr. Lewis: You are an emperor without clothes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I see.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

POISONING OF WILD ANIMALS IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. In view of the article that appeared in the Raven, a bulletin written by the Algonquin Park staff during the summer months, which mentioned that sometime last November or early December a deer that had been taken by wolves was loaded with strychnine by someone, and some four or five wolves were poisoned, as well as a number of ravens and perhaps a golden eagle, in view of this does the minister feel that guerilla warfare is being waged against the wolves in Algonquin?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, this matter is under investigation. We have been trying to ascertain who was responsible for the poisoning and I would be pleased to keep the hon. member informed of the results of our assessment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the minister responsible for Ontario Place. Are waitresses working at Ontario Place, which is under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, being refused their legal rights under section 12(2) of The Employment Standards Act, which states that,

> The employer shall provide a female with private transportation to her residence when the work period of a female

employee ends between 12 o'clock midnight and 6 o'clock in the forenoon;

Secondly, if any waitresses are thus being denied their legal rights, will the employer or employers involved lose their concession permits at Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, first, now that the hon. member has made his charges and issued a press release yesterday, I appreciate the fact that he does me the courtesy of asking me the question, now that he has made his decision. I appreciate that very much. Always on Sunday, I appreciate it.

Mr. T. Reid: I phoned the minister at home on Saturday night.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is it true the member has a relative on the CBC news?

An hon. member: He is a Sunday man.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that all of the young ladies working at Ontario Place are familiar with their rights. They have been advised that cab fare would be provided under such circumstances. In fact, this has been done in numerous instances where they have asked. They know all they have to do is ask. As far as the concessionaires are concerned. We have canvassed the concessionaires and they advise us that they have done the same thing.

If the hon. member has information which would lead him to believe otherwise, I would be very pleased if he would give us the instances and the names, and I can assure him, in spite of the charge he made that they were being intimidated, there is no intimidation. We would be very pleased to investigate the matter and correct it if such is the case.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question. Am I to understand therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is satisfied through the investigations he has made, if any, that there are no female waitresses at Ontario Place who are being denied their rights under that subsection of The Employment Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am only telling the hon. member that I have been so advised and I have no reason to believe the information is not correct. That is why I tell the hon. member, if he had any such information, I would be pleased to have it, and feel it is his duty to provide it, and if such is the case we will see that it is corrected.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough, a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid: Will the minister, perhaps in conjunction with his colleague the Minister of Labour, investigate whether the practice that I have outlined has taken place at Kelly's Keg 'n Jester Pub on the island?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, obviously if I go to Kelly's Keg 'n Jester Pub and ask them this—and they have replied as apparently they have, because I am advised that the concessionaires have so advised my officials—they say this is not the case. It the hon. member has such an incident, or if he knows of such an incident, would that not be better? I would point out to him, rather than argue back and forth day after day on this matter, if he has such a case, if he would let me know, I assure him that it will be corrected.

Mr. T. Reid: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could not the minister ask his colleague, the Minister of Labour, to initiate an investigation into the employment practices of Kelly's Keg 'n Jester under section 33 of The Employment Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess I could ask him, Mr. Speaker, but merely because the hon. member comes in with some vague charge about some vague instance of not carrying out the law, does he think we should carry on an investigation every time such a charge is made without anything to back it up? If the hon. member has such information in that case and if it is serious enough to cause an investigation, we will have one. If he has one or two cases—and it could happen; we have a lot of students who are employed there, some are going in and out, some are moving to other jobs, and of course some of these things could happen.

Maybe in some instances he may even find some young lady who has come in and who has not been told that this is her right. This could happen. By and large, I am told that the employees know this and they have taken advantage of their rights. Now why does the hon. member not stand up and say, "I would be prepared to give you this name; would you please investigate"? I would be pleased to do it for him.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister not aware that

employees at that particular pub have not been told their rights and have not been receiving transportation home at night; and that this minister, in conjunction with his colleague the hon. Minister of Labour, has the legal responsibility under The Employment Standards Act to initiate such investigation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. member has said something specific. He has asked me whether I know that they have not been told their rights. Now that is something I can work on. I can find out whether in fact this is the case. If the employees at this particular pub, as he calls it, have not been told this I will find this out and if that is the case we will soon correct it. Now he said something, now I can do something about it, if in fact that is the case.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the minister ask the employees too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course we will ask the employees too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCE ON COSTS OF EDUCATION

Mr. Pitman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education. I would like to ask him, when will the minister announce the names of those who will be joining Dr. McCarthy on the committee or commission which is supposed to be looking at the cost of education?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): The membership of the task force will be announced very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary: Can the minister indicate why there has been such a delay in view of the fact that this matter received so much attention both in this House and indeed in the wider community?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is for that very reason that we have taken a great deal of care, with respect to the terms of reference and to the membership to ensure the fullest possible investigation by the task force.

Mr. Pitman: Might I ask a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if the minister would indicate at this point when, for example, he would expect the hearings to begin? When there will be an interim report, and indeed, when the final report will be made available by the task force?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As I indicated, we hope to have the membership announced very shortly and we expect the task force to present interim reports as they are ready. One area which will be of particular interest, of course, for the report will be the effect of this year's spending ceilings insofar as the quality of education is concerned. I will indicate to the task force at that time —that I hope they might address themselves to that in the early stages of their study and attach some priority to that.

Mr. Pitman: As a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the minister whether on this task force he has ensured that there will be representatives of parents, students and teachers, in regard to this discussion on the whole question of the cost of education?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfying myself that the membership of the task force will be very representative.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

INDICTMENTS FOR INCOME TAX EVASION

Mr. Sopha: Yes, a question of the chief officer of the Crown, along similar lines to that which I asked his predecessor last spring—receiving a certain vacuity of response—that notwithstanding the outstanding indictments for income tax evasion against Stafford Smythe and Harold Ballard, what consideration is being given to the laying of charges under the Criminal Code against these two individuals?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, government policy in this regard will be known very shortly.

Mr. Sopha: I asked this question last spring, as I say, and I am going to pursue it a little bit further to ask this: Was a transcript of the preliminary inquiry in the income tax indictments obtained? Was it studied by the law officers of the Crown, and might the House expect that some charges will be laid under the Criminal Code shortly?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have nothing further to add than my answer in the first instance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South.

LEGISLATION DEALING WITH NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I would like to ask him when we can expect some action on non-returnable bottles; whether he is going to tax them, ban them, or charge a deposit on them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member probably knows, the report of the litter council was just filed recently and tabled in this House. We are still studying the recommendations made in that report. It is my hope that in any legislation which will be brought forward at the current session there will be something in that legislation dealing with that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. May I ask the minister, since in his own words he said that the guts of the report were in the alternatives, is the legislation being prepared on the basis of those alternatives?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the legislation will deal with the basic recommendations, the basic programme of the report. It is quite possible, depending on the results of our deliberations over the next week or so, that one of the alternative suggestions could also be included in any such legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington South.

ISSUANCE OF CHARTER TO EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Would he inform me when I can expect an answer to my question of some three weeks ago in regard to issuing the charter to the Ontario Management Employees Association?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I have that answer but I did not bring it with me today. I expect to start on my estimates today and probably sometime during the course of that trial I will give the answer. In any event, I can produce it shortly here in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

MAILING OF OHC QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. He is looking right at me anticipating this one. Why does the Ontario Housing Corporation persist in using the outmoded "mail-out" of questionnaires to determine the extent of need and demand for family housing in this province as reflected in the announcement last week?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will check the questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, and see, if in my view, it is outmoded. The hon. member may rest assured that if it is outmoded it will be changed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

UNIVERSITY MORTGAGES ON FACULTY MEMBERS' HOMES

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Would the minister inform the House if public money is involved in the practice whereby some universities hold mortgages on the homes of faculty members at prime lending rates or, if in fact, they are merely backing loans so that such faculty members can borrow at prime lending rates?

Hon. J. White (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard of this practice. My expectation is that public moneys are not being used, but I will check on that and inform the hon. member.

Mr. Good: A supplementary: Mr. Speaker, would the minister check to see if, in fact, universities are mortgagees for faculty members' homes?

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member get his reply?

Mr. Good: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

MINISTERIAL STUDY OF LIGNITE DEPOSITS

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. Is the minister prepared to report on the trip that he made with his colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests, over the weekend to study the lignite deposits at Onakawana, between Cochrane and Moosonee? Is he prepared to say what determination has been made about the possibility of using those in his discussions with people from Alberta?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are prepared to go into those discussions at this time.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary: Did anything fruitful come from the discussions and is there any possibility of utilizing that deposit in the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This will be revealed in the fullness of time when discussions are carried on further.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. MacDonald: Another pre-election junket.

Mr. Stokes: The government has been doing it for 30 years. I thought they would have the answer.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The government tries but still the member criticizes.

Mr. Lewis: Give me a chance.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Lewis: Emerald deposits in Kenora.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Diamonds.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, that is in Moosonee.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

REMOVAL OF HIGHWAY SIGNS

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Why did The Department of Highways officials or The Department of Transportation and Communications officials remove the sign recently erected by the town of Markham at its boundaries on Highway 48 and on another provincial highway?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am bound to admit I do not know. I shall have to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Trade and Development—Trade and Industries.

An hon. member: No, Development.

Mr. Gisborn: I was right the first time.

An hon. member: He never is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has been around long enough. It is all right.

RELAXATION OF AGE LIMIT FOR SENIOR CITIZENS' APARTMENTS

Mr. Gisborn: Will the minister consider a relaxation of the restrictions on the handicapped in their application for senior citizens' apartments? As he knows, they are restricted to those aged 60 years or over. The social planning council has recommended a relaxation. The managing director of the Hamilton branch for senior citizens' apartments has endorsed the recommendation. Will the minister now relax the age limit for the handicapped in being accepted in senior citizens' apartments?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that was a rather involved question and I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that. I will look into this and get the details of it and whatever is necessary to be done for the handicapped he may rest assured we will do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

REQUEST FOR SPEED-UP ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): A question of the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Is the minister aware of the recent additional deaths on the killer strip section of Highway 417, east of Ottawa?

Would the minister consider reviewing the construction programme for Highway 417 with a view to speeding up the completion of this highway? There were four more deaths last week on this killer strip.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had a report on the accident referred to by the hon. member. There will be a report with the full particulars disclosed to me in due course.

But as far as progress on Highway 417 is concerned, I would have to tell the hon. member it is proceeding as fast as possible.

Mr. MacKenzie: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: I understand the minister is proceeding as fast as he can, but would he review it? Present indications are, sir, that there will be another 50 deaths there before 417 is completed at the present rate, and we would like you, if you would, to give consideration to reviewing to see if there is any way to speed up its completion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is a much easier question to answer. The answer, of course, is yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

CUSTODY OF CHILDREN

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Attorney General: Is it a fact that a father may not apply for custody of his child in the family court, but must go to the surrogate or the Supreme Court? He cannot obtain a custody in family court as a mother can. Is this some form of prejudice?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is the case, but I also think that I had better check into it and take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

LAYOFF OF TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEES

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Due to the recent layoff of 25 male employees working on the Queen Elizabeth Way at the Dorchester circle within the last week, could the minister inform us why this layoff at a time when there is so much unemployment?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I shall have to get that information and make it available to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister offer them jobs in Thunder Bay when he laid them off? Did he offer them jobs in the north?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: No, just a couple of—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, not Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I gathered that.

DUMPING OF WASTE IN DETROIT RIVER

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is the minister looking into the licence of occupation of the Wyandotte Chemical Company—this licence of occupation granted by The Department of Lands and Forests—permitting them to export their liquid wastes on to Fighting Island, and is the minister considering any revocation of that licence?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this question, as the hon. member knows, was asked in a different way last week when we dealt with the problem of Wyandotte Chemical Company and Fighting Island. Since that time I have asked for a complete report from the commission and also information leading to the agreement between The Department of Lands and Forests and the company.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that such a question was asked well over a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not exactly, no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

CLOSURE OF CHEESE FACTORIES

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: In view of the fact that there is an increasing number of cheese factories being closed down with a consequent depressing effect on rural communities,

will the minister indicate to the House whether any change in milk marketing policy is under contemplation?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate to the House that any change is contemplated. The Milk Marketing Board determines the policy as far as industrial milk pricing is concerned. That is all I can say at the moment.

I do not agree entirely with my hon. friend from Middlesex South when he says the closing down of cheese factories has a depressing effect on the local economy. There are many cheese factories which came to us asking that some sort of provision be made for them in order that they could relieve themselves of the incredible debts that many of them had accumulated because there was simply no profit in processing industrial milk into cheese.

That is what prompted the Ontario government to provide a consolidation subsidy programme and it is a purely voluntary thing. The cheese factories themselves can make their own decisions as to whether they close up or keep open. It is entirely their decision, nobody is forcing them to do anything.

Mr. Bolton: As a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Carton presented the report of the select committee on company law respecting co-operatives.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What happened, Tim? What about the other charges?

Mr. T. Reid: Tomorrow!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the member for Scarborough East find out the facts?

Mr. T. Reid: Why did the youth pavilion close yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Swords at 10 paces.

Mr. T. Reid: With the minister I would say pistols.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement on that report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has a statement.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members are aware that two previous reports have been tabled by this committee. An interim report on the business corporations was filed on April 4, 1967 by the then member for St. George (Hon. A. F. Lawrence), and on December 15, 1969, a report on credit unions was tabled by me.

The co-operative movement in Ontario is one of the oldest in Canada. The main strength of the co-operative movement is based in agriculture, but in recent years there has been a growing interest in the co-operative as a social vehicle for meeting the economic needs of agricultural producers and consumers alike. This has led to an increase in the variety of co-operatives and in the services made available by co-operatives. At the same time, the increase in number and variety of co-operatives has accentuated the inadequacies of the somewhat archaic legislation by which they are regulated.

In this report, the committee has examined a number of problems brought to its attention and through its own research, and has attempted in its recommendations to suggest what is hoped are solutions which will foster the continuing growth and expansion of the co-operative movement in this province.

In conclusion, I would be remiss not to add a note of appreciation to the members of the committee, the counsel, Mr. John W. Blain QC, and staff. I am proud of the report and of my association with my fellow legislators in my capacity as chairman.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, being a member of that committee, I would like to congratulate the chairman. He was so successful in leading this committee that he became a minister of the Crown. I do want to say though, that it was an excellent group and the minister made a very good chairman. Even if he is on the other side of the House, I think it is fair to say that of him.

Also I would certainly agree with the minister that Mr. John Blain, who was counsel, did a superb job, I have been on committees before and we have brought in reports, but I can say to the members of the Legislature that these reports make good reading; they are well written. I want to congratulate the staff that we had.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr Speaker, I just want to say briefly that we join the member for Parkdale in the warm remarks he has made about the chairman and fellow members of the committee and members of the staff who

were of such able assistance to us in the preparation of this report.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton presented the annual report of The Ontario Department of Transport for the year 1970 and the report on highway traffic collisions for the year 1970.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information be referred to the standing natural and physical resources committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, before we reach the orders of the day, might it be possible to ask the House leader the estimate order the government has planned beyond his own estimates, which are coming up this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will answer as best I can at the moment. In committee, there is presently Mines and Northern Affairs. That will be followed by Labour. I think that was known to the House.

Then, I anticipate what was Highways and Transport and is now Transport and Communications would be in committee and, then, the one I have just moved, Tourism and Information.

Now there are left, in addition to my own department which is coming on today, Justice, Education, Municipal Affairs, Trade and Development, Treasurer, Revenue and the Prime Minister.

I would anticipate that probably Revenue might follow my own, but I cannot be firm about that. And those other departments, I must confess I do not have in their rotation at the moment I hope to have that ready very soon.

Mr. Lewis: We hope so too!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will do the very best I can.

Mr. Lewis: We are very anxious to learn how they are stacking the deck for the election.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am anxious to know also. There is no thought of stacking the deck. Oh no, nothing like that.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. The hon. minister.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, this is the first occasion on which I have had the honour of presenting the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, but it is not an altogether new exercise for me. All the items that comprise this department—with the exception, I think, of the corporations branch, which came over to this department recently, and the lotteries, which is a little better than a year old—were all part of The Department of the Attorney General through the years 1964, 1965 and 1966, until this department was created. So I find myself with many items with which I had to deal some years previously and with which I am somewhat familiar.

The department, I find, has grown in strength and in performance and I take some satisfaction in the recommendation which I made in 1965 or 1966 that it deserved the attention of a special department and of a minister, because the matters with which The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs deals are of such importance that they need daily and strict attention with special legislation, which perusal of these estimates will indicate, having been carried forward from year to year and actively from session to session.

My own feeling of this department from the beginning was that it deals with matters of great importance to society and to our people; that these things which are administered by Financial and Commercial Affairs touch the lives of everyone. I think the significance of the department cannot be overestimated. It is a busy department—one reason why it should have been created as a separate department—because there are many things when one thinks of real estate, real estate brokers, mortgage brokers, the field of insurance, all types and kinds of insurance, corporations, credit unions, con-

sumer protection—stuffed articles even. The whole gambit of our commercial life is touched by this department and administered by this department, and from day to day there are problems, questions and matters for decision arising in every branch of the department. As the estimates are discussed, I think this will become apparent to hon. members of the House.

With those rather personal remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal specifically with some of the work the department is doing, and I think this may be helpful to members to see how our work is progressing and the areas in which we are most active and where our estimates are spent.

The estimates of $5,887,000 which we ask for the department, cover a staff of 483 people. I suggest that it is not large when one compares it to the far-reaching effects which the programmes of the department have on the day-to-day activities of the people of this province. We administer 26 pieces of legislation, including the highly technical and sophisticated Securities Act—one of the branches I did not mention when I was enumerating our activities—which deals with investments in the province.

I might say that as we were moving the various branches that form a department from The Department of the Attorney General to constitute The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I had the great privilege to introduce to this House a new Securities Act back in 1965 or 1964. I think we took a great deal of time in preparing, drafting, considering, discussing, modifying amending that Act and you will note as we go through these estimates, that it has been kept very well up to date, and with a much enlarged and more capable—I say this not in any derogatory sense to the former Securities Commission, but under the legislation which we brought in we were able to give the securities commission larger, broader powers, and to strengthen its personnel. It was one of the things which I think was most worthwhile in doing because that particular area, as I well recall, in 1964 and 1965 gave us a great deal of concern. The hon. members will recall Prudential, Atlantic, British Mortgage, Ontario Natural Gas.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We will never forget it. Windfall!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, you will not forget, nor shall I forget. But I think I am prepared to stand here today and say that since the enactment of that new legislation and the formation of the securities commission with enlarged and strengthened powers, we have not had those crises to deal with. This is something in which I take some small satisfaction.

Since that legislation was brought in, as I say, there have been amendments, and I am sure the hon. members will make some comments about the field of securities during the course of the estimates.

I would like to refer also to another piece of legislation which comes within the purview of the department and this one is one of those recent ones—The Business Corporations Act. As I mentioned, the corporations came over to The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs about one year ago and the new Act which has been presented to and passed by the House represents a major initiative which followed the study of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on company law. That Act came in in 1970.

It has been described as a shareholder's bill of rights. It is a code of ethics for the corporate director and it strengthens the position of the auditor. Those are the three salient features, I think, of that new legislation.

Another Act which the House has seen fit to deal with is The Consumer Protection Act which was amended to define the status of unsolicited goods and credit cards received in the mail by consumers. Where unsolicited goods or credit cards are received in the mail, by this legislation the consumer is now not obliged to pay for the goods and he is not obliged by the credit card—or not obligated by the credit card—unless he uses it or agrees to its terms in writing.

There was an amendment to The Loan And Trust Corporations Act which prohibits the registration of the transfer or shares in a loan or trust corporation to a non-resident. I am sure the member for Lakeshore will probably have something to say in his remarks about that. This amendment, as I mentioned, prohibits the registration of the transfer of shares in a loan or trust corporation to a non-resident, where the total foreign ownership would exceed 25 per cent of the capital stock, or where any foreign owner would be registered with more than 10 per cent of the capital stock.

The Loan and Trust Corporations Act was amended to give Ontario loan and trust corporations powers similar to federally incorporated corporations. The amendment also updates financial reporting standards and

provides for additional supervision and control of loan and trust corporations.

The Insurance Act has been amended to authorize the superintendent to maintain a closer watch over the marketing factors of the insurance industry. Special attention was paid, through that amendment, to training and education and to the crucial question of improper conduct through methods which might involve coercion, discrimination or misrepresentation. The revision in The Insurance Act also provided for greater uniformity with federal legislation and provided for rehabilitation of companies where their financial condition was impaired.

In this session, Mr. Chairman, we have introduced an Act to provide for the control of credit reporting agencies, and that deals, of course, with the collection of credit information and credit reporting. The purpose of that Act—clear, I am sure to all members—is to ensure accuracy in information as it compiled and as it is distributed, and to enable persons on whom the report is made to have access to the persons acquiring, collecting and storing that information so the persons may see it and have the opportunity to correct it, should it be wrong.

We have introduced and carried through to third reading—if not to its final move—The Used Car Dealers Act which extended that Act to include new car dealers as well as the used car dealers.

We introduced an Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, and that has been carried, I believe, also to third reading—that new Act ensuring that the assignee of a conditional sale or other contract is in no higher position than the assignor in respect to the promise to pay in the contract.

These amendments also preserve the implied warranties in The Sale of Goods Act in consumer sales and prohibit the seller from having an agreement that the warranties shall not be there as a part of the sale and enforce it. I see the hon. member for Lakeshore looking with attention in this direction. He made some comment on that in the course of the introduction of that bill—I believe on second reading—but perhaps he did not have that opportunity? Possibly I may anticipate something from him in the course of these estimates.

We introduced an Act to amend The Corporations Act in this session. The hon. members who have read that bill will note that the reference to the mutual insurance corporations which have guaranteed capital stock is deleted since there are actually no mutual insurance corporations today which have that form of incorporation—this guaranteed capital stock—and by reason of the deposit and the licensing provisions now in The Insurance Act, it is no longer considered necessary for such corporations to have guaranteed capital stock.

We have introduced an amendment to The Securities Act to widen the provisions with respect to takeover bids and the insider trading provisions. I think these are essential and when the hon. members come to consider the amendment, the amending legislation, we will have a chance to discuss it further.

On some other matters we have studies going forward, particularly in the matter of franchising. A minister's committee in the department has been examining all aspects of franchising with special reference to referral and pyramid selling. That committee reported quite fully to me some few weeks ago, although they were not in the position to make a final report, but undertook that a final report would be forthcoming shortly. I expect daily that I will have a final report and possibly I will then be in a position to introduce legislation which I would hope would be based on recommendations from this committee which is studying the matter, which has problems and gives us some concern.

There is a committee of the minister examining all the methods and practices of handling insurance claims; I am sure that members are aware of that because it has been given publicity through our press media. That committee is active, and we are hoping that it will be able to complete its very important study without too much time and that we can go forward with some improvements in that area.

There is also the committee on automobile insurance, which is a very broadly based committee, representing people from the insurance field, the adjusters, the academic world, the lawyers, the public—in fact a very wide-ranging committee with competent people. It also has reported quite recently to me, and as a result of its report I think I may say to hon. members I expect to be in a position to offer, at least to my colleagues, legislation which I think would be desirable; and if my colleagues accept my recommendations, I may be coming to the House before long in this session with such legislation.

Legislation is also being drafted to implement many of the recommendations of the select committee on company law—it seems to

me I saw that report arriving on my desk today, and it is corroborated by the select committee on company law. We also have a report on credit unions. There are some recommendations there that we have been studying and discussing with the representatives of the credit union groups, and I would like to say to the members that I feel if government can move forward with the assistance of any responsible group in industry, have its co-operation and its responsible approach with government, this is a good way to achieve good legislation because then we have industry working with us and helping to see that their activity is conducted in a beneficial and a responsible way—beneficial, I mean, to the public.

It was recently my privilege to attend a federal-provincial conference on consumer affairs. It was called May 25 and 26 by the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Basford, at Ottawa. I might report to the House that, without being boastful at all, I think we found ourselves well in advance of the field with respect to the other provinces of Canada in the field of consumer legislation and consumer protection. I think it was recognized there by my opposite numbers in the provinces and even by the minister of the federal government that we were perhaps often giving a fair amount of leadership in this direction.

We have established in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs a consumer registration appeal tribunal. It is the first body of this kind or nature which has been set up in this country, and it was set up following the recommendations of the McRuer report. It is now in operation and is hearing appeals from decisions of the registrar dealing with real estate, with used cars and with other types of consumer legislation which is administered by the department. That is a new departure, I think—a board which will prove its worth in reviewing policies as they are administered by the director.

Mr. Chairman, a field which we consider of considerable importance in this department is consumer education and the furnishing of information to the consumer and to the public who are in the marketplace and who need to know their rights, their remedies and the laws which apply. We are expanding our work in that area and—from my own point of view and I am sure that of the officials of my department—we would like to expand that even more rapidly than we have been able to do under the constraints which finances impose upon us at the moment. As I present my estimates, I am sure you will look closely at the money which is asked for that purpose. We do not think we waste any money in pursuing the field of information and education to the consumer.

Our latest activity and another new departure is what we call the consumer caravan, which I mentioned to the House a few weeks ago and which perhaps some of you saw and examined out here in front of Queen's Park. We have had it moving now about the province on its first stops—it was at Ottawa during our conference there—and the public interest in it was remarkable. The public came out in great numbers to see it, to see what information and material was offered, to inquire, to complain, to make requests. The caravan was staffed with personnel to answer the inquiries, to take down the complaints, to forward them so that they could be dealt with, and in some cases to give immediate reply, advising what might be done by the consumer who had a problem.

I would like to suggest—and I will be suggesting to my colleagues—that this service should be expanded, because I think it is very much needed. That will entail the training of additional staff so they will be competent and capable to deal with the public in the field of education and information.

The Securities Commission continues to play a prominent role in the deliberations of the provincial securities administrators—this is where we go outside our own jurisdiction—and our Securities Commission, I think, provides initiative in the field of expanding interprovincial co-operation in that area. There have been major breakthroughs in several areas; they have been accomplished in the past year.

The commission is seeking to achieve, as far as possible, uniformity in legislation in the securities field across the country. The hon. members will agree with me, I am sure, when I point out that the dealing in securities does not know provincial boundaries, but that the trading in that field flows across provincial boundaries, as it should do. If we can achieve uniformity through co-operation, this would be a very desirable result.

Perhaps I might mention that, in discussing this with the hon. Mr. Basford, he has some thoughts in this area and it may be we will have some discussions about the role of the federal government in this field. It may very well be that some legislation can be achieved by co-operation. Certainly, some uniformity could very well be achieved, I

think, by co-operation and I think this is desirable and essential in this field.

One of the things which the Securities Commission has done is to draft policy on a national basis, actually, for a system of clearing of national prospectuses, so that they could be filed through one jurisdiction and there would be a clearing house where they would be readily available.

I come to what perhaps is not the most important branch, but is one which takes a good deal of our time and one which it is essential be firmly and well administered. That is the lotteries branch with which we have had just better than one year's experience. It was created following federal legislation.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury) Has the minister won one yet?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I have never been lucky. Anything I got I had to get through hard labour.

Mr. Sopha: It is a pretty ineffective minister who has not won one and yet is running them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Sometimes, even though they are licensed, I wonder if I should buy one.

During the course of the year the branch in the department has put in more than 30,000 licensed events and has accounted for prize money exceeding $22 million, but the experience has been that it has been well controlled. The department has control of the situation. As you know, those lotteries where the prizes do not exceed $3,500 are licensed by the municipality? When they exceed that they come to the attention of the province.

But the province, in every case, has knowledge of the objects, the purpose and the persons operating them. We get statistics on the take that is, the amount sold and the disposition of it, so that we are able to ascertain where the money went, what portion of it is used administratively, or for advertising or for paying persons and so forth. There has been a very tight and effective control on lotteries through our lotteries branch.

I think, perhaps, I had occasion in the House the other day to mention that there were some questions in my own mind as to the proliferation of lotteries, particularly those where they range across the province, perhaps initiated in some small locality or by groups of organizations such as service clubs and others, and where the purposes may be into areas where the province has responsibility to spend the taxpayers' money, such as education, or health, or recreation, or welfare. And perhaps some thought will need to be given if there is evidence of a very great growth and proliferation of lotteries that we may need to think out further the controls which we shall have to exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed generally, I think, the particular activities with which we are concerned. I say again, I think my estimates are not large for the very large work we do and I shall be delighted to examine them in detail with the members of the House.

Mr. Sopha: I had not intended to begin by saying something about the regulation of securities, but it becomes so apposite and germane to say it at this juncture of the province's history, in the history of our country, that I am once again going to take the opportunity to promote in this House the notion that the very soundest, sanest, most rational, far-reaching and progressive thing that Ontario could do in respect to the regulations of securities is to get out of the field and to give the field over to the federal government.

And indeed the Premier (Mr. Davis), if he were a statesman, would say to the Prime Minister of Canada next Monday at Victoria that here is one area that Ontario—the linchpin of the nation, the banner province of the nation, the founder of Confederation—here is one area that we are ready to vacate in order to give the federal government the facility to regulate the economy on a nation-wide basis.

Anybody with glass in one eye and sand in the other can see that it not only defies credulity but it tests rationality that this country should have 11 different county palatines regulating the marketing of securities.

Just to think about it for a moment compels one to no other conclusion but that Canada would be economically advanced, would be financially strengthened, in every way if we had but one jurisdiction, but one regulation of securities from coast to coast.

And of course somebody not so long ago got that brilliant idea, about one year ago, and Robarts turned him down flatly—the great statesman, the great promoter of the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, turned him down flatly.

Ontario's Premier, through his minister, who apparently talks to Mr. Basford, should

say to the federal government unequivocally that, "We are willing to vacate this field and to give it over to you in the interests of the national financial unity of this country," because part of the history of this Canada, part of its tragedy, is the fact that the federal government has not been able to affect the economy easily on a nationwide basis.

It has had to struggle and to manipulate and to get into areas of anti-inflation policy and tinker with the monetary system and adopt all kinds of exotic devices in an attempt to manage this vast nation as an economic unit.

But, in 1971, as in 1871, there is nothing new. You go home and your boy says, "What's new, Dad?" There is nothing new in this country. As a century ago, the provinces are jealous of their powers, unwilling to give up a single one. Oliver Mowat is as much alive today as he was at the turn of the century. But I say that is one area, the regulation of securities, where there is no justification whatsoever for the province to be in the field.

All right. That is in parentheses. I wanted to begin by expressing my felicitations to the minister and they are extended on the basis that he survived. We did not expect him to survive.

We tested him as the chief law officer of the Crown for a good many years and established very warm relationships with him. But came the nones of February and the beginning of March when this new government, this government took office and on the Friday this minister resigned as Attornatus Regis. He gave up the laurels of office.

We thought he was going to return to Sault Ste. Marie and that we had seen the last of him. At about the same time my friend from Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) was getting the phone installed in his car, waiting for the call from the Premier which never came, for him to join the government. Then, lo and behold, on the Monday morning, on March 1, the Attorney General turns up as Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

That was quite a feat. A considerable amount of mesmerism must have been exercised during those 48 hours. Because I was watching the papers and it said that Mr. Davis was going to make his calls over the weekend—he would be making his calls on Saturday and Sunday. I stayed near my phone also, always in the hope. And this minister, I am delighted to see—and I say that genuinely to him across the House—once again occupies an important portfolio in this government.

Now sir, I want to make a few remarks about this department. In my view the importance is not in the legislation that the minister is responsible for, as he has recited it. The importance of the department is the thrust of those several activities which it has under its jurisdiction and the energy and the determination with which those matters are projected on behalf of the people of this province.

In particular I single out, though I am going to return to some of the others later, I single out the department of consumer protection. There can be no activity, of course, that is of greater importance in this department than that one.

After all, under this important mandate is the responsibility for the protection of those who are trapped in the web of poverty and to whom it is crucial that they gain the maximum use of their income, because none suffer like the poor from shoddy goods. The rich can get wall-to-wall broadloom and buy all sorts of quality materials and exotic things to adorn their houses and their persons. But the poor have to make do with that which the dollar will fetch for them. If goods are bad, then it is a special injustice to the poor. Study after study has shown that it is the poor who pay more for consumer goods of lower quality than the average Canadian income earner. It is the poor who must resort to high-cost credit with little protection or guidance. It is the poor who are residents of our urban or rural ghettos—terms that I detest—who do not have access to outlets where comparable shopping and a wide range of goods are available. It is the poor and the uneducated and the unsophisticated who are taken in by the unscrupulous sellers, who fall prey to the unethical advertiser and who too readily get caught in the special kind of commercial jungle that is spawned on exploitation and fraud.

One student of the matter put it this way one time when he said—and I quote, "In reality, the poor buy different goods and services at different stores for different prices, and this has a profound effect on their standard of living, compounding, preserving and deepening their poverty."

So, therefore, there is a special obligation on the consumer protection division of this department, especially in these times, when we have far too many of our fellow residents of this province who have no income at all, save that which is supplemented under

benefits they may receive in replacement of income. Therefore, our efforts must not only aim at raising income, but we must also increase the quality of the goods which that income can provide. The Lord knows there are enough shoddy goods on the market nowadays.

I think it was Carlyle who said a long time ago that if anything can be made cheaper and less expensive and shoddier and of worse quality, then surely someone will make it and sell it at a cheaper price. We live in a society that is oriented toward the consumption of consumer goods, where so much emphasis is placed on the possession of things. We have such a high degree of stimulation by advertising. The consumer is faced with the bewildering, tantalizing need to grasp the nearest shiny object.

A problem of special severity is created for families on limited incomes, and a Canadian living in poverty is placed at a great psychological disadvantage in our marketplace. He is very much a victim, very much. Therefore, it is incumbent upon this department—that division—to make special efforts to protect those who have not the defences, have not the ordinary defences and, especially, have not the economic defences that others more fortunate may have.

I do not know that this department has many consumer protection bureaus outside Queen's Park. Certainly there are none that I know of in Sudbury, a large area. I would think that it is obligatory on the department to expand this branch so that consumer protection bureaus are to be found throughout the province where people might resort and, especially the poor, to get something of the sap of the strength of government to aid them in their very desperate struggle in the economic climate of the day.

As I say, it is that branch of this department that particularly attracts my interest. It is that branch upon which I am ready to put the greatest emphasis and, especially, as I say, must we be conscious of that when the economic climate has appeared to become somewhat adverse.

Now I am glad to have had the opportunity to say those things, to put it that way, at this time. I have not had that chance in this House before and to underline and emphasize that aspect. It may be it is safe for me to say—as one looks around, one can see in this place and the press gallery this afternoon the fewness of the numbers of people—it is safe for me to say, because no one will ever know, that perhaps when the new government is formed after the election, the leader of the Liberal Party will call upon me to be minister of this department. Well, I hope so, because, as I say, I would consider it a great challenge—a great challenge to take hold of it and to try to shape a new zenith, give it a new zenith, give it a new thrust, to—

Mr. Lawlor: It will never happen.

Mr. Sopha: Oh it may, it may. Stranger things have happened; stranger things have happened.

Mr. Lawlor: Exercise in futility.

Mr. Sopha: Well, all right. I can say to my friend from Lakeshore, for whom I have the deepest affection, that even in the penultimate stages of an afternoon one can enjoy intellectual maunderings you know. It is something of an opiate but—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): There are three members in the press gallery now.

Mr Sopha: Well, we got them in. That seems something of an achievement.

Now I want to say a word about a couple of other things that I think something has got to be done about; the computer, especially in respect of these credit card outfits—and I want to talk about a personal experience. I say in respect of American Express and Diners Club—and I mention those two from personal experience—that it is virtually impossible to get a response from them. The computer just will not answer. It will not answer. It keeps shooting out the material and notwithstanding protests, pleas, the incantations to it, it makes no response.

Now I say from personal experience that there was a time when, by mistake, the Diners Club sent to me the bill of a federal member of the House of Commons. I am not going to mention him by name. He is a cabinet minister now. But they sent me his billing for one month, and I must say in those days before he was a minister he led a very interesting life, as I looked at the invoices.

Now I want to tell you—and I can show the correspondence—that it took me six months to get the Diners Club to acknowledge that it was not my bill. I kept writing to them and the computer kept sending the bill. Every time you write a letter—now mark this—to the Diners Club or to American Express you get back a form card. The computer sends you this form card and it says, "We know we have received a communication from you. It will be answered in due course." Nothing happens.

The computer kept spewing out the billing and finally I had to write to the president of the Diners Club in New York. I wrote to him pleading with him. I was figuratively on my hands and knees by this time, pleading with him to have the machine stop sending me the bill of the member of the House of Commons.

I say that in this technological, this cybernetic age, I think seriously now that we are going to set up tremendous frustrations among people unless something is done about that computer. Of course, it is being used—I mentioned the Diners Club and American Express—in many areas of the economy now and the human intervention, the human participation in it, the human response, has been virtually eliminated, given away, of course, to the cybernetic input.

I would think it is incumbent on this department to begin to do some studies. If, as the minister says, he has a number of studies under way he might begin in this area because I can visualize tremendous frustrations for people as they meet the faceless, soulless, unresponsive monster of the machine that is now part and parcel, an integral part, of the business establishment system. I do not speak idly at all when I draw that to the minister's attention.

Another area that I want to mention, of course, is an old favourite of mine. That is the Ontario Securities Commission and there are two or three things that I want to say about it. In my view, the Securities Commission has never reached the full potential that it might have in its operation within the economy in Ontario, quite apart from my earlier remarks that I think we should get out of the field altogether.

We are not going to next week and I do not suppose the Premier is going to tell Mr. Trudeau that he is willing to, so I had better direct some remarks to the hypothesis that we are going to stay in the field. In that light, as I say, the Securities Commission has not reached, has not become the instrument that it should have become in the regulation of the marketing of securities within our province.

I say that for two reasons. One is that it has always been my belief that in the matter of takeovers; in the matter of the reorganization of the business structure; in the matter I am thinking of in terms of the transformation or transmogrification—a word my friend from Lakeshore would like—of the monolithic business structure, the Securities Commission in my view should play a very integral role.

I have put it many times in the light of the attempted takeover of Canadian Breweries by Philip Morris, but I always thought that was a good example. I am aware that for a long time in the United States the practice has been before any drastic change in business structure is contemplated, before it can be put into operation, Mr. Chairman, the first people who are approached are the SEC. They go and check it out with them first. They sort of clear it with them.

Not so in Ontario. The chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, so far as foreign takeovers or, for that matter, domestic takeovers are concerned, knows what he reads in the Globe and Mail on Monday morning. That is the first intimation he gets. That is not the way I would have it and it is not the way I would order. I would require that an approach be made to the Ontario Securities Commission before a major change in the business structure of a public trading corporation was even contemplated.

I say that for two reasons. One is that we want to ensure, as far as possible, a complete fairness to the investing public on a universal basis. That is to say, ideally we want every member of the investing public who hypothetically might invest in a security to have an equal access to information. We want complete fairness. The second reason, of course, is that we want to prevent individuals from making unconscionable profits as a result of special inside information that they may have.

It is a funny thing, with all the insider disclosure that we have in Ontario, that we have never managed to put anyone in jail as a result of the use of inside information. The Americans, of course, have. The Americans have prosecuted by indictment, under the authority of grand juries, a great many people who have made unwarranted use of insider information. For example, I have in mind the Texas Gulf Sulphur individuals who sought to profit as a result of the special information they had about the affairs of that company.

But in our securities legislation the theory seems to be that the person who makes unconscionable illegal use of inside information, becomes liable to the shareholders. That is all very well and good, though of course it strikes one looking at it *a fortiori* that it is a very unhandy type of remedy to have to maintain an action in the courts to return to the shareholders profits that were not warranted and were not deserved by the persons who made use of the special inside information.

I would say that in some of these sudden market movements—and I do not like to speak in generalities; I have in mind the famous old chestnut of some years ago, Canadian Oil-Shell. The Shell game rapidly comes to the lips when one thinks in terms of that unsavoury experience that we had a number of years ago where there was clearly use made by insiders—in fact, I think the fellow went to Italy. Memory tells me that, having made a big pile of dough—I forget now how much, though I usually have a good memory for big money—but he made big money and I think he ended up in Italy where he lives to this day, a chap who made use of the information.

You recall, Mr. Chairman, some of the details of it. The president of the company obligingly dated a letter back and they went all through all sorts of machinations. They say that is ancient history, that is water under the bridge, but one of these days one would only hope that in respect of a sudden and wild fluctuation in the price of shares on the Toronto Stock Exchange that there might be some very intensive, intrusive investigation into it, and a few indictments might be preferred.

Because I would think that, if some of these people got even as much as 30 days—I am not a cruel man, no Justice Jeffries in me—but the taste, just the taste of prison food for a limited period of time would have a tremendous remedial effect upon some of the practices that take place down the street. And notwithstanding that the Toronto Stock Exchange in recent years, of course, puts a tremendous face of modern respectibility on it, one suspects that underneath it all, that the larcenous hearts, Mr. Chairman, are still there.

One is reminded when one thinks in terms of the Toronto Stock Exchange and the trading in securities and the money that can be made—one must have somewhat of a little feeling of bitterness that for Joseph Hirshhorn, this week, they are laying out the final plans for the construction of the mausoleum in Washington to house the art collection that now is valued at $50 million. I think they are going to build that shrine next to the Lincoln Memorial. I think he is going to become an equal of Abraham Lincoln himself.

All of which leads me to say, of course that is our uranium. That is our uranium. That was money that Hirshhorn made, partly on the Toronto Stock Exchange, as a result of the sale of shares respective of that uranium boom that occurred in the 1950s.

As I say, the vice is still there—it is always there if not always blatant. One can never be assured that the Securities Commission, in its modern functioning, really has its ear to the ground, its finger on the pulse. I am not satisfied in any way that the Ontario Securities Commission is interfering or engaging in the inner workings of the Toronto Stock Exchange in the way my friend from Downsview (Mr. Singer) and I would want it to, which we have been protesting for a dozen years here.

If I had my way, the governor of the Toronto Stock Exchange and those who manage it would not be able to blow their noses without calling up the Securities Commission to get permission as to which hand to use. I say that literally. That is how far I would go and how far I want to go.

There must be observance of the fundamental principle of equality and fairness among all investors. We must, so far as is humanly possible, create a universality of equitability—I cannot think of a better way to put it than that. There must be a universality among the investors and the public.

I must confess that sometimes I do not know what they are doing. I find it difficult to understand what they are doing. I want to use a little example. As I say, I do not like to deal in generalities. I want to talk about Erie Diversified as an example.

I hold in my hand a prospectus that was approved by the Ontario Securities Commission, and I think the first rule that the Securities Commission might adopt tomorrow —I am going to give this as a piece of gratuitous suggestion, Mr. Chairman—is to require people to date prospectuses, to put a date on them.

The only document that I ever heard of that was not dated was a certain treaty that was made about 3,000 BC between two of the Grecian states. They said that the treaty would stay in existence for 10 years and they failed to date it. The treaty was in existence about 2,500 years, because it did not have a date. So there might be some efficacy. But tomorrow they might adopt the rule that a prospectus should be dated, because I searched this one from stem to gudgeon looking for a date and I came up vacant.

But apparently it has some relevance to the period October 1, 1969, because the eight per cent subordinated convertible, redeemable sinking fund debentures were to be dated October 1, 1969, and they were to mature on October 1, 1989. So we can assume that it was sometime around October, 1969.

What happened in regard to Erie—and this is illustrative—Erie was originally called Erie

Flooring and Wood Products Limited; that was its original name. It was a private company by letters patent, dated August 12, 1940. It became a public company apparently by supplementary letters patent that were issued in 1968. Apparently in November, 1968, it became a public company.

That was the time of an intervention of an individual known by the name of Mr. Frederick Arnold Litwin. He is described in the prospectus as a promoter and he is well named, I must say, though, apparently that is a term of art in the securities business. But the story—and it is illustrative of what I am saying about the securities commission and my feeling that it has not always got the flag at full staff—but in this case, Mr. Litwin took over control of what was a private family company probably. I am not sure of that, but it probably was, and he took over its direction, management and its control.

Now this company, Mr. Chairman, operated a hardwood plant at a place called West Lorne, Ontario, which is down in the riding of my friend from Kent (Mr. Spence) apparently in the county of Kent. This little plant that they had down there employed something in the neighbourhood of 190 persons, as I say, in the hardwood flooring.

Mr. Litwin and a firm by the name of Cochran Murray Limited approached the securities commission and had this prospectus approved, and also the Canada Trust—Huron & Erie Corporation—was to be the trustee under the trust indenture. So they raised this $500,000.

In the prospectus, as I say, it points out that the company has a plant that was located at West Lorne, about 30 miles west of St. Thomas, adjacent to the New York Central Railway line and about one mile from the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway and the plant including kilns and undercover storage areas, covering an area of approximately 180,000 square feet.

It goes on to say:

> The plant contains eight kilns with a combined capacity of about one billion board feet per month, three parquet flooring production lines, milling and planing equipment for strip flooring, and automated machines for producing pallets and dimension hardwood.

Here is the critical part of the prospectus as far as I am concerned, in respect of the $500,000 that they propose to raise.

> The company proposes to construct a 10,000 square foot addition to its plant to increase its production of dimension hardwood and has applied for a loan of $93,000 from the Ontario Development Corporation which, if granted, will be applied to the cost of construction of the plant addition. The company's plant labour force at present numbers about 190 and operates under a union contract, terminating in June, 1970.

I must say, having read that into the record from the prospectus, that in all fairness it never does say that the $500,000 is to be used to construct the 10,000 square foot addition to the plant.

It never does say that, but by necessary implication one would gather that that is the reason for the raising of this half a million dollars. I would give another piece of advice to the Securities Commission, that they should require people who write prospectuses—or do you say prospecti, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Prospecti? I like that!

Mr. Sopha: Prospecti! Well, it is like the fellow who went into the bar and he said, "Give me a martinus." The bartender said, "You mean a martini?" And he said, "If I want a double I will ask for it." But that is a diversion.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Not a real good one, though.

Mr. Sopha: I would say to the Securities Commission that they should require people who write prospectuses—prospecti—to say in unequivocal terms what the money to be raised is going to be used for. They should require a separate paragraph where they set out, with no ifs, ands, or buts about it, just what they are going to use it for. I think the investing public is entitled to know that because, now the reason I mention that is because it has relevance here.

I must read this part of the earliest words in the prospectus where it says this:

> The company under the direction of Mr. Frederick Arnold Litwin, who acquired control in September, 1968, has grown by acquisition and by internal expansion. The company's acquisition policy is to seek out companies whose operations complement its existing organization.

In other words, Litwin is going to be some kind of an entrepreneur.

They have a word now, there is a modern jargon for that—a conglomerate promotor. My friend for York Centre (Mr. Deacon)

has left; he could help me. These conglomerate builders, diversification experts. Indeed, Litwin changed the name of this company. He changed it from Erie Flooring and Wood Products Limited, to Erie Diversified Industries Limited.

But as I say, early on it talks in terms of the policy of the company "is to seek out other companies whose operations complement its existing organization." Well, part of its existing organization, of course, was the operation of the hardwood plant at West Lorne. Indeed, I would think at this time —at the time that it approached the Securities Commission—this is basic. That is the very be-all and end-all of the operation of the company. If he is looking for additional companies, then they are going to be those that will use the products that are produced at the plant at West Lorne.

So, as I say, and I have read from the second page, that:

> The company proposes to construct a 10,000 square foot addition to its plant, to increase its production of dimensioned hardwood.

So that is the basis on which it approached the Securities Commission, got approval to raise the $500,000, going on also to tap the Ontario government—which is easy, they tell me—through the Ontario Development Corporation. It was going to grab ODC for $90,000 along the way. And he is going to expand the plant at West Lorne.

So that is the background of the story. And that, as I say—if I only had a date on the prospectus—is in October, 1969.

To get down to the nub of the issue, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you that on April 27, 1970, he closed the plant. They closed the plant at West Lorne. The only industry in West Lorne. It employed 190 people. Having raised the $500,000, he closed the plant.

I made some inquiries about it. I got a letter from one whom I take to be one of the leading citizens of West Lorne, Dr. C. B. Cantelon. Probably he is the only doctor there.

Dr. Cantelon wrote to me on May 6, 1970:

> Dear Mr. Sopha:
>
> I have just read in the London Free Press your statements concerning Erie Diversified Industries Limited, and I would like to give you my complete approval of your actions.
>
> As a doctor in this area for 23 years I have seen many of the families affected by this flooring factory left without work, and worse still many of the older handicapped workers probably will never ever again be able to find employment.
>
> These are the people who have somehow managed to buy homes and cars and raise families and in many cases send them on to university and are a credit to this village and this province.
>
> To see this factory close for what appears to be personal greed is just a crime that should be exposed. From the very start of the stock market activity everyone in this town became suspicious and now we see the reasons behind it all.
>
> It is unfortunate that you probably cannot push this investigation to a final showdown, but just to see your frank, courageous words in the newspaper is somehow helpful. More power to you.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Dr. C. B. Cantelon.

As I say, I do not know, but he is probably the only doctor in the town.

There is the entrepreneur of this one you see. He has become a wheeler-dealer, goes to the Securities Commission—as I say, they are not very discerning, because nowhere as I read the document does it say that he is going to continue the operation. There is another piece of advice to give them, that in their dealing in the receipt of prospectuses there should be some undertaking given to the public, to the government, about the continuity of the operation or at least some expression of intent.

I am not saying that the Securities Commission is required to substitute its business judgement for that of the promoters. I am far from saying that and I do not want my words to be misconstrued into that guise.

But what I am saying is this, that Litwin has not got the right to go to the public and raise half a million dollars, giving the impression that the operations of the company are going to continue unfettered along the same lines as they did, and then a bare —October, November, December is three; to April, end of April is four—a bare seven months later, Mr. Chairman, he has completely altered the operation.

Now, what would I do? What would I do? The Securities Commission should have called Litwin in; if they read the London Free Press and had seen what had happened

to the operation of this company, they might have called Litwin in and said to him, "Look Litwin, you were here seven months ago, getting our approval to go to the public and raise half a million dollars on the basis of the implication that you are going to continue the operation of this company, and now you have not only altered it but you have closed it down and put 190 people out of work."

And what better agency is there, I ask on this seventh day of June, than the Ontario Securities Commission, acting on behalf of the public interest, to ask those questions of Litwin? What better agency? But as I say, my complaints about this prospectus is that nowhere does it say—(a) what the money is going to be used for, in an unambiguous way, and (b) nowhere does it give an undertaking that the operations of the company will be continued.

Now it is wrong not to carry on the activities of this commission in the public interest, in my view. I take the position here—I want to be understood unequivocally—that I see this commission as an instrument that is not only cumulative of the universality of fairness among the investing public, created and fostered, but on the other hand that there is an instrumentality of society that prevents unconscionable acts being perpetrated by individuals who have not the democratic right to do those acts.

I am willing today to deny, as a moral proposition, and I do, that Litwin had the right to go to the public and raise $500,000 and put 190 people out of work. Litwin does not have that right; he does not have the moral right to do it. Nowhere can he point to the moral law of philosophy that tells me in 1971, when the age of the buccaneer has long gone, where we do not issue letters of marque anymore, that he has any such right to do it. As far as I am concerned in that one, the Securities Commission struck out; they absolutely struck out on that day.

In a similar circumstance, in my view, the Securities Commission is obliged to call these people in and to say, "Look, we will have a fast explanation from you as to what was going on." If the explanation does not hold water, then the Queen's indictments that I was speaking of earlier with the Attorney General in respect of two other distinguished citizens of this province, the Queen's indictments will be flying around. I say quite legitimately, and with a good measure of conviction, that if we put a few people in the clink—those one often encounters at church on Sunday taking up the collection; they are not averse to a little bit of larceny in the marketplace on Monday—if we put a few of those behind bars for a limited period, it would have a great cathartic, corrective effect upon the operation of the market in this province. But, I do not know, there is a certain respectability about larceny.

Mr. Lawlor: Some forms!

Mr. Sopha: Some forms, yes! I always thought that the bank robber was basically more honest than the dissimulator. The bank robber goes in and says, "Give me all the twenties in the cash drawer or else!" He is more honest than the person who gathers together the web of language, puts out the brochure, and uses the telephone with sophistication in order to mulct the widows and orphans. But, as I say, he has a measure of respectability that the bank robber does not have, for some reason. That has always escaped my comprehension.

That is the story of Erie Diversified. I use it as an illustration of my belief that the Securities Commission does not always do the right thing by the public and by the government, or by this Legislature. They invited me down to see them. I have not been able to make it yet.

It is a matter of public record in Sudbury that I issued a writ that is still pending in the Queen's court—some day one of Her Majesty's judges will try it—and there is a statement of claim in that action. One of the items of the prayer for relief, I say to my friend from Lakeshore, is to the effect of asking for a permanent injunction against the operations of the iron ore plant of International Nickel—a permanent injunction. And if I can persuade a judge, if I can only summon the oratory to persuade a judge, and could place the law before him to get him to grant me that relief, I will close down the operation of the iron ore plant at Sudbury by Inco.

And yet the International Nickel Company put a prospectus through the Ontario Securities Commission raising—it is only a minor amount for Inco—a mere $90 million, I think they want. And they did not even make material disclosure of my outstanding writ in the case of Palonen against the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited—Palonen and Palonen. They did not even make disclosure of that writ outstanding. So it rather surprised me that that prospectus has got through, and I wrote to the Securities Commission and asked them why no disclosure

was made. Because if I am successful, I am going to shut down about one-third of Inco's operation, one-third of it, if I meet with success when that case gets to trial later this year.

I do not say that lightly. I do not want to try the case here, but the Palonens were living on that farm for—let me summon up memory now—I think it was 16 years before Inco came along and built the iron ore plant. They lived together on the farm and Inco built that filthy stack at the iron ore plant that pours out malodorous polluting gases, quite one of the worst ones they have, half a mile from the Palonens' residence. So is it any wonder that they eventually go to law? But Inco goes to the Ontario Securities Commission and they do not even require them to mention that Mr. and Mrs. Palonen have a writ that, if successful, is going to shut down about one-third of their operations.

I wrote and asked them why. They wrote back and referred me to a section of the Act. I have looked at the section and I think the section says something to the effect that you only have to make disclosure of material things. Well, it defies my imagination to think of anything more material in the circumstances than as to whether one-third of Inco's operations at Sudbury are going to be closed down. I really have to stretch my thinking powers to come up with something.

Well, as I say, the Securities Commission kindly invited me down to see them about it but I did not find the time to go down. I just cite that because I think really here there is a syndrome of very sloppy activity on the part of the Securities Commission in respect to these prospectuses; I think I have presented the evidence to show that there is, and a new verve, a new sharpness, a new acuity, might well replace what I think has become a rather casual attitude toward it.

Let it be said, of course, that over the years in the Securities Commission the attitude has appeared to be that they spend a lot of time focusing upon the sharpster. They appear to give a lot of their time toward a few people that they are watching for fear those identified individuals will get their hands in the till when no one is looking, and as such they lose sight of the total picture, total comprehension of their activity. Speaking on behalf of this party, we are far from satisfied that things are as they should be in the operation of that.

Well, there are many other things that I could talk about. I am not going to take much more time of the House. I could spend some time on another of my favourite subjects, and that is the mutual funds. You know, it was really funny; the predecessor of this minister had a report on the mutual funds by a committee, and the committee was composed of the representatives of the mutual funds. They played a major role in the committee. It is like the Mafia reforming the police commission. It is the same principle. And all they need do in respect to the mutual funds is to go into California which leads the nation, the world, in the policing of mutual funds.

In California, in fact they do not permit them to do anything. None of the practices that are anathema, that are criticized elsewhere, are permitted in California. None of the front-end loading—that type of thing; or churning, another device.

But the one about them that really gets me is their investment in American securities. They have turned over the portfolios—gone abroad, so to speak—for the major share of their investments in American securities.

I think of United Accumulative, I speak of Investors Syndicate of Winnipeg. In the Province of Ontario, the predecessor of this Treasurer is shopping in Germany for money. He is over begging the Germans—those Rothschilds—to lend them money, now suffering from the strength of the mark, of course.

And here you have these mutual funds that are permitted to put a major portion of their investments in American securities—our people's money. I cannot think of an industry that has been less conscious of responsible Canadian citizenship than the mutual fund industry; that has shown less Canadian attitude and responsibility, than they have.

But as they say, they had that report that I thought was laughable, where important people from the mutual fund industry were allowed to make recommendations about themselves. Those are some of things we will change, come the day.

This, as I say, Mr. Chairman, is a very important department, because this department—I want to leave off where I began—this department deals with people. In fact, for and on behalf of people. And this department, like few other departments of the government, has the opportunity to give the unsophisticated, the uneducated, the unequipped individual who is not able to compete, this department is able to assist him to get an edge, to keep up, to keep even. And whether that individual is to be found among the poor, or he is to be found among the ordinary investor whom we want to encourage

to own a part of Canada, then this department has a special ability to assist that individual. That is what is exciting about this department and that is what poses the challenge of this minister.

I went into a great deal of detail with respect of my opening remarks and that of course will relieve me of the obligation of repeating those remarks when the individual items are reached. Another excuse that I have for doing so is that the estimates of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs are proceeding co-extensively in committee down below and I, being the member for Sudbury, want to have the opportunity of participating in the consideration of those estimates also.

So, for your patience, Mr. Chairman, in respect of those remarks I am grateful.

Mr. Lawlor: That was a very interesting speech, Mr. Chairman.

I want to congratulate, first, the new minister of this department. He has his task cut out for him in this area. While the department has moved ahead in some way, particularly the securities legislation, I think before the estimates are over the deficiencies even there and in the area of consumer affairs will become abundantly apparent because there are abundant deficiencies.

I thought I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that is the second set of estimates I have had—shall I say—the pleasure, rhetorically, to bring before this House in the past seven days. It is a bit onerous when things come together like that because—well, let me put it this way. The estimates in this House strike me very much like a throwback to an earlier time in one's life—when the springtime came, came the examination period, too.

It is very much like preparing, including the cram sessions immediately before, for a set of examinations in the spring. There is a great difference, though, in some respects because at the end of the day at least you know whether you have passed or failed so far as the examinations are concerned.

Here you are never really sure one way or the other. Perhaps that is just as well. In any event, you know, you come to question the whole procedure. There is an advancement in passing examinations.

I have reached the stage that I think, so far as this ostrich-like performance that we go through is concerned, this ritual dance that is called estimates, is of very little worth and fundamentally a waste of breath. Who cares anyway? All the cramming that goes into it seems something of a lost cause. However, I guess that is what we are being paid for so we will persist.

Last week in introducing The Department of University Affairs estimates, I took an hour and a half, a good long time, to run over certain fundamentals in the background of education because I thought that was the chief thing that was peculiarly lacking in that particular area. I will not attempt to do that today.

As a matter of fact, my introductory remarks will be rather short. There are five major areas, I would think, taking a grab-bag main office situation into account in these estimates. So far as this introductory statement is concerned, I shall only advert to two, that is, securities on the one side and consumer affairs, consumer policy, on the other side.

As a basic background, however, I thought it would not be unwise—since I came across just yesterday a quotation from Einstein as to the focus, the perspective, from which this particular department can very well take some movement and orientate itself against the whole society. Einstein said that the individual has become more conscious than ever of his dependence on society but he does not experience this dependence as a positive asset or as an organic tie, as a protective force, but rather as a threat to his natural rights or even his economic existence. The egotistical drives of his makeup are constantly being accentuated while his social drives progressively detoriorate. Man can find meaning in life, short and perilous as it is, only by devoting himself to society.

This department, its general philosophy and its deportment, is precisely dedicated to that purpose in the way that the concept of disclosure runs through it like a gold thread. It is disclosure—full, adequate, true disclosure—in all its aspects that affects the security situation, giving a quality of bargaining power to those who are investing their money on the market—on the one side of the fence, in the area of insurance where highly expert people are deeply imbedded—and serving a very esoteric interest. It needs regulation and control if that public interest is to be forefended and protected.

If that is paternalism, so be it. That is the movement of the time, in seeking to make people feel at home in the society in which they were born; so be it. It is very affirmative and to the extent that this government has come forward to that vein of thought and

to confirm that principle to that extent, it acts responsibly and not within the dimensions of irresponsibility that characterizes the kind of affirmation of personal rights involved in Einstein's statement.

In the area of securities legislation their moves have been rather rapid and rather incisive. If you read the estimates of this department of three years ago, which went on for days and days, the central themes of that occasion pointed out that there was not timely disclosure. The commission, over a period of three years, has moved from adequate, true, full disclosure to something called continuing disclosure and within a brief time after that has begun—although it has not yet seized the full impact or taken the bull completely by the horns in the stage of timely disclosure. But it is edging in that direction; we have legislation before us, ready for debate in principle, or second reading—to have impact and effect upon the 10-day rule and the business of getting as much information as quickly as possible to outsiders, and to rectify the condition of those who regard the stock market as their tiny personal preserve, which they can arrogate to themselves, the disposition of that market through its internal instrumentality and, through the specialist and through the floor man, set the price of stocks.

It is still a huge emporium, a great gambling show, but in grudging recognition of these propensities in all of us I suppose I have validity; it is just that people ought not to be able to trade in this particular regard.

Just mentioning one incidental rather small thing which I think that you are going to have to move into—Kimber was against it—is anybody in a confidential or direct relation deriving monetary gain from the internal relationship or having access to information not readily available to anybody else, such as the lawyers, the accountants, the financial advisers and the subordinate junior staffs—there is a certain amount of machinations go on in these areas. Kimber says:

> We will not seek to set up without legislation determinative sanctions against such individuals using their inside knowledge. What we will do is we will leave it to their professional associations so to do, and for those who employ them.

Oh, that is a highly dubious proposition. I think the market precisely has to be protected per se, not with respect to throwing off that responsibility to some other collateral bodies that do not have an immediate and vital interest in that particular area.

In other words, it should be very autonomous and very self-determining as to its own mores and modes of procedure, which it refuses to be under that particular doctrine. It would very often serve the interests, I think, of a senior executive on occasions to leak confidential information or for a junior executive within a firm to be the beneficiary of that either on his own hook or through the medium of his superior in order that he is outside the sanctions of this legislation to benefit himself and, by undercover and under-the-table transactions, have it flow back into the beneficiary.

I will not spend much time on this, because no doubt later this week or very shortly we will come to the rather searching amendments now being made to The Securities Act arising out of the merger study which will be before us. I see little point in taking a good deal of time here now to review, to seek to scapple or analyse those particulars. They are, I think the hon. minister and you, Mr. Chairman, will agree, matters of considerable significance to the financial community, but which are a little remote and complex to the man on the street.

As a matter of fact, the reason I took this department was because a few months ago, even fairly recently, I knew nothing whatsoever about the matter. I always found it an intriguing, satiric subject that some priesthood of men in strange mantles made awkward noises about at a certain building on Bay Street. I want to be initiated into the club, at least to the point of understanding what they are talking about, and we will find out in the next few days to what extent the baptism has taken place. Even if I have been baptized on the forehead, I do not feel any the holier for it, I can assure you, just a little wiser; just another area of human recalcitrance breached, and conquered perhaps. It gives one some kind of satisfaction to have a sneaking knowledge of what puts and calls are really all about. Not that I expect to be either a mercenary beneficiary of that particular knowledge although some day when I have time, when I leave this chamber, I may try and turn it to good account and see just what happens. But I suspect that the furies and the fates are far more powerful in that particular amphitheatre than any degree of human rationality, prediction or play; particularly

if you are the boys running the show on the inside, and if you are not introduced into the sacred lore by way of also being physically present, so to speak, in order to watch how the manipulations go on.

There are two things, nevertheless, which I want to take some issue with. This merger study, on the last pages thereof, talks about the situation in takeover bids, and the role of the minority shareholder in this particular context. They point out at 194 that the control of a company may be obtained privately without making a takeover bid, by negotiating with the controlling shareholders. Such shareholders—I mean this is either by way of an approach, or private placements, or there are several ways to do this under the Act—such shareholders may require the buyer to extend the same offer to the non-controlling shareholders of the offeree company.

Now, going back a page or two, what they are reviewing here is a period from May, 1967, when part 9 came into force to December 31, 1969, during which period 87 takeover bid circulars were filed. Then they go on, on this further page, to say there were only five takeover bids in which it was stated that the controlling persons required the offerer to make an offer to the minority shareholders in the offeree company on the same terms as the offer to the controlling person. Absolute figures were difficult to establish because this particular fact was not always mentioned by the offerer or company because the Act does not require it to do so.

I think maybe the Act should require it to do so, Mr. Minister, but I will leave that in your good hands.

> There are 11 other offers in which it was disclosed in the signatory that the offerer already owned 50 per cent or more of the offeree or had agreements from the offerees for 10 to 50 per cent of their shares. There are other cases in which the offerer demonstrated—

And I am quoting this:

> There are other cases in which the offerer demonstrated some concern for the minority shareholders.

Now, true, this is outside the takeover bids. It is effectively a takeover nevertheless because the controlling shareholder is selling out, regardless of and completely oblivious to the interests of his minority shareholders. And I think, you know, that on moral grounds it is highly questionable, on economic grounds even more so, and that some protection, some greater protection than you have presently afforded, even within the terms of your share-capital corporation under The Business Corporations Act, ought to be afforded to the minority shareholder. That is an area of defect and lacuna within your legislation which speaks for itself in terms of the total protection given to the public in this regard.

This goes together with kind of the last dregs of laissez-faire-ism; the caveat emptor business which is endemic to the writing of Kimber's report. He says at page 26 of his report:

> The committee considered whether the takeover-bid circular should be reviewed by or filed with any government agency.

My contention is, as the member for Sudbury said a few moments ago his contention is: that it ought to be.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What page was that?

Mr. Lawlor: That is page 26 of the Kimber report.

> The committee recognizes that the issuance of a company of its own securities as part of a share exchange takeover bid does not differ in any essential constituent from the issuance of its securities in the course of primary distribution to the public.

Let me pause there, because the new legislation that is before us wipes out the concept of primary distributions.

It deals under section 35 of The Securities Act with all distributions from herein, carving out from that numerous exemptions, exceptions and qualifications that, for a neophyte, makes one's head spin. You wonder what is left after you see the carving that is done. If the Venus DeMilo had to be carved that much from block granite, she would be left in total nudity, I can assure you. That is a prospect—I do not know how you look upon it—but it is something that—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): It might be all right.

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Oshawa should not say that.

> However, because of the importance of speed and secrecy to the success of a takeover bid or a counter-bid and because of procedures subject to recommendations which comprise the suggested statutory code for takeover bids, should on a logical basis be applicably both cash bids and share exchange bids, we recommend, as

stated above, that the takeover bid circular should accompany or form part of every takeover bid.

Of course, you will have to send a circular out.

Further, that there be no requirement that the takeover bid circular be reviewed or filed with the Ontario Securities Commission or any other governmental agency, the obligation of ensuring compliance with the suggested statutory code will rest entirely on the bidder or in some cases on the directors of the operating company.

That just is not adequate. The veins of enlightenment, the shallow Klieg lights that come on and are coming on increasingly within the terms of your legislation—it reminds me of the denizens in Plato crawling out of the cave.

They thought, being inside in the total darkness and having got accustomed to the darkness, that everything was grand—that is the way everything should be. But one of them one day, you remember, discovered that there was a hole in the ceiling and that if you crawled out long enough you would come into the light. They were terrified to do that because it blinded them; it was a painful thing to come out of the cave.

You are beginning to come out of the cave, but the sunlight is just a little too great and that as you become accustomed to the surrounding verdancy, to the mountains and to the plains, that sort of thing will have to be obviated—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Took them a long time to see the light though.

Mr. Lawlor: —and your legislation changed. In other words you say, "It is fundamentally a jungle, let us try to bring some rules of civilized behaviour into it, but let us not change it from being a jungle. Let us not change it into a zoo, with manageries and well-cared-for and well-kept animals." You want the savage left somewhere in the underbrush, I suppose, for a little delectation some afternoon, just because of the danger of the thing.

When your dangers take the form of Atlantic Acceptances and Windfalls, that is where the problem lies. Your danger here, again, is in the subtraction from the rights and the beneficial position of disclosure to minority shareholders. They are not in an equal position at all and will eventually be forced out.

At least they should have some form of appraisal and consultation and some protection emanating from the Ontario Securities Commission. I think that I have said all I want on that head, until we get to the securities vote.

Dealing with consumer affairs, I do want to say I was sorry that we could not have got together on that Friday morning with respect to the second paragraph of the new Consumer Protection Act. That the infringement and preservations of the warranties in The Sale of Goods Act, are now being protected.

You know, I bought a car the other day, a General Motors product, I am sorry to say to the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: The very best.

Mr. Lawlor: They tell me that Volvo lasts 11 years. Nobody ever said that about General Motors! Anyway, I am sure the minister is perfectly aware of the warranty sections and the exclusions that are set forth. At General Motors, you know—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is why I was hastening to get my act through—to stop that.

Mr. Lawlor: Were you? Well, I should have held the sale up for a couple of days, but they tell me that Ford is raising the price by $500 and expect that it will ricochet all along the line. That extra $500 just turned me pale. I will take my chances with the warranties at the moment.

The business of disclaimers and opting out has now been substantially wiped out, and I am wondering in the course of the estimates, whether Professor Ziegel of some fame—who is the only university professor I know who takes modest interest in this august body, goes to the trouble and puts himself out sufficiently to attend upon our ministrations—will come before the committee and tell what he thinks. Now, it may be—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The minister does not have too high a regard for Professor Ziegel.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not think he is very fond of Ziegel really—

Mr. J. Renwick: I have heard him comment on—

Mr. Lawlor: But in any event, Jacob does his homework and I think adds a great deal. Maybe a little hair-splitting there, but for one trained in mediaeval philosophy and angels on pins, that is okay.

We can accept that as long as the substance is extracted out of the rest of his many—I am sure the minister has seen his comments about how really loopholish and full of swiss cheese caves is this new legislation that you are terrified to bring in for second reading. Have you seen Ziegel on that? Well, we hope to get him before the committee and really give it a good going over.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Are you going to quote him? Is the hon. member going to quote his article?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. I shall use it extensively. Does it make—Ziegel says, and this is what I was getting around to if you would only let me—Ziegel says, and I wonder if he would say so as a result of this new legislation, that what you needed were positive and affirmative warranties, written into these things, along the lines of a very flexible, standard form contract drawn up through your instrumentality and brought to legislation, and I am wondering what the minister thinks with his reliance upon the sale by description, the sale by sample, the sale by fitness and quality concepts within that old Act, whether that was adequate protection for the consumer now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I might, Mr. Chairman, just interject at this moment because I am very interested in this. In our discussions in Ottawa—the federal-provincial conference called by the hon. Mr. Basford—that was one of the things we talked about; a rewriting as it were or revision of The Sales of Goods Act and the thought of part of the warranty being inserted in the contract.

Well, it is a matter certainly under consideration by my office and by other ministries of government in other provinces and by the federal government. It is a very interesting thing and I think there is certainly some room here to do something.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE EXTENSION ACT

Mr. Kennedy moves second reading of Bill Pr34, An Act to amend The Municipal Franchise Extension Act.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit residents of mobile homes to vote for boards of education, public utilities such as hydro and water commissions, and many other elected offices.

The Municipal Act, 1970, in section 37(1) subsection (d) provides that a person, to be eligible to be entered on a municipal voter's list, must own land or be a tenant. There are certain other qualifications but these are the two main categories of people who can vote at municipal elections, with one exception.

A municipality, by bylaw, may extend voting privileges to trailer residents under section 6 of the present Municipal Franchise Extension Act. But under this provision they can vote for council members only, and on questions where there is no expenditure of money. So this bill would merely extend the right to vote for the bodies I have mentioned, as well as for councils.

A letter from the Canadian Mobile Home and Travel Trailer Association, which I recently received, says:

> We made an estimate of the number of mobile home parks and the number of mobile homes by provinces. For Ontario, we showed 81 parks and, because we did not define the word "park" too closely, this would include any gathering of half a dozen upwards. However, I do believe that for the most part our estimate would cover viable mobile home communities.
>
> Since the brief was drafted in 1968, there have been half a dozen additional parks and about 4,000 additional mobile homes added to Ontario's housing stock. So our current estimate for Ontario would be 87 mobile home parks, containing about 4,300 mobile homes and an additional 11,700 mobile homes situated individually.

Mr. Speaker, this totals 16,000 units. Assuming two voters in each one, there are some 32,000 people who are denied the privilege of voting for boards of education and utilities.

This home report to the Hellyer task force has a section entitled, "Reputation of

the Mobile Home." I just wanted to quote a portion of this because it gives background information that is significant in respect of the present situation. It says:

> Because of conditions in early so-called "trailer parks," mobile home living acquired a poor reputation among the public at large. Substandard housing, slum area and gypsy life are terms frequently associated with mobile homes.
>
> The industry started in the 1930s. These early coaches were known as "trailers," because they were relatively small and were used primarily by sportsmen, vacationers, construction workers and other groups located temporarily in out-of-the-way sites. At this time, trailers did not have bathrooms, nor were their kitchens equipped with ultra-modern conveniences which mobile homes now contain. These sites in poor areas often accommodated only small, narrow trailers and park services were provided via temporary installations.
>
> As a result of their transient nature, these dwellers accepted the inferior conditions of the park. These are the factors upon which today's unfounded image was established.

This report continues:

> The early conditions are now largely a thing of the past. Recently built parks have all the necessary characteristics for today's community life and the only similarities between "trailers" of the past and today's ultra-modern "relocatable houses" are the "wheels" and the "mobility." Even these two remaining characteristics are rapidly disappearing since the large sizes of today's mobile homes do not lend themselves quite as well to mobility. In addition, today's mobile homeowner has only a minimal transient characteristic and he resides in one place, on average, for periods as long as the conventional home dweller.

I have a Financial Post article on mobile homes and, included in that, is support of this contention because it states that 72 per cent of these residents have not moved for five years, about the average of all Canadians. This is as the result of a study conducted by a group and it is reported in this article in the Financial Post. Then the article goes to to support the use of mobile homes in respect to our housing needs.

There was an article in the Toronto Star on May 22 which describes a $7 million, 170-acre mobile home park which has been approved near Innisfil, south of Barrie. I quote part of this article:

> It is the first mobile home park close to Toronto to win approval by a municipality and the Ontario Municipal Board since Paul Hellyer resigned as the federal minister responsible for housing almost three years ago.

That is one section. It is by Stan Davies, Star staff writer. The article goes on to say:

> In the first phase now being sold, the developers are offering 165 mobile homes of two and three bedrooms in various sizes.

Then it goes on to list the prices, the financing and the quality of this home park —which, I understand, the municipality is quite willing to go along with, because it has made a satisfactory financial agreement with respect to the cost that would be incurred in servicing this new facility.

So, I am convinced that there is a place in our society for mobile homes and, having been convinced of that, it is only logical that we should go along and say that these people should have the right to vote.

There was a letter, Mr. Speaker, in the February, 1971, issue of the Municipal World. It is from an L. J. I would like to quote it. It is apparently from southwest Ontario.

> I am writing in regard to a provincial law which states that mobile home owners who rent property are not allowed to vote in municipal elections. This law seems unfair as people who rent houses or apartments are allowed to vote. From this area, trailers are taxed $20 a month on rented property. Of this amount, $9.40 goes to the schools, and $10.60 to the town council. This should entitle them to some say in how the money is spent and by whom. With the nuclear power project there has been a large number of mobile homes moved into this area. As this project is expected to last for 10 or 15 years, there is some concern over the fact that quite a large percentage of our taxpaying citizens are not allowed to vote. Would you, please, inform us if there are any steps we can take to have this law corrected?

In the reply, they state that persons residing in trailers are not assessed for land and are not entitled to be entered on the voters' list, pursuant to The Municipal Act and The Voters' Lists Act. However, where a bylaw is passed by the council of a local municipality providing for resident voters' lists, such persons may obtain a limited franchise to vote

for council and they go on to quote the section.

I received a letter after this bill was introduced from a lady in the Ottawa district. She expressed appreciation that the bill had been introduced. I quote:

> For some time now I have thought our governments (federal and provincial) did not know that mobile homes existed. I have written other letters demanding and asking for the right to vote, and I did not even receive an answer. But now some action . . . Thank you and all responsible. I know I am a good, responsible citizen.

That is a portion of her letter, Mr. Speaker.

In Mississauga we have some mobile homes, Mr. Speaker, and my experience is the same as this lady states; they are responsible people. They are active in community affairs, in the home and school, and so on. They are good citizens, as interested in their families as any people in our society, and they should be able to vote for their board of education and commissioners, and so on.

I know in a particular area of which I speak they certainly have taken on the appearance of permanency, with attractive gardens, flowers, fenced-in yards and all the amenities that one might have in conventional homes.

There may have been a justifiable reason for having this voting prohibition at one time because, as I mentioned there was no such thing as mobile homes. They were trailers, and they were not nearly as permanent as they are now.

Municipalities too, Mr. Speaker—I recall very well incidents in the past—are very wary of these residents and units because they did not pay taxes as such, and still do not. And maybe then they did not even have a licensing system, certainly not one as sophisticated as it is today. Rightly so, I would say, there was no provision that would allow them to vote.

Also in the past they had an apprehension, I suppose, that a large influx of trailers would have a significant effect on school budgets, especially when jurisdictions were small and there is a small assessment base. But Mr. Speaker, with the county boards of education, a much broader assessment base, and now that the province has moved to provide grants of no less than 60 per cent of school costs, there is no justification to continue this archaic limitation.

Mississauga, and I presume other municipalities, has a licensing arrangement which, according to the brief mentioned earlier, submitted to the Hellyer task force on housing and urban development in 1968 yielded the property tax equivalent of $83 per person per mobile unit. This is in excess of that which is derived from a duplex and from a semi-detached dwelling.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have this table from that report to the mobile task force, to the Hellyer task force, and it is rather interesting. It gives the averages they have worked out for persons per unit in the various types of accommodation: single family dwellings, apartments, duplexes, semi-detached, mobile homes. It ranges from about 4.3 down to 3.82 in single family dwellings; duplexes 3.6; mobile homes are 3.2. Then they broke this down into tax revenue per person. There is quite a wide range and I would commend it to any one in the Legislature who is interested. In fact, that whole report has some very interesting material in it.

Anyway, the $83 figure was for the Cedar Grove Mobile Home Park in Mississauga. Also they emphasize, as do these articles in the Financial Post and perhaps in the Star, that the park provides installation of roads, sidewalks, sewers, water and hydro and maintains these utilities and services without cost to the municipalities, including ploughing and sanding of roads, sodding and playgrounds. The municipality, of course, provides schools, police, fire protection and garbage collection. Thus the sponsors of this report feel that the $83 should be stepped up a bit by a factor of, perhaps, 1.5 or 1.75 to provide a comparison with other tax revenues that are shown on that table.

The Financial Post's article that I referred to supports this as well, stating that in addition to licence fees, park owners pay lands and business tax, which they say in their article amounts to $50 or $60 a year for each site. The Post goes on further to support the position that there is a reasonable tax yield from these units and, of course, that some services are not a charge on the municipality. It mentions that in Calgary it costs $518 to service single family dwellings and only $236 for a mobile home.

Apartment dwellers perhaps have a higher rate of turnover and yet they do not need to have any long period of residency. They get on the voters list the same as a home-owner.

It is perhaps a bit inconsistent or unfair that a boarder in a home may be placed on the resident voters list after a year's residence under section 1(c) of the present Franchise Extension Act as I read it. Yet a mobile home

resident regardless of the permanence of his residence cannot be added at any stage for these two or three offices I mentioned.

They have demonstrated stability, Mr. Speaker and I would urge the government to accept this private bill. I think in this modern day and age we can certainly define it in the area of discrimination, and I think we should join the 1970s and bring them on to the voters' list.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of this bill, which deals with the extension of the franchise for certain purposes to all people who are listed on the residential voters' list, I am wondering if the person who sponsored the bill is aware of all of the implications of this legislation?

In the explanatory note he states that this would give franchise to people in mobile homes to vote in elections for members of local boards, but says nothing of the fact that it would also give franchise—in which, I might say, I heartily agree—to roomers and boarders or anyone who is on the residential voters' list, which includes, according to the Act, a variety of individuals.

The Municipal Franchise Act, Mr. Speaker, gave municipalities the power to pass bylaws establishing a residential voters' list. Now, subject to the consent of municipal electors on the question which says: "Are you in favour of extending the right to vote at municipal elections for members of council to all persons of the full age of 21 years who are British subjects and who have resided in the municipality for at least one year in accordance with The Municipal Franchise Extension Act?"—so if the municipality has then had consent from the voters it may pass the necessary legislation.

This legislation then gives the vote to all people in the municipality who are 21 years of age, are British subjects and have resided in the municipality for at least 12 months preceding the first day of January in that year for purposes of electing a council only.

The amendments to The Municipal Franchise Act in 1965 added to that that they could vote for council and on questions upon which the opinion of the electors is to be obtained where no expenditure of funds would result from an affirmative vote. So on non-money bylaws anyone on the residential voters' list would then have the right to vote. My interpretation of that would be that on votes such as Sunday sports, dining lounges, and amalgamations probably—things of that nature—everyone on the residential voters' list would have the right to vote.

Votes on money bylaws are not very frequently held at the present time since the Ontario Municipal Board may waive the requirements if it passes certain projects; so that votes are not held too often anymore. With the present system of the Municipal Board sending out publications and notices to objectors of hearings, we do not find nearly as many money bylaws in our municipal elections as we did.

So now we have the situation where roomers and boarders and mobile home owners can now vote for council and for bylaws where no money is spent. The amendments in the Act before us today would extend the right to vote for these people to local boards as defined under The Department of Municipal Affairs Act. Section 1(b) states that local boards mean school boards, public utilities commissions, transportation commissions, library and park boards. I think the only two boards that have ever had elected members would be the school boards and the public utilities commissions; those are two of the basic extensions of the franchise that would be involved in the legislation before us today.

Residents of trailer parks—and I will deal with this group first—under section 379, subsection 186, and sub-clause (b), gives the municipal council power to pass bylaws to control and license the trailers. The maximum licence fee which they may charge is $20 per month per trailer and this, in my investigation at a prior date, is applied by all municipalities; that is the maximum of $20 a month for a mobile home or trailer, which amounts to $240 a year in municipal licensing fees. These are really not taxes, they are municipal licensing fees paid by the owner of the property to the municipality. Of course, a person living in a mobile home still has to pay a land rental fee to the owner of the park, which is usually as much and in most cases more than the municipal licensing fee.

Now, a problem has developed here, and I think I will just mention it briefly: it is the difference between trailer parks and mobile home parks. Section 379 of The Municipal Act states that for a month or a part of a month a municipality may collect the $20; so what do the municipalities do? They charge $20 for a camp where trailers are just coming and going on a daily basis. The owner may have a trailer there for only one week and

that particular space may be empty for three weeks; the municipality can still collect its $20 for that whole period of time. We find then that the $240 is paid to the municipality by each mobile home or space within the park which has been used for one day or more during that month.

What about the rights of these people who are paying $240 a year to the municipality? Section 97 of The Schools Administration Act requires that the municipality share of its $20 per month licensing fee with the county school board in the same proportion as the municipal taxes for elementary and secondary schools. If the municipal taxes are, say, 50 per cent for school purposes and 50 per cent for local purposes, the county school boards would in fact collect $120 per year taxes from the municipality for education purposes for each mobile home or trailer situated in that municipality.

So all mobile home residents are in fact paying $120 direct money toward the cost of education; I would say, a fairly substantial amount. And why in fact should they then be disenfranchised when it somes to voting for school board purposes? In fact, I can think of instances where three-room apartments in many of the municipalities do not generate $120 worth of money for school purposes in that year to be used for the county school board.

So we have a group here who are in fact paying pretty well their share in education costs but not being allowed to vote for county school board members.

No doubt some municipalities have not taken advantage of The Municipal Franchise Act and have not given the right to these people to even vote for council. The Act, in fact, is permissive and says that the council may pass bylaws to put them on the residential voters' list. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that mobile home residents should not be treated as second-class citizens.

Now, let us look at the effects of a mobile home park in the municipality. Councils have long been opposed to the establishment of mobile homes parked in many of the municipalities because, they say, of the education costs. Well, here is a little research I did about six months ago, in which I came up with: Trailers are not assessed; they do not change the assessment in that municipality, simply because they pay licence fees and not taxes. So when the county school board puts this levy on a municipality, the levy is put on on an assessment basis.

The trailers present in that municipality do not raise the assessment of that municipality, so the basis for the levy from the municipality to the county board will not be increased by the presence of the trailer park. But with more pupils the assessment per pupil will be lower than if they were living in houses. Therefore, less education tax will be levied from that municipality by the county school board. However, as grants for education purposes are on a per pupil basis, the municipality and the county school board will benefit from the presence of that trailer park in the municipality. So in actual fact the mobile home park is not the millstone around the neck that many municipal leaders would have us believe.

Mr. Speaker, this group of persons should definitely have a vote for school board membership and public utilities commission.

The other group which would be affected by this Bill 34 are roomers and boarders—in fact, anyone not a property owner or a tenant who qualifies under the Act; that is, being 21 years of age, a British subject, and 12 months' residency. So we must surely assume that every individual in our society over 21 years of age and a resident of Ontario for 12 months has some interest in the total operation of our province, including the education system. To deny these persons the right to vote for the school board members and the public utilities commission members is to say that they have no business to be concerned. As residents for one year, we owe them a voice in the affairs of our county school boards. Many of our young unmarried people fall into this category. Usually this group is highly intelligent and would make a great contribution to our society.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the purposes of the bill and would support the extension of franchise for the election of local board purposes to all on the residential voters list.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I think that what the member has tried to do is commendable. I do not doubt for a moment that this bill will satisfy the needs of a small group of people in the Province of Ontario and we support it.

I want to say that I am disappointed that the member has not taken a look at the overall problem of tenants and residents and come forward with a resolution that would have been all-encompassing. In fact, I cannot help but think, as I look at what has been offered by this member, that he must surely

feel some sense of fear of the government to which he is affiliated, and perhaps even look at them with a little bit of doubt from time to time when he thinks that he must move such an amendment in this House in order to get justice for one rather small segment of the society in the Province of Ontario.

I am disappointed. I am disappointed that the member did not go the whole way. I think that it is necessary that we recognize people in this province pay taxes, whether they rent property or whether they rent an accommodation.

I think it is time that we recognize in this Legislature the changing face of Ontario. There are more and more people who are tenants and who are renters in this province with every passing day and I feel that the member even in this bill as it applies to those who rent property and those who are in the field of renting for the purpose of providing homes, mobile homes, ought to have the right not only to vote for bodies other than council but ought to have the right to vote on matters that affect the monetary policy of the municipality.

I think it is time that we understood that whether a person pays rent or whether a person pays taxes directly, everyone pays taxes, everyone pays his share. That includes these people and it includes tenants. Now in the city of Hamilton recently we had the situation arise where there was a conflict over a question placed on the ballot of the municipality as to whether or not after the ballot was effected and after the vote was counted, it would be considered legal by the Ontario Municipal Board simply because this Act and other Acts do not permit tenants and residents to vote on matters of monetary policy.

If this member really wanted to change for the better and to come into line with what is existing in society, he would have moved an amendment that would have deleted all of the words after "obtain." He would perhaps even have moved a resolution rather than an amendment which says that residents and tenants in the Province of Ontario should be given the rights, the same rights, as homeowners in terms of voting for councils, in terms of voting for boards and in terms of voting on matters of expenditure. There is no difference. No, tenants do not have the right to vote on matters of expenditure of funds and the whole matter really rests on the point that when a person pays taxes—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): I think they do. In some areas?

Mr. Deans: No, no! It is excluded by the Act. When a person pays taxes, he is given the right to vote on all matters, including monetary matters. Everyone pays taxes. Everyone pays taxes. A roomer pays taxes. If it is decided by the municipality that a certain levy will be put on all real property, the roomer's costs go up. If it is decided by the municipality that a levy will be put on real property, the tenant's costs go up. If it is decided by the municipality that levy will be put on real property, the tenant's costs go up. If it is decided by the municipality that a levy will be put on real property, then costs go up for those people who rent space in trailer camps and in mobile home camps. They should have the right after complying with the residence requirement to vote on all matters that affect their day-to-day living.

I suggest that this particular bill, though it is commendable and deals with a very tiny portion of the populace, requires some considerable thought by the government. We were told not many months ago that the government was prepared to make changes that would bring The Municipal Act into line and that would permit persons residing in the Province of Ontario to have equal rights.

We were told in the city of Hamilton at the time we were faced with what became a referendum which might well have been a plebiscite that even although it may be in contradiction to the existing Act, it was the intent as stated by members of the cabinet—it was the intent of this government—to alter the legislation to grant rights to vote on money matters to all residents in the Province of Ontario. I am surprised that as we come into the month of June, 1971, that this member should have to stand up in the House and move such an amendment. I am surprised that he has not been able, because of the expressed willingness of the government or supposed expressed willingness of the government, to bring pressure to bear on them to make the necessary changes.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The member for Peel South should be ashamed of himself.

Mr. Deans: I think that this government, rather than the member, should be ashamed of itself I think the member for Niagara Falls facetiously says that the member should be ashamed, but while the member bears the brunt of the government's inactivity, it

is the government itself that should be ashamed.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Terrible government.

Mr. Deans: It has not kept pace with the changing times.

Mr. Gaunt: Just not interested.

Mr. Deans: It has not even made any effort to recognize the changing face of the municipalities in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Bukator: I agree. The government ought to be ashamed of itself too.

Mr. Deans: I feel to place the blame on this member would be to place it wrongly.

Mr. Kennedy: My shoulders are broad.

Mr. Deans: I think we have to recognize very quickly that unless we are prepared to grant those kinds of rights that are available to homeowners to all persons recognizing their participation in the tax structure we are not granting equality within this province.

Because of that I feel we might then suggest to the member that in any future attempt to change this—assuming it goes the way of all private members' bills—that in any future attempt to change this particular area of jurisdiction he give serious consideration to making his proposal in the form of a resolution, so that not only will persons living within trailer camps be given the opportunity of participating in elections at the local level, but in keeping with their contribution to the financial affairs of the municipality that all persons who are non-homeowners be given the opportunity to take part in all votes that pertain to the municipality in which they reside.

I think that that would have been a much better move by the member. I think that it would probably have met all of the objections that have been raised in this House over the last number of years, about tenants not getting their rights within the law, and I feel that it probably would have been a much more acceptable amendment in the overall picture to all members of this House.

I would hope that the government is prepared to move. There was a committee set up by this government, a committee that had within it clerks of municipalities, and they reviewed The Municipal Election Act and in reviewing it they reviewed those things that pertained to municipal elections, including plebiscites and referendums. They recommended, as I understand, that those portions pertaining to plebiscites and referendums dealing with money matters be amended to include all persons within the municipality. I trust that the member for Peel South will use whatever influence he has—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He will not have much influence.

Mr. Deans: —whatever influence he has anyway, use it to try and convince the government that the recommendations of the town and city clerks of this province be abided by by this government and that they move immediately to implement the changes that will grant the same rights to all people.

I say to you, and I quote to you from a little book that I have, this is another of these promises of the government of Ontario that go in one ear and out the other. It is the kind of thing that will leave some pussy-foot prints in the sands of time. I suggest that it is totally inadequate and that we should have an overhaul of the entire structure and that we should try to provide equality in this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I am quite taken up with what has been said by the speakers before me, because they have given me a lot of information with which to debate this bill.

Mr. Deans: Nothing to say before?

Mr. Bukator: I had nothing to say before you all spoke. As a matter of fact, I have just acquired some knowledge that the hon. member who spoke before me did not know. There are tenants that do vote on money bylaws providing they have a lease for 21 years. That is according to the Act. I realize that there are not too many people that have a lease for 21 years but they are tenants and they do have a vote on money bylaws.

I suppose, for the people who are affected by this amendment, I should pursue the reason why they should have a vote because of the type of investments that they make in these mobile homes today. There was a type of trailer camp at one time—most of

you are acquainted with them—that was not too well maintained, the grounds were not what they should have been, the city did not want to take the garbage away because their taxes were not sufficient to require that kind of service, and the people who maintained these camps did not do what they should have done by their tenants because they felt they were not getting enough money and it came in from—I suppose you could have considered some of them slum sections of our cities or towns, or at least on the outskirts. But with my experience and knowledge of mobile homes—and because I am in real estate and because I am seriously concerned about people who do not have homes and cannot purchase them because of the high prices—the mobile home will answer the purpose of need for many people.

There are people who are on fixed incomes who could purchase a mobile home. These are people who are on pensions who could purchase these mobile homes. They are two and three-bedroom units, quite substantial in floor space, completely furnished with rugs on the floors, refrigeration. Yes, a unit with two bathrooms, three bedrooms, and furniture in place costs less than $10,000.

That is a good deal. They can pay for them, or amortize them on the present system of payments, in about 7½ years. I am hoping that CMHC and the government would put these in the same category as they do homes and mortgage them for 15 or 20 years and give them a real break.

There are many people in this province who have maintained homes and large lawns for many years and find themselves physically unable to maintain their gardens and their properties as well as they used to because of their age. They would like to have a little more comfortable state in which to live, with not so much to maintain. The mobile home fills that bill and fills it exceptionally well.

I know that in the Niagara Falls area I am acquainted with one mobile home park. The city of Niagara Falls refused to allow them to develop this particular plan for something like 500 homes. They felt they could not afford to have the taxpayers carry the brunt of the load for this developer, who is going to develop this big park and then charge a rental for the lot. The city felt that it was not going to get sufficient dollars to maintain the park and provide the necessary services that you must for citizens living there. They turned the plan down.

After a lot of debate and discussion with the councillors, the public utilities and the school board, they found that they should take a second look. They decided that they would let this plan go through in an industrial area. I realize maybe I am veering just a little bit from this bill, but it all dovetails, in my opinion.

They wanted to build this mobile home park in an industrial area along the Queen Elizabeth Way. Immediately the school board decided they were too far from schools. They came up with an agreement with this man who was going to build this park that he would provide buses—pay the $20 a month that the law requires to bus those children back and forth to school—and pay a per capita cost if it was required to put him in the same category as other taxpayers. In other words, they were going to carry their load and carry it well. With that thought in mind the city council approved it.

The planning department in Toronto decided that you should not have these mobile homes in an industrial area. Yet it would properly stand, if this mobile home park was put in among small, tidy, industrial units, then the worker could walk back and forth to his plant and not have to drive his car. I thought it was an exceptionally good idea.

However, the OMB have not decided that they should support the thing at this time because the school has put up a roadblock. So it has become a stagnant bit of business and nothing is being done about it and I am very upset about it.

Now, if these people have made this investment in a mobile home, such as the one of which I speak—with a country club atmosphere, with a recreation centre, with off-street parking, with all the requirements that you would have in any good subdivision—I think they are paying their taxes and they are entitled to a vote. Yes, of all things, no matter whether they live in a trailer or in some small room in an attic of a house, he is a Canadian citizen and he is entitled to a vote.

It is for this reason I commend this gentleman from Peel South for bringing this bill before us. If he could persuade his caucus and this government to do what they should have done long before this, there would have been no requirement for this private bill. If he cannot get through to them, then he brought it to the proper place by bringing it to this House. With the exception of the speaker before me who rubbed you one way

and made you feel good, then proceeded to take you apart because you were not thinking too broadly, I think one step at a time is good thinking and good reasoning, and I like this bill.

The tenant who does not pay for the necessary services along that roadside is another issue, a major issue. If he does have to pay for it, then he should be able to vote on a money bylaw; yes, I agree with that. There are not too many instances where there happens to be a balance between the tenant who wants to vote on a money bylaw and the people who are taxpayers. I remember originally why this came about.

People who owned property, who had tenants during the Depression and services were to be put in were there to carry the brunt or carry the load and pay those debentures off during 20 years, whereas the tenants could pull up stakes and go, and yet vote to put that particular landlord in debt.

It might have had merit at that time and maybe if we investigate, it may continue to have merit. This section of this bill, as far as my party is concerned—my colleague from Kitchener just said so, and I, too, say—is a step in the right direction. If I have made a point at all this afternoon I would like to reiterate what I have said—that mobile homes are here to stay.

These are not second rate citizens. They are senior citizens; young couples who are married, and these are the homes that will accommodate them until they can get something bigger and better. With the facts that were presented to me or to the House by the instigator of this bill, the hon. member for Peel South, and the statistics that he brought to us—he said that there were 81 parks, 87 mobile home communities, 11,700 individual homes, 16,000 mobile homes—I think the show is on the road but it is not moving fast enough for me.

I do believe that the hitch—and I am speaking to those within earshot; not too many members of the government especially ministers, take time to read my speeches I do not think, but we have one or two ministers here—I do believe they could do two things along with this bill. This is persuade the government to let people amortize their mobile homes over a period of 15 or 20 years, rather than seven, through some finance company. I think that should be part of the CMHC proposition. I think it is good, because there is a good investment here; the money is soundly protected. On top of it, I think the OMB—and I do not have any axe to grind with them, but I sometimes think the planning department of the Province of Ontario, the planning board or whatever you call it, the planning division under municipal affairs—

An hon. member: Community planning.

Mr. Bukator: —community planning. The OMB move very slowly in a rapidly moving world and I think they are dragging their feet at a time when they should join us rather than hold the municipalities back from building the very things that this hon. member presented to us this afternoon. Certainly, by all means they are entitled to a vote. That is the least we can do for them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this bill, my mind goes back some years to a lot of discussion that took place about the establishment of mobile homes in and around our major cities, and the objection to those homes on the part of those who sat in councils.

I think the major objection stemmed from the fact that we were steeped in a tradition of tidy homes, sitting on a well-manicured lawn with plenty of square footage of land around about—all subject to taxation and paying regular cheques into the treasury of the municipality. In recent years more and more of the municipalities have become crowded; the tradition of the single-family home is passing, and in our great urban metropolises like Toronto people are going up into the air—we are getting vertical instead of horizontal development—so we get more and more people living on less and less land.

While that is true, those people who live on less and less land bear the same burden of taxation through their rentals that the single-family home did. As a matter of fact, the balance is the other way: Today municipalities look upon highrise apartments as good assessment; they are bearing their share of the assessment far more equitably than the single-family home, and so the taxation picture is somewhat different than it was some years ago.

The question then comes: What are we going to do with these single-family homes sitting on small pieces of land? How are they going to bear their share of taxation? How are they going to carry their burden of police, fire protection, schools and all the other municipal services? I think that has been the problem with municipalities more

than any other problem. This is the thing they have been asking: "How can we bring them in and how can they bear their share?" In our old taxing system perhaps this was not possible, and even though we have raised standards and the parks carrying the trailers today are much better and are better looked after, the problem still remains: How do we make them pay for their share of the services which municipalities must render?

I think this brings us ultimately to the whole revision of the taxation structure. If we could come to the place where the solution that we have been offering is adapted, in bringing the foundation plan of taxation into the municipalities, where more and more the province does the taxing and rebates the taxation to the municipalities, the wherewithal to service the people, then we are coming nearer to a solution of this total problem. I think as that comes then the problem of the trailer park will become less and less in the minds of the municipal council. But that is still some way off, and even though the provinces today, particularly this province, are starting to move, they are moving slowly; so that problem is not yet solved.

But the thing that strikes me in this bill today, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt on the part of a member of this government to make one little halting step toward a solution to this matter of giving to these people who live in a democracy something of their democratic rights. This is not going to give them much; it still withholds from them the right to vote on money bylaws. This is not right, because if we are going to call these people citizens, if they are going to pay their share of taxation as gradually they are, then we should give them a right to vote on money bylaws as well as for the boards and commissions and so on that may be set up in a municipality.

The other thing that strikes me is the fact that this bill and this government, while talk-about this little step, still refuses to give the vote to that very large segment of the population from 18 to 21. Many of the people, as a matter of fact a very large proportion of the people living in these trailer homes, are young people; many of them still without a vote. I do not know whether the member intended that they should be included in the legislation—I do not suppose it is possible because of the present wording of The Election Act—but I would hope that the member will think in terms not only of these few people living in trailer camps but the hundreds of thousands of people who are 18 and who are mature and who should have the vote today. He talks about, and I quote him—I think I have the quote accurately: "There is no need to continue this archaic legislation." He is right. But let him go on a bit further and break down some of the archaic legislation that still remains in this whole field and let him agree and urge upon his government the granting of the vote to the 18- to 21-year-olds. In this modern day and age, he says, this is sheer discrimination. Sure it is. It is discrimination also to refuse the vote on the money bylaws, to refuse the vote for the young people who today, as I say, are mature enough to know what they are doing.

So, to use his words again, let us move into the 1970s and let us clear out this injustice, which is a legacy from the feudal system centuries ago, and let us give justice to the people who are living in trailer camps. Yes, let us give justice in voting on money bylaws as well as electing boards and commissions and let us move into the 1970s and give justice to the young people of this province which this government is refusing—this government, along with the government of New Brunswick—two Tory governments—the only ones in Canada that refuse to give that kind of justice to our young people.

So, while we support this bill as far as it goes, it is inadequate. Perhaps this government should think seriously of not only doing this, because it is a timely step, but of filling out the whole process of democracy until the people who are responsible for running this country also get a chance to have a full voice in that process.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the debate on that particular order. Will there be another order of business called at this time or at 8 when we resume?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): We will return to the consideration of estimates at eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. House leader like to move that we move to committee of supply at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would make that motion.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 7, 1971

Stopping federal investigation into Kingston Penitentiary riots, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Trotter 2401

Amending regulations re four-week notice to employees when plant closes down, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Trotter 2401

Complaints re safety, particularly for children, at Ontario Place, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Trotter 2402

Quebec's policy at Victoria Conference re income maintenance, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Sopha 2402

Transportation of single welfare recipients from one part of province to another, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Pitman 2403

Consulting with Minister of Social and Family Services re job estimates and various positions of Manpower offices, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis 2406

Conference on foreign investment, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 2406

Terminating grants on haemophiliac research at veterinary college, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis 2406

Survey of conservation and recreation needs in Niagara region, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis 2406

Tabling document re funding of Spadina Expressway, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 2407

Poisoning of wild animals in Algonquin Park, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Yakabuski .. 2407

Waitresses at Ontario Place refused legal rights under Employment Standards Act, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. T. Reid 2407

Names of those joining Dr. McCarthy on commission of education, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Pitman 2409

Laying of charges against two individuals for income tax evasion, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Sopha 2409

Legislation dealing with non-returnable bottles, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Gaunt 2410

Charter to Ontario Management Employees Association, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Worton 2410

Mail-out of questionnaires on need for family housing, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Peacock 2410

Universities holding mortgages on homes of faculty members, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Good 2410

Trip to study lignite deposits at Onakawana, questions to Mr. Bernier, Mr. Stokes 2411

Removal of sign on Highway 48 erected by Markham, question to Mr. McNaughton, Mr. Deacon 2411

Relaxation of restrictions on handicapped re senior citizens' apartments, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Gisborn 2411

Speed-up of construction re killer strip section of Highway 417, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. MacKenzie 2411

Father unable to apply for custody of child in family court, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mrs. M. Renwick 2412

Layoff of workers on Queen Elizabeth Way at Dorchester circle, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Lewis 2412

Wyandotte Chemical Company dumping wastes onto Fighting Island, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. B. Newman 2412

Closedown of increasing number of cheese factories, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Bolton 2412

Presenting report, select committee on company law re co-operatives, Mr. Carton 2413

Presenting annual reports, Department of Transport, and on highway traffic collisions, Mr. MacNaughton 2414

Motion to refer estimates of Tourism and Information to standing natural and physical resources committee, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2414

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart 2414

Municipal Franchise Extension Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Good, Mr. Deans, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Young 2431

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2440

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Debates

Monday, June 3, 1974

Evening Sitting

No. 59

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 7, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor I believe.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, before we had the dinner break we were discussing the main parameters of this department, and over the dinner hour a piece of writing came to my mind, contained in the Crosscurrents publication of summer of 1963 in which somebody wholly unknown to me—the publication itself brings together the leading articles in translation published in journals all over the world, largely of a very broad spectrum, politics and religion and philosophy—the man who wrote this article is called Ferees, a member of the Fund for the Republic, apart from that I do not know him.

His chief contention in this article—and I throw it up for what it is worth—is that the stock market ought to be abolished. He says the downturn in the market of 1962, fairly catastrophic in the United States, held memories of the famous stock market crash. And I think, Mr. Chairman, you would have to agree with me that the years have seen a roller-coaster effect involved in the stock market. It is wholly unpredictable.

Sometimes one wonders whether the stock market is a reflection of current economic conditions in the society, and perhaps of total social complex, on the one side or on the other side is a casual factor reflecting back to feedback into the dislocations and internal chaos that we often encounter in this society. It was the stock market decline in 1962, and how much horrendous has been the stock market decline since that occasion.

I well remember attending a conference thrown by the people in charge of the Stock Exchange in Toronto two years ago—maybe it was 18 months ago—in which they were all in a state of down-in-the-mouthedness, in extremis—if I have ever seen people. They were hardly able to drink their cocktails because of the current state of the market then.

And they had one of those prophets of doom, one of those doomsayers, up to talk to them—I forget his name—but certainly a very pompous and splenetic fellow he was too. I remember him speaking in the conference room up there and predicting the utmost catastrophic consequences arising out of the market in the next 18 months, and thank God he has been proven wholly wrong.

That of course will have nothing to do with his credentials or his prestige as a soothsayer, because we are dealing here with incantational problems, with the problems that do arise in the African veld, under somewhat less civilized conditions, but generically the same, where the ringing of a bell fortuitously in the night brings about certain dire social consequences, that the trees talk, the rivers whisper and the stars give strange noises, which have a detrimental effect, particularly the sun-spots on the current state of the market.

Mr. Ferees says:

> The message I get is that the stock market, the shrine of the something-for-nothing cult, ought to be abolished and the destiny of nations should not rest in an institution whose ultimate irrationality, like that of war, is everywhere acknowledged.
>
> The economic justification for the market today is minimal. Its political and moral justification even more so. The exchange is an enormous dice game whose real character is shrouded in mythologies, sedulously built up by public relations.

He based his contentions on two things, one of which has a fair degree of relevance—the one being that the major corporations in North America and throughout the world, the oligopolies, are not in any way dependent upon the stock market to do their primary financing, that they rely upon the generation of their internal wealth so that the stock market is subsidiary to that general problem, and besides that, should they need

sufficient funds they can obtain them from a diversity of other sources without any dependence in this particular regard.

That is the one argument that is used and I say it seems to me to have a considerable amount of weight. The other one is what I mentioned a few moments ago: the irrationality at the heart of the market; the possibilities, the built-in likelihoods if you will, of manipulation; the fact that it does cause in our society, is used as some kind of index to, dislocations of all kinds.

And I think you may very well scout the possibility of retaining in being an institution which has such detrimental effects on the whole. I think that you should, that it is worth bringing this sort of thing up, although I do not give accordance to it, because it makes you fundamentally rethink the various institutions of our society. The only time we come to regard anything with any sort of assessing judgement is if it is about to die, or if it is no longer, if it is not going to be around in a few days time. In these particular circumstances then, we come to regard things as precious and we come to look upon them with clear eyes in order to judge their merits or demerits.

Well, I will leave you with those particular thoughts on the market. He has many other things to say about it. I will just read one other short sentence in this regard: "As for something to put into the place of the exchange, this would seem to be no problem to an ingenious nation." It might call for some bizarre measures to keep the inveterate gamblers happy, such as federal laws licensing some of the chains of stock brokerage firms as high-stake gambling parlours or legalized lotteries and since we are coming into the lottery field in a big way—as the minister pointed out to us this afternoon—perhaps this would be an area for the exercise of these peculiar talents that people have.

I would like to return to the business of consumer affairs and to place on the record the general approach made to this by Lyndon Johnson. Johnson, in his fourth message to the United States Congress said:

> A hundred years ago consumer protection was largely unnecessary. We were a rural nation then; a nation of farms, of small towns, even in the growing cities neighbourhoods were closely knit. Most products were locally produced and there was a personal relationship between the seller and the buyer. If the buyer had a complaint, he went straight to the miller, the blacksmith, the tailor, the corner grocer. Products were less complicated. It was easier to tell the excellent from the inferior.
>
> Today, all this has changed. A manufacturer may be thousands of miles away from his customers, even further removed by distributors, wholesalers and retailers. His products may be so complicated that only an expert can pass judgement on their quality. We are able to sustain this vast and impersonal system of commerce because of the ingenuity of our technology and the honesty of our businessmen by this same vast network of commerce, this same complexity, also represents opportunities for the unscrupulous and the negligent. It is the government's role to protect the consumer and the honest businessman alike against fraud and indifference. Our goal must be to ensure every American consumer a fair and honest exchange for his hard-earned dollar.

And as a general statement of approach or philosophy in the particular area, I think that pretty well sums it up—precisely what you should be doing.

What we want to do is to eliminate all forms of chicanery, all forms of abuse in the marketing of goods and services and credit—the three great areas in which you are concerned in your department and in these estimates.

In the course of the estimates and perhaps before even we get into it, the minister might point out or might seek to delineate something I find very difficult to do on the reading and that has to do with your shared jurisdiction or your divided jurisdiction in these matters with the federal government. Precisely, if you can say precisely, where you have divided up the territory by amicable agreement among yourselves.

For instance, even in such matters as harmful toys, the federal government has passed legislation in that regard. Nevertheless you get a fair number of complaints addressed to you as your yearly report discloses touching that particular kind of toy.

Food seems to be largely a preserve of the federal government, particularly in the realm of its testing. Nevertheless, our agricultural department here in Ontario has some kind of responsibility over quantities of foodstuffs and I would like to know the demarcation under this particular heading.

Just what are the areas—even if it takes a while, I do not mind. I think it is from the

constitutional point of view extremely interesting and from the point of view of what your department is doing with the very much increased expenditures you have. What precisely are you doing?

Your expenditures in the last couple of years have almost doubled. I could give you the precise figures going from your 1969-1970 estimates of $3.4 million to this year's figure of $4.9 million, $5 million.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I wonder if I could ask the hon. member under what vote he is reading that item?

Mr. Lawlor: I am looking at the summary at page 89 of the estimates. The total summary picture of your estimates.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: How does the member relate that to dangerous toys or articles brought into this country?

Mr. Lawlor: How do I relate it? The minister has a vastly increased expenditure largely arising out of a consumer affairs department which has to be justified and it can only be justified in the breadth or the scope of the activities of his department as they impinge upon, or are shared with, or have some relation to with that of the federal government which is also spending vastly increased sums of money in this particular regard. I want to know if this government is wasting it by doubling it up?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know we should not perhaps interject here but I think, perhaps, also that maybe this is the place and we can deal with it further in the actual item of the vote. I am sure that the hon. member is aware that we discussed this in Ottawa May 25 and 26.

The jurisdictions re importation into this country are surely and clearly federal and the decision as to what articles may come in under the federal laws governing that area lies in the federal jurisdiction.

It is true we have an intercourse and we are concerned if these things get into our area. We have one particular Act which sometimes is treated in a lighter vein. That is The Stuffed Articles Act but we examine those articles for standards of quality. We make sure it is new material and free from disease or contamination and things of that sort but the federal government is in this area. It is primarily federal jurisdiction and in our discussion at Ottawa a few days ago we indicated our attitude, which was that generally it should be federal and that we would cooperate in any way asked of us, as did the other provinces.

I have not looked at my estimates or the particular figure the hon. member is reading but I think it goes much wider and beyond what he is trying to relate it to. However, when we come to it I will have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. Lawlor: I will refer to some notes I made out of this heading, Mr. Chairman.

First of all the provincial government in the business of itinerant sales and cooling-off periods.

"Some degree of false advertising," and there would be a kind of a shared field, I would suspect. Under "Some degree of false advertising in Ontario," I put down with a question mark, production design of automobiles, including new safety equipment. The 1969 report brings in the area of toys.

Over against that under the heading of "federal government," I placed food, labelling, substances to allergic consumers, abnormal users of all kinds, spill-proof containers, particularly with respect to child care, actions, under The Combines Investigation Act, hazardous household products of all kinds.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is all federal.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, that is all federal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, almost entirely.

Mr. Lawlor: That is what I say. Their particular sphere of jurisdiction over against the ones I mentioned for your heading. Now I would like that elaborated upon and explained as to just how much further the minister feels he can go. Take just the one field, the field of advertising itself. The minister has the possibility under this legislation of issuing cease-and-desist orders to fraudulent advertisers. You have used it sparsely mind you. Up to 1970, I believe, there have been only six orders given by the department in that particular regard. What happened to them we will find out during the estimates, but let me refer you to what my old friend Ziegel has to say about this very point:

> Many observers are quick to suggest that effective regulation of misleading advertising, without minimizing the definitive problems, must reside in a public administrator armed with the authority to order the immediate cessation of such activity. In the event of dispute his order could be appealed in an expeditious and inexpensive manner

> to a review board, and in due course if necessary to the courts. In this manner the allegedly deceptive advertising is nipped in the bud and potential harm to the public is thereby minimized.

This at least appears to be the rationale behind section 31 of The Ontario Consumers Protection Act which empowers the registrar of the consumer protection bureau to issue such an order subject to detailed appeal provisions.

Unfortunately since the operative date of July 31, 1967, only six such orders to my knowledge have been issued, and the public was only acquainted with the identity of one of the businesses involved because an appeal unsuccessful was taken from the order.

The pace of enforcement, I would suggest, varies not only with the strength of the literal language which is present, but also with the political priorities in the concerned department. Now what do you think about that last statement? What could be possibly meant by a professor who is lifted above the fray, that the strength of the enforcement varies with the political priorities involved in the process of those industries and those individuals who have to be brought into line with respect to false advertising.

He goes on, and this I find rather interesting, to describe in another area what goes on in the State of New York, which is somewhat more in advance of our jurisdiction. However, you may plume yourself upon your new legislation. He is saying what the government can do in this particular regard instead of parroting the old phrases about vigilance being your best protection, etc.:

> Beyond the publication of pamphlets on its activities, the New York Bureau of Consumer Frauds and Protection interprets its informational responsibilities to include timely warnings of sharp practises in the public media.

Do you do that? I have not noticed you on television of recent date telling what the newest piece of chicanery is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Since the hon. member asks; he was speaking only a few moments ago about the fact there were only, I think he said, six prosecutions for advertising. That is one of the reasons why the intervention of our people as to the type of advertising which is submitted and reviewed and checked prevents —and I think this is more important than prosecution really—prevents the publication of this type of advertising. We get at the matter before it gets damaging.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): How do you get at it? Do they submit it in advance to you?

Mr. Lawlor: Come on!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A good deal of it! We see it and call it off before it becomes a matter for prosecution because it gets much—

Mr. J. Renwick: That is a very cozy arrangement.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Which I think is much better than waiting until it is advertised and then prosecute it. Just because New York, maybe, has more prosecutions or something of that sort than we have, does not prove a point to me that they are more effective in their methods at all.

Mr. Lawlor: No, you may learn something.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am quite willing to learn but not that way.

Mr. Lawlor: Just keep your soul open and find whether or not New York has valuable things to confer upon your head. The point about this advertising—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will permit. He says "I have not seen you on television." I do not go on television very much except in my home riding, perhaps, when I am there every week. I am sorry the hon. member cannot observe me there.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Believe me, there are grounds for prosecution in what you say in the Soo.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He comes across better than the Premier (Mr. Davis) does.

Mr. Lewis: Talk about false advertising.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Is it in living colour?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes. You may have an opportunity to observe me in future months.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Meaning what? The "Howdy Doody" show?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was on the news media, on television, warning not so very long ago about pyramid selling or referral selling and the things that I thought were wrong about that and the steps we were taking to investigate it with the committee and the steps which we may contemplate

taking to prevent it, to stop it. I think that that warning in itself has quite an effective result in stopping some of the practises; scaring some people off.

I am not satisfied, of course, that it is concluded. We will certainly, I think, need to take steps in legislation, to get at this. I was on television just a few days ago about lotteries, and in this House. I think there are a few problems there. They are not serious, but they give me some concern. We have tightened some of our regulations, quietly, without getting into a lot of publicity about it. I do not know that I have run to the news media on every occasion when we are doing something. But, since the hon. member asked and said, "I have not seen you appearing on the news media," I would like to tell him I do get into the act once in a while.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean, despite his genial personality, that the minister in person would be obliged to do this. He has people who have trained scowls or smiles, or whatever it is, who go with television, who can carry out this function rather more often. He has more important things to do in this House than to spend his time depicting sharp practices on the media. I will come back to it in a moment.

As far as false advertising is concerned, I cannot help but think, with all the deference I can summon on this occasion, that the minister exaggerates as to the submissions of advertising to his department and their approvals in advance of the cause. Certainly, there is nothing in the legislation that makes that obligatory. If they do on occasion submit some advertising in advance to have the minister approve it, so be it. I doubt sincerely whether it is done on any great scale. I would have to have proven to me that a certain percentage of the total advertising done through the media, through the newspapers, radio and television, received your prior approval before being aired. If that were all the case, then so be it. But I can hardly think that good deal of advertising I see in the various media has been particularly approved by you. I would think, somehow or other, they would have to cut back considerably in their protestations and claims.

Therefore, it is just the opposite. It comes around that your six prosecutions do indicate a fairly pusillanimous attitude and a fairly light hand, let us say, which, you know, basically typifies the consumer affairs department with respect to its enforcement all the way along the line.

I do not think it is a roaring success by any means. My fellow members, whom I speak with in this particular regard, and the general public, with whom I come in contact, are not raving about the high rate of kill or the high rate of solutions. Don Goudy in the Star probably pulls off more alleviations for human beings than your department does at the present time.

It is not a good and tough department. I can give you half a dozen instances I know of in my own personal experience where I do not think they have turned on any steam. They always say they are shackled by the law, that the Act does not permit them to do this, and permits them to do that, that you have to sue—we will come to representative actions in a moment too.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think this is interruption, This is question and answer, more or less. It is debate.

Mr. Lawlor: You just want to defend your people, as you should, that is your job.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member does not mind my debating with him and I like his debate with me.

On the question of advertising, where we get into the act, really, is with the advertising media the newspaper which says: "We have an advertisement here. This is the way it reads, what do you think of it?" and submits it to us in that respect. We say: "That will not go," or, "That comes within the lines of our standards."

That is where we affect the situation and prevent the false advertising, the misleading advertising. That is why we do not find that advertising coming out.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Yes, but you prevent it on the part of the people who are not prepared to engage in it in the first place, because they check with you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the newspaper which submits these things to us with some concern, says: "What do you think of this?" and we say that we do not like it, then they do not publish it. That is a much more effective way than waiting for it to be published, and after a number of people have been taken into camp, carrying on a prosecution.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, to return to the object lesson and model of the State of

New York, beyond the publication of pamphlets on its activities, the New York Bureau of Consumer Frauds and Protection interprets the informational responsibilities to include "timely warnings of sharp practices in the public media." That is a different thing from the advertising, I think the minister will agree with me.

What they are saying here is that, in conjunction with the Better Business Bureau, and in consequence of a number of complaints of a particular sharp practice that is operative in the community, he then makes this well known to individuals, through the public media, to warn them off. Now, I do not think that the minister does that extensively.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Pyramid selling, referral selling—exactly the same thing.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister has run out of steam. He has cited the two instances in which he has recently done precisely this sort of thing. Pyramid selling I think did have an impact upon us because at a certain restaurant out toward which I have my stamping grounds, the tents of the Arabs, one morning, suddenly disappeared. They were there for weeks getting their pyramid-selling portfolios into good shape, I was told. All kinds of activities were going on there. But when the department indicated its intent to move in, suddenly, they say, there was not a wet coffee cup left in the joint. They have all gone west, I understand. Let them stay.

Nevertheless, the minister knows as well as I do there are any number of the rackets as do the fraud squads, Better Business Bureau and others which your department may and should be in on the ground floor of. They crop up all the time with respect to paving contracts and driveways. With respect to the selling of certain kinds of pens, an infinity of things crop up then take on a certain boom over a period of time.

I am suggesting to the minister it is in line with what the New York people do, that timely warnings are given to the populace at large so that many of them do not have to wait until after they have been bilked and taken advantage of. Be ahead of the event and say this is a coming piece of unscruplousness in our community at the present time and make it known to the public at large.

Then go on with an energetic representation of its activities in the foreign language press, in neighbourhood legal aid clinics and in the federal anti-poverty programme, which may not have as much implication here.

Certainly in the legal aid clinics, the activities of the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Ontario Consumer Protection Bureau pale by comparison. That is an astute judgement.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who says that? Who says that?

Mr. Lawlor: I want to make sure. Oh no, and thank heavens, it is somebody other than Ziegel. William A. Neilson. Neilson is the associate professor of the Osgoode Hall—

Mr. J. Renwick: He is the favourite of the ministers.

Mr. Lawlor: —Law School of York University in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is on one of our committees. He works with us. So does Ziegel.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have Neilson: We have Ziegel and who is the other one?

Mr. Lawlor: Soon you will not have any.

Mr. J. Renwick: You have institutionalized your committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And we have Linden. We have Professor Linden, Professor Neilson.

Mr. J. Renwick: Pretty soon you will have no recourse but to appoint members from this party.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, we are always glad to have worthwhile suggestions.

An hon. member: We have these three professors work with us.

Mr. Lawlor: There you are, you see. You try to emasculate the opposition. You try to draw the teeth of the dogs.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no; no, no.

Mr. Lawlor: The only independent people left in this province will be the member for Riverdale and myself over here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Far from emasculating them we try to energize them.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Another hon. member: Still we will reserve that for the opposition.

Mr. Lawlor: Here is another area which has a good deal of validity and which you are deficient in. Should the disclosure rationale extend to the testing of products and services and the publication of the test results? To some extent through the Ontario Research Council you have a certain amount of testing done, but let us not say that you become the great white bearded grandfather of them all and do all the testing of products like Consumer Reports does in a wide area. Let us not go that far.

But surely consideration has been given to testing the products that the Ontario government buys for its own use as to its longevity and as to its tensile strength and as to the value of the product that you buy?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We use the Ontario Research Council to a large extent. You will find that in the estimates, I am sure—the money we pay them.

Mr. Lawlor: That is true. I mentioned it myself a moment ago, that you do use the Ontario Research Council on occasion, not in depth I suggest to you. If the minister can counteract that statement, do so by all means. Give me—you are the minister, you have everything at your fingertips—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Vote me some more money.

Mr. Lawlor: They can supply you with a plethora of material. I say to you that it is shadow, that the minister just touched upon the Ontario Research Council to the little extent that he does.

And secondly, suppose the minister did it in the bulk of his products to find out just what he was getting, would there be any harm in making the results of that test procedure known to the general as a protective device?

And then the minister can consider going one step further, and I think it would basically end up with this in another decade, that the minister will provide some kinds of certificates of specification and what not to products as they go on to the market—performance tags as they are sometimes called—on products. That will be a primary responsibility of government to have a role in seeing that the products being placed on the market are up to the standards that they purport to be and will be validated by such a performance tag.

You may work—and I hope that does not have to be done again—solely through the auspices of government—you can work in conjunction with not only the minister's own internal organization, like the Research Council, but with consumer affairs.

Even that American publication which has a very wide circulation—I am sure—is always, forever complaining about having a lack of funds, that it cannot buy the proper testing equipment, that it cannot even buy the products to test in sufficient abundance to find out. They say, "We were able to purchase one Porsche this afternoon and we tested it"—that kind of thing—instead of having adequate funding so that the test procedures and performance standards are set and we know what we are getting.

There are about four or five other things that I think consumers affairs might do by way of giving greater service to the community than it presently is doing. One of them I mentioned earlier, before dinner, namely, is that the minister should consider the business of—and the minister mentioned that he was doing it at the federal level, and that is good—a flexible standard of adhesion contract form to protect consumers or purchasers in all consumer transactions.

The second one is this: To what extent, if at all, has the minister considered the possibility of taking representation actions in the court on behalf of consumers, that is, if their number was sufficient, not an odd one here and there, but if a case was egregious enough, if it stood out like a sore thumb? The minister might, in the case of certain victimized consumers, assume the burden from them and take the case into court on his behalf by way of representative action.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is the hon. member talking of criminal or civil action?

Mr. Lawlor: The minister has got me stopped for a moment. I would think that the action should be basic civil; yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Civil?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. I would not insist upon the minister's taking the criminal action because of the instrumentalities of the criminal court. In other words, through the Crown attorney's office, the minister would be able to get his sufficient investigation under way.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Which we do.

Mr. Lawlor: But I think the minister has already got the device there, up to a point.

But what he has not got is an action for damages, an action whereby he can get some recovery for the victimization, unless he risks in an unacceptable way the costs of the action, the attritions that go in, the whole bit. He is moving into the area of considering representative action of latter date in his business organizations under The Corporations Act.

Representative actions have become an acceptable form of proceeding. I simply say, give it some thought, adapt it to the consumer affairs department, see what the minister can come up with by way of assisting the consumer. Actions are usually too small and too hazardous, however afflictive they may be, for an individual or even a group of consumers to venture into the courts because the courts are too costly.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would again permit—this is perhaps not strictly on the point, but I think it was raised earlier in the debate this afternoon. For instance, the Ontario Securities Commission by its action in preventing trading, by stop orders, in removing listings of stock from exchange, protects the public and puts a very drastic penalty really on the promoters—the company which is doing something of which the Securities Commission cannot under the regulations and the legislation approve—and, thereby, by what is a civil action.

The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) was berating us a bit, I think, in his remarks about not taking more criminal action, but I think that the effective thing that the Ontario Securities Commission was doing, or is doing, and doing continuously, in preventing people being taken in stock transactions by our laws and our regulations in a purely civil way and by the exercise of its power is really more effective, a more effective penalty and a more effective protection by far than waiting for someone to be bilked.

Then even though the Attorney General and The Department of Justice carry the prosecution, that does not put money back in the pocket of the poor citizen who has been robbed by some fast promoter. But stopping that promoter before he gets down to robbing the individual, by destroying his plan and keeping the money from getting into his pocket, is far more effective than the criminal prosecution. I mention that only as an illustration of a civil process which we are carrying out in this particular area of securities which I think is more effective, more rapid, and more effective—that is the only word I think I can use—to prevent the offence and prevent the robbing of the citizen, than a criminal prosecution after the event.

Mr. Lawlor: I quite agree with the minister, Mr. Chairman. He is perfectly right. There are two stages involved and two sides to the coin. One is wholly negative. The cease-and-desist order or the business of suspending trading by the Securities Commission is an altogether valuable weapon and should be exercised extensively. The other side of the coin is that in the case of the harm or damage actually having taken place, the terms of redress for that, again in the terms of the Securities Commission, I have not got it at my fingertips, but they have some form where minority shareholders under certain circumstances may call upon the commission to take representative action civilly before the high court in order to obtain certain orders to protect the interests of those—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is there to keep the directors honest and conscientious in their job.

Mr. Lawlor: Precisely. I am simply saying by an extension or analogy of that principle into the area of consumer affairs, the second head or positive side of the coin can be turned up, and if it is not presently in your legislation I suggest to you it would be an affirmative move and of so great benefit to the public at large for you to possess that power, or for your bureau to possess that power, in the area of consumer affairs. You presently do not.

You leave it wholly to the terms of the market, which means to the courts by way of an individual proceeding to seek to get redress, to get revisions of contracts, to sue for damages, either in whole or in part, because of the loss in defective goods and so on, and all that that involves. And this is an area which you very well may balance out and flush out the balance of your law in this particular regard.

The third thing I would like to bring to your attention and ask, for what it is worth again, is: Is it not curious that in British law they have through the centuries provided in the case of land, immovables, real property, release in various ways when a persons falls into debt or falls behind in his payments, say, on a mortgage. If you remember, in the old mortgages there were acceleration clauses of all kinds to pull the mortgages in. They are still there. Relief against forfeiture may be given under certain terms by the court, etc.

One gets there and gets adequate time and the judge gives the person the opportunity to redeem the property again; but in the case of chattels or personal property, this is not so. I suggest that in terms of consumer credit and the lending policies that are in effect in the western world and in Ontario at this time, some consideration should be given to relief against forfeiture and acceleration clauses and all this sort of thing that are imposed by conditional sales and hire-purchase contracts of all kinds. Why not give it to—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You do not put the two on the same basis, do you? The land on which you stand, on which you build your home, on which you must have space to exist is not the same as your refrigerator, your television set, your piano or your washing machine, really. You do not put them on the same basis, I am sure.

Mr. Lawlor I have constituents who are deeply attached to their colour television sets. As a matter of fact, it is almost umbilical, the cord which unites them; it has never been severed. There are things that people have. The move with respect to once having paid two-thirds of the value of an automobile, it cannot be seized from you—that was a move in the direction I am talking about. It was a relief from forfeiture, because in the old days when you were down to the last month's payment, were unemployed and failed to make your payment they moved right in and took it away. They could do so, at least, and very often did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Maybe you were better off then.

Mr. Lawlor: Now you have afforded some protection. That was a measure of protection I will give you credit for. But can you not envisage a deeper measure? Sure they are more movable, they are more seizable, they are more obtainable, they are more exposed. At the same time you must consider, this is the important thing, that there are cases of the consumer, the purchaser, who has bought an article that is precious to him, and that he wishes to retain but because of adverse circumstances at the time, he falls behind in his payments. In most cases he surrenders it without blushing: "Take it back, I do not want to see it." Of course, they become responsible for the difference between the sale price of the article and what was still outstanding, under the credit agreement which was probably twice the value of the thing. But leaving a little thing like that aside, in the odd case when they do desire to retain the article, cannot you give them some relief in that circumstance? I suggest that our law is not so uncouth and so purblind as not to be able to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am going to deal with that right now, Mr. Chairman, and certainly say I will take the suggestion into account. I think it bears some further debate, eventually, because in addition to those things I mentioned a moment ago, there is the depreciation which occurs with an article of personal property in use—a car, the television set, the household appliance—which depreciates from day to day and eventually becomes worthless. Whereas our experience has been, over the last several years at least, that land, far from depreciating, although remaining the same in essence, appreciates a great deal in value, so that one loses a great deal in the taking away of a little portion of earth to which one may claim for some space on which to exist. So there is quite a difference, philosophically, between dealing with personal property and real property.

However, I have noted the suggestion of the hon. member and I would like to consider it. I think we have some provisions for provisional forfeiture after the claim has been advanced by the purchaser or the owner, where it exceeds that of the seller, or lender, but perhaps it needs expansion. I will take it under consideration.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, of course, the depreciation argument operates both ways.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It does not operate on land.

Mr. Lawlor: At least it must operate, to some extent, in the mind of the creditor as to whether or not it is worth seizing, or whether what he is going to realize from the seizure is going to be sufficient unto the day. Would it not be better simply to sue the—I suppose the seizure then would occur, in those instances when he thought that the debtor was completely down and out and that this is the only thing he was likely to save from the rubble.

But that is not usually the way they act, is it? They seems so pretty carte blanche right across the board. They seize where they can seize and they do not seem to worry particularly about depreciation, and they take their chances with the debtor as they would anyhow. In other words they will bounce back against him subsequently

for the difference, which, if he has not got the full amount owing, is still plenty big anyhow. They still take those risks and chances.

So I think your argument is not all that powerful. Anyhow, I wish you would stop resisting my blandishments in these particular regards. But do take them under consideration.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I did not resist. I said I have noted the suggestions, and I can go further and say since the hon. member presses me I would say we have that under consideration. And that is a fact.

Mr. Lawlor: Okay. Well, the last matter on which I wish to speak has to do with the balloon provisions written into conditional sales and other kinds of contracts.

As the minister knows a balloon provision is one where a person buying a product puts a small down payment on it, gets uniform monthly payments at a very low figure as an inducement to buy, and the whole amount owing falls due at the end of the day. The last month the overwhelming amount of what is owing all comes at one crack. Nothing has been done to alleviate that particular piece of iniquity. What happens is that they go back in to refinance the thing, and practically the whole initial amount of the loan has to be paid. Even if that is not so, the increased rate and the bonus he has to pay to renew the loan for the next subsequent period, probably on a balloon basis again, is ever that much greater and it means that over a period of time his debt is greater at the end of the day because of the accumulated balloons than it was when he got started. Surely a protection ought to be given in that way, and the way in which the protection can be given is well set out. Let me see who wrote this one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Never mind who wrote it, but tell it.

Mr. Lawlor: Maybe it is our friend Ziegel; you would have to give him credit, for heaven's sake.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think I have read it. He was a great philosopher, and I pay him great tribute for saying that. There comes a point where we decide how far we can go in legislation: How far is it practical and feasible to go to protect the purchaser, the consumer? He wants to buy some article, he has a great desire to get it. He is willing to pay a price for it. He is willing to pay a certain interest rate. He is willing to make certain payments per month whether he can afford it or not. He says he can.

How far can government go, which certain individuals—not the least of whom is the hon. member for Lakeshore—will stand up and say has no right to interfere. How far can government go to say to that individual: "You cannot buy that article. You cannot enter into that contract. You cannot commit yourself to this obligation." The hon. member says we should protect him, not let him get into that situation, because it will balloon on him and he will find himself. His last day will be far worse than his first, with which I agree. But tell me, philosopher, how far do we go? And do not point to Professor Ziegel, because, with great respect, he never ran a commercial enterprise as far as I am aware.

Mr. Lawlor: I have never been in outer space but I am extremely interested in space travel. That is a very poor argument. Ziegel will tell you; be attentive to Ziegel. He has the answer, I think, and it is as follows—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will listen.

Mr. Lawlor: Okay, now do not be prejudiced, just because he knows more than you or I. He says:

> Two related problems also deserve some mention. The first concerns the use of balloon clauses in those agreements and the second involves the position of the Siamese. Now, you have cleaned up the Siamese situation. But as for the balloons—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: How is he going to stop it?

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

> —the Ontario select committee was opposed to prohibiting their use but recommended that the lender should be required to draw attention to the presence of the clause in ink of a different colour. For my part, I much prefer the approach adopted in UCCC:

I have not got a clue what that means.

> This provides that, "with respect to a consumer loan other than one primarily for an agricultural purpose, one pursuant to a revolving loan account, if any scheduled payment is more than twice as large as the

average of early scheduled payments, the debtor has the right to refinance"—

That is, all you have to do is alter your legislation.

—"the debtor has the right to refinance the amount of that payment at the time it is due without penalty."

Now, would that not put a stop to it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, no. He refinances, and if Professor Ziegel would carry out that refinancing contract to its bitter end he would find that he might not call it ballooning but he would be paying about three or four times what the article is originally worth.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, it is certainly a mitigation of the present conditions. He goes on:

The terms of the refinancing shall be no less favourable to the debtors than the terms of the original loan, which you know they always get worse because the interest rates are constantly escalating, and you start off with one interest rate and you are going to hit another one. These provisions do not apply to the extent that the payment schedule is adjusted to the seasonal or irregular income of the debtor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is beautiful theory. That is beautiful theory. I would like to see it in practice.

Mr. Lawlor: That is what you could say about all your legislation. It is beautiful in theory until it is legislated. And when it is legislated it becomes high practicality, does it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It has got to be practical.

Mr. Lawlor: I am surprised at you. I am surprised at you. Such hostility in this particular regard.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): You tell him.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. These high-falutin fellows from up at the university do not know what it is all about. If they had to run a consumer credit bureau, by gad, they would change their tune. There are a number of areas that one could talk about, but we will talk about them when the time comes, particularly with respect to the new lotteries legislation, which has a great deal to commend it. The thing is I just want to say a word about it.

I was amazed to learn in your brochure on the lottery situation that prior to 1969, or prior to the coming in of this legislation, there were over a quarter of a million various kinds of lottery schemes going on all the time in the Province of Ontario. You know, I think it is a heaven-sent thing that we do not enforce half our laws because all of us would be in jail.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was under a certain Attorney General.

Mr. Lawlor: A quarter of a million other things that were opposed to the Criminal Code are in operation in the Province of Ontario. No wonder you are terrified at the prospects of across-the-province schemes. If there were that many afoot at that particular time, they will certainly begin to burgeon under present permissive legislation. But by this time, I suppose, it is like hens' teeth, you know—the selling of the thing—and all the soldiers sprang. I suppose there must be at least half a million at the moment, of one kind or another, in full and magnificent array.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are all licensed.

Mr. Lawlor: Did you know all about them? I mean, have you got a brochure or a book that can detail to me the various schemes and the various things that were going on? How did you reach that figure of a quarter of a million various things?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I published that.

Mr. Lawlor: Your department did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not in my time.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, in your time. I will send it across to you as soon as we get going. I am finished, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have any further reply?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, it has been a very interesting commentary by both the member for Sudbury and the member for Lakeshore on the estimates, and I have been delighted to take part to some extent in discussion with the member for Lakeshore. Perhaps it will save us from time as we move on into the individual items of the estimates. I have made a few notes as we went along. Perhaps if I could refer to them?

The member for Sudbury suggested that Ontario should get out of the securities field. I think he was sincere in that regard. We have talked about this; not just Ontario alone,

but the provinces. Some provinces do not have much of a securities field to work in. Ontario is, without doubt, the great area in which stocks and securities are traded and I think the other provinces to a large extent do look to us for leadership which we try to indicate and give. Quebec—the Montreal Stock Exchange—and British Columbia are the other large provinces which are interested, particularly in this area.

All the provinces have met and discussed the field of securities trading, securities regulations, securities commissions, what should be done, what could be done by way of standard uniform procedures, what could be done in the way of co-operation. We have talked with the federal authorities, the hon. Mr. Basford and his officials. There has been a proposal for an organization known as CANSEC which would be a co-operative organization agreed upon by the provinces to lay down certain definite and uniform rules.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): For the last three or four years he has been discussing—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, and there has been a lot of discussion, a lot of consideration and a lot of co-operation and considerable progress toward this idea.

Now, I think it has to be said that while we have offered to the federal government and federal authorities the fullest co-operation in discussing how the federal authority or federal jurisdiction might be established for the whole country, there has been little participation by the federal government in the discussions which the provinces have carried on.

The federal government has been notable by its absence. There seems to be a reluctance to discuss these matters with the provinces and while Ontario has offered co-operation, there has been no firm proposal, no definite proposal by the federal government as to what it seeks to do, what it seek to establish, what it seeks to accomplish, how far its authority would extend, whether it would dispose of the provinces completely or whether there might be—which I think very well could be—a field in which there could be a very large and effective area of federal legislation and federal control, federal direction and some function for provincial governments to carry out.

I would like the hon. member for Sudbury to think, if he would, that possibly this is one of the things—I think there is a lot of merit in his suggestion—this is one of the things in the great territories that we have such as Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec. Again, I mention those three particularly, great wide territories with different conditions, industrial situations, prime industries, particularly mining, lumbering companies, promotions of various sorts that possibly the province and the provincial administrators might have a little more know-how, a little more sympathetic approach and, perhaps, a better understanding of the needs of the locality, the needs of the promoters and the needs of the people than one overriding body sitting and being administered from Ottawa for this whole country of Canada.

I think, perhaps, there is still some area where we certainly should move to some substantial federal direction and control and I think there is still a role for the province to play. But the point I make is that, at the moment at least, the government at Ottawa, has made no specific proposal, except something which, I suggest, is indefinite, very vague and a two-tier operation, which, I think, would be more full of delay, full of expense and full of uncertainty than what we have, where we do have our quite capable, quite knowledgeable and quite experienced provincial legislation and provincial securities commission now operating.

Mr. Deacon: Almost as bad as that regional government in Niagara.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes; it might. This two-tier thing might be not as happy an arrangement as one might conceive, I am glad to hear the member, who has some experience on the stock exchange and with the market, offer this contribution.

The hon. member for Sudbury complained, and perhaps with some justification, that he did not think we were doing enough to protect the consumer. We will not argue that there are many things that we wish to do yet. With the estimates I ask of the Legislature I hope to achieve some additional things, but he was specific in saying that he finds no consumer protection bureau in his city of Sudbury, in the area which he represents, and he is right.

As I look at the report which I tabled last week in the House, I find that there are regional offices of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs in Hamilton, Kitchener, London, North Bay, Ottawa, Peterborough Sault Ste. Marie Thunder Bay and Windsor. I would like to see a few more established and Sudbury, I am amazed to see, is not here. That is a very active commercial area, a great area where a great

deal of commercial life is carried on, a community in which the rate of pay of the citizens who work in those mining industries there is very high.

Perhaps we will find it possible to establish additional regional offices. They do take complaints. They do afford a certain assistance to consumers, somewhat similar to our consumer protection bureau here at 555 Yonge Street, in the city of Toronto. They are perhaps not as completely staffed, but they do serve a very effective purpose in those places. I agree with the member for Sudbury. We would like to establish more of them and perhaps we can get at least to Sudbury since he specifically complained.

Mr. B. Newman: We have one and it works well, except that it could use a little more help.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The member would like some more staff?

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And so would I.

The member for Sudbury asked, what are we going to do about the computer? I do not know. What are we going to do about the computer? I do not know whether that lies within the jurisdiction of my department alone or not. He cited a specific case where he did not get results. The computer was slow in replying and very difficult to get an answer from, but I do not have much sympathy for anybody who uses a Diners Club card. I do not use those. I do not think he had difficulty with the American Express. Perhaps he should be using Canadian Express or a Canadian bank's card in any event.

We have passed legislation to control the use or the obligation with respect to those credit cards, and I do admit there is a problem if you do not get a satisfactory answer. But I am sure he did not feel worried that he had to pay the bill for an hon. member for Ottawa, now a member of the cabinet, for the account he got. So I take it he was giving me that for a matter of, perhaps, personal interest more than a real complaint about the operation of my department.

As I mentioned, when he spoke about the lack of prosecution, I mentioned that in speaking to the hon. member for Lakeshore, our actions in stop trading orders and the other means we take to prevent promoters, who are outside the law or trying to evade our laws and regulations, are more effective and more prompt in protecting the public than criminal prosecutions. But where fraud, misrepresentation—fraud amounting actually to theft of the citizen's money—is found, we then consult and refer to The Department of Justice those cases which should be prosecuted.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Yes, but you never win a case.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh yes, in my time we did.

Mr. Sopha: You have an almost unbroken record of losing them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In my time, we won some cases and I am sure we will win some more.

Mr. Sopha: Who did you ever put behind bars? What happened to Viola and her husband? Where did they go?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will give the hon. member—

Mr. Sopha: They got the George Cross. They got the $2 million and they got the George Cross in addition. You have not won a case in five years.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, yes. I am not going to go into detail but if the hon. member thinks about Atlantic and Prudential, and checks those records, he will find that we have prosecuted some very prominent people who were involved. And convicted them and they were sentenced. We do refer those cases to The Department of Justice and they are prosecuted.

The hon. member for Sudbury spent a good deal of time on one specific case, Erie Diversified Industries Limited. I think he was justified in citing that. I think he did last year, if I recall, although this was not then my department. I think he gave the House a dissertation on the failure, what he felt was the failure of the Ontario Securities Commission and he reviewed the matter then. He has placed it in Hansard again today.

I have to confess that you can take one case out of a great many dealt with by any department, or any organization such as the Securities Commission; you find one case where judgement was not perfect, where judgement was not good, where somebody, apparently with design, took advantage of the law and was able to circumvent it, to damage the public and get away with it for the time being.

All I would say is that apparently there is the situation here where you can take a particular instance and say, "This was not a good thing; this does not look very good." That case is under investigation; it is being pursued. I do not know what the result will be, but I am certain of this—that if it is found that there was a concerted plan, a design, to rob the public, rob the citizens, those persons will be dealt with by the law.

I can only tell the House that matter is not one with which we are very happy. It is not one in which perhaps the best foresight could have seen what the party had in mind, but we are following it up and this is not the end of the story.

The hon. member, however, said—and he has the prospectus in his hand—he could find no date on it, and he made something of that.

Mr. Sopha: Did you find the date?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Did you find it?

Mr. Sopha: No, I did not find it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You did not. Do you still have your prospectus?

Mr. Sopha: No, you have mine.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No I have not. I have got one of my own.

Mr Sopha: Well, where is mine?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yours went to Hansard, I understand. But anyway, I will send you this one. If you look on page 25 of that prospectus, on two places on that page you will find the date, September 26—

Mr. Sopha: Yes I saw that. But I did not think that was the date of the thing.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, that is the date that appears on this prospectus. The certificate of the company is dated September 26, 1969; that is signed by Fred Litwin and by Giles, the chief financial officer of the company. And there is the certificate of the underwriter, Cochrane, Murray and Company, also dated September 26, 1969, and that is signed by Mr. Kassel, C. K. Kassel, the vice-president of Cochrane, Murray. Then, the hon. member also made much of the fact that nowhere in the prospectus did it say what the money which was to be raised—

Mr. Sopha: Now that is more important. I did say that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, you did.

Mr. Sopha: I did say that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You did. Yes.

There was nowhere where it said what the money that was to be raised by the securities was to be used for. Now, it is my understanding that every prospectus requires a statement as to what the proceeds of the issue are to be used or applied, what they are to be used for or applied against.

Now, on page 6 of the prospectus, there is a clear paragraph headed: "Use of Proceeds."

And then under that it reads

> The estimated net proceeds to the company from the sale of 500,000 aggregate principal amount of convertible debentures, amounting to $450,000 net will be used for repaying of bank loans of the company incurred with the acquisition of subsidiaries and for the acquisition of machinery, equipment and inventory.

Now, I think that would clearly put on notice anyone contemplating—

Mr. Lawlor: Hey, how close can you read that one, Elmer?

Mr. Sopha: How does that jibe with the statement on page 2, I believe it is?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I will come to that. But that would surely bring to the attention of anyone contemplating buying those securities that they were bank loans, and they would then look at the financial statement and see how much the company owes, so that it is very possible that that whole 500,000, the net proceeds of which are $450,000, could be used largely to pick up debts and obligations existing at the time this prospectus was filed by the company.

Mr. Lawlor: If you do not read them more carefully than that, the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) will not consult with you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I am not saying that in defence of this company's action, I am merely putting on record the fact that in the filing of that prospectus which came to the Securities Commission, there was that information—use of the proceeds, what they were to be used for—so that, in good faith, one would expect that the company would improve its position by paying off its debts—

Mr. Sopha: You learn something every day.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will just end by—

Mr. Sopha: But it says on page 2 they are going to build 10,000 additional square feet of space. Now, how does that jibe?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I merely stress that it is a mandatory requirement that the use of the proceeds be shown in the prospectus, and in this case it was shown, and I do not think it is important that the prospectus was dated, but it was.

Mr. Sopha: All right. We will not quarrel about it. You caught me without my prospectus.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And the final point which I again repeat is, this thing is still under investigation.

The hon. member for Sudbury—I think I took his remarks down correctly—said that what my predecessor in this office established, with respect to mutual funds, was composed of members of mutual fund companies. I think that is not correct. I think he went on to say there is no industry less conscious of its responsibility to Canadian citizens than mutual fund companies and he said that the people representing the mutual funds were on the committee which was established by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Now I think that is not correct and I have not had the time to finally check it out but I am quite certain I am right. Presentations, submissions, were made from the industry, and I think it is quite proper and quite desirable and very advisable to get such submissions, but the members of that committee were officials of The Department of Financial and Commercial affairs. They investigated the industry and had the industry make representations, gave them every opportunity to come forward, and made recommendations as a result of what they heard.

Perhaps it may be said that the committee might have been wider, might have had other representation upon it, but it was not a committee composed of members of mutual companies. I want that on the record.

I have a note, I think it relates to this. The committee was composed of administrators in this area from across Canada, including representation from the federal government. That is even wider than I had been aware.

Now I come to the member for Lakeshore. He started off with the commentary on the takeover bids, takeover of companies, that situation generally. And as I understood his remarks as he opened, he was questioning the effectiveness of our law, how far it went to protect the shareholder of the company being taken over, and particularly the situation where an offer is made to the controlling shareholder, holding or controlling a large interest, whether a similar offer or an offer of equal price should be made to those other shareholders.

It seems to me, although I am not certain, that within our legislation, as presented, if not as presented then certainly under consideration, we have that very question as to whether we shall require, or it should be required, that where in a takeover situation an offer is made to someone holding a controlling interest, a similar offer or offer of equal price should be made to those others.

More than that at the moment I cannot say but I know if it is not in our legislation which is coming forward then it certainly is under very immediate consideration.

The hon. member also referred to the Kimber report, page 26, which I noted but I have not had time to read since he made his remarks. Perhaps before the estimates discussion is over, I will have something more to say on that.

As the hon. member for Lakeshore went on I saw fit to interrupt him, as he said, in his discourse, beyond what he contemplated, but I enjoyed the interruptions, and I think we both got something from them. No doubt some of those points will be raised again as we continue with the individual votes. I do not know that I have much to add to what I said as I interjected into his commentary.

I did point out to him that Professor Ziegel was one of my appointments, I think, when I was Attorney General, to the committee which assisted the Ontario Law Reform Commission in its study of The Personal Property Security Act which is very closely related to the protection of the consumer as we deal with him under Financial and Commercial Affairs. I have a great respect and a great regard for Professor Ziegel and his intellectual quality and the contribution he has made.

I do think—and I do not think he would mind perhaps my saying this—but I have to look at these matters. I think government must look at these matters from a practical, feasible, achievable point of view. It is all

very well to propose something that is beautiful, idealistic and perfect in its conception, but if it will not work down in the marketplace in the day-to-day nitty-gritty of interplay between seller and lender and banker and borrower, it is just useless to put it in that language on the books.

Mr. Lawlor: May I ask a question? Surely you do not think there is anything utopian about saying that at the end of a ballooning contract they must renew that contract at least at the same rates as when it came into existence. There is nothing nebulous about that, is there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just say this. If that contract as originally written was so bad that it could not be carried; that it did balloon; that the interest rate was so high; that the payments were so much that they could not be met; that it had to be refinanced, all I would ask the hon. member to do is take his pencil, and take that contract and refinance it for another two years or another three, and tell me at the end of his figuring what the article which was bought for $350 cost at the end of five years.

Mr. Lawlor: It depends on how hard you blow on the balloon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member thinks that is idealistic, if he thinks that is going to be a good contract, then I will sit down. But I will tell him when he does his figuring he will find that it costs three or four times what it is worth.

As I say, it is very beautiful to say there should be an opportunity to refinance but if the contract was so bad originally that it has to be refinanced and it is going to sink the man at the end of two years or one year, then it is going to sink him twice at the end of four years or six years.

You cannot convert it. There is an old proverb that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Perhaps that might be applicable here. You cannot take something that is bad in the beginning and make it good by stringing it out over a number of years. I would like to have that example worked out.

Mr. Lawlor: We are both right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes. Both right.

Mr. Lawlor: It depends upon the computations made and the degree of the ballooning as to what extent the monthly payments cut into the interest situation. Maybe they just do not eat into the principal situation very much. It depends upon the terms of the thing; how large the balloon is.

As I say, it is a question of how hard you blow on the thing whether or not the renewal of the thing is in the best interests. Certainly, very often mortgages are all balloon contracts are they not? All falling due within five years with the bulk outstanding. Nevertheless, when they are renewed it would be a good thing to have it renewed at the same interest rate as the previous time, but whether they were or not, it is a termination point. No mortgagee would accept such a sum of money that will not, in some way, cut down upon the total principal situation. The same thing should be applicable indeed. Even doing that, though, you get the great big balloon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, that is not right. First of all, there are many mortgagees who are happy over a long period of time to get interest at eight, or nine or 10 per cent. They do not need to cut the principal down.

Mr. Lawlor: I bet a lot of finance companies are, too.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let us take the contract that Professor Ziegel has in mind. Let us take a case where a husband and wife buy a television set and they pay $500. The interest is 10 or 12 or 15 per cent and at the end of two years they are just as far behind or almost as far behind as when they started.

Instead of repossessing, it is refinanced and at the end of seven or eight years the wife says to the husband, "Joe, do you know what we have paid for that television set? It cost us $1,500 and it is damn near worn out." I do not think she is going to be happy with that, nor is Professor Ziegel. I do not think that is an ideal situation.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Nor is her husband.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Nor is her husband, no. You have got to sit down and take the actual case, and I will not accept the idea of generality, which sounds so delightful as it is read.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we have had a fair discussion on certain general features in some detail. There was one point that somewhere I noted and I do not see it in my notes at the moment, but the question of the principle of federal function and our function in relation to dangerous articles, standards of imported items.

I think we generally follow the principle that the federal field has to do with the standard of the product, its quality, how it is made, its ability to meet their product standard, and we in the provincial field have to do with the selling of it, the distribution of it, the advertising of it, the financing of it, and that sort of feature, except in the stuffed-articles area where we have a special Act, where we do examine, we do require certain standards to be met, we do use the Ontario Research Council to check these items, and you will find that item in the estimates.

That is our particular field, but where there is importation, and certain standards to be met as to the nature and the quality of the product, that is generally federal. We look after the way it is handled to the consumer in the field of selling, advertising, financing and meeting those standards. Generally that is where we try to draw a reasonable dividing

As a result of our discussions in Ottawa two weeks ago, on May 25 and 26 we may, I think move to a clearer delineation of federal function and provincial function. And one of the things I always take pleasure in mentioning, with which I will conclude, is that we try to carry our education and our information and the things we are doing, to the people. A step in that direction is our "Caravan." We have staffed it and it has our brochures with respect to the laws we have on these 26—I think it is 26—pieces of legislation which we administer, explaining what we can do for the consumer.

We tell the young couple the cautions to take before they engage in the purchase of a home or a car, a used car or a new car; we tell them about credit unions; we tell them about financing, the things where we can help them; and we tell persons who have problems and complaints how to bring them to our attention and how we shall try to deal with them; we deal with securities, we deal with insurance, we deal with real estate, we deal with all these items, and I think that that approach which we have just launched upon is something we can well expand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I am wondering whether we can deal with the votes by items. Certainly in vote 601 the first four items seem to be more or less related; it would be difficult to separate them; perhaps the fifth and sixth items could be separated.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, do you want to take them individually?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps on vote 601 we can take the first four items together. Would this be agreeable? Does this sound reasonable? The first four items of vote 601 together and then we will deal with item 5 separately and item 6 separately. Would the hon. minister agree to that or has he—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All right, let us take vote 601, items 1, 2, 3 and 4. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

On vote 601:

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under research and advisory services I wanted to ask the minister if he did not think that the department should have been able to provide the public with information as to whether gasoline prices were justified on the part of gasoline companies?

Mr. Minister, you know that the gas prices have gone up substantially just recently, and parts of the province are paying substantially higher than other parts. In fact, gassing up yesterday I paid 55 cents a gallon for gasoline back in Windsor. You can buy it on the highways at substantially less than that. I think that certain areas of the province are being penalized as a result of the discriminatory practices of the gasoline manufacturers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's question is well posed and proper. When I was in The Department of Justice we did, along with the then Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), some studies. We interested ourselves in the question of gasoline, fuel oil prices, and interviewed some of the big oil companies, who were supplying people of this province with those products, and I have certain material obtained as a result of those inquiries.

I have not, as Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, carried that on in the short time I have been in this department, particularly because I am aware that the Minister of Highways, now Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton) I believe, is doing a study on that, and I think that was mentioned either in the Speech from the Throne or the budget address, by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) who was also involved in that matter. I am hopeful that those studies will be pursued and that we will be given the information which comes from them and perhaps find it possible to take some action. But I must confess I have not, in this

department, followed the studies I undertook pretty much on my own initiative along with the then Minister of Revenue in that period.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I had asked of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs last year a question concerning the gasoline pricing in various parts of the province, and I specifically asked if he was going to undertake a survey and a study in the city of Windsor. He gave me the understanding that he was going to, in connection with the federal officials. Now the study has been completed, but no results have ever been recorded of that study, and I think it is high time that we knew just exactly what did happen as far as the federal-provincial look into the pricing structure in the Windsor area is concerned. Has the minister anything to report on that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member mentioned the Windsor area. One of the reasons I undertook the study—and it was quite factual—was because I found out that oil which was brought to Sarnia for refinement could be delivered cheaper in my constituency, Sault Ste. Marie, which was all by water, than it could be delivered to Toronto—maybe Windsor, I do not know, but certainly Toronto. The price differential was quite marked, much lower in my area. That was one of the reasons I undertook the study I did at the time, and with the Minister of Revenue.

Now, of course, the answer becomes immediately apparent that while it is cheaper to deliver the product in Sault Ste. Marie than it is in Toronto, with the volume of market in the vast north area, the distances it has to go to be delivered from Sault Ste. Marie—and just even to deliver a small quantity in Sault Ste. Marie—the cost related to the unit was higher than in the great teeming market of Ontario. That was one of the answers we received.

Now to come specifically to the hon. member's question, I do not know what my predecessor did. I shall have to make an inquiry. But I would hope that the inquiry being carried on by the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Treasurer will be pursued, not only with respect to Windsor, but all across the province, and I am particularly concerned with northern Ontario as well as the very southern portion from which the hon. member comes.

Mr. B. Newman: I am glad to know the hon. minister has looked into it as far as his end was concerned, but as I previously mentioned, the previous minister did undertake some studies, because I know of gasoline-station operators who were interviewed both by federal and, I think, provincial authorities. I do not know, now. I know the federal authorities were there and no results have ever been published and no one knows exactly what did happen as a result of the studies.

Now, I am sure that the minister is aware that during the Throne debate I made mention of the fact that gasoline from the Sarnia refinery was being sold, or I was told it was being sold in Detroit at 23.9 cents an American gallon. And that same gasoline was being sold across the river, no great distance to travel at all to transport the gasoline, at 49.9. Now, if you take the differential between the sizes of the gallons, then it probably would have been the equivalent—or sold in the states at the equivalent—of probably 31 cents a gallon in relation to the 49.9 that we were paying.

Surely there must be something wrong when the Canadian distributor can sell the gasoline in Detroit at such a ridiculously low price? I know there was a gas war on but why should we have to pay for it in Canada?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Government tax, is it not?

Mr. B. Newman: Well, even with the tax and everything of the sort, there would have been the difference of approximately 20 cents a gallon. It would practically pay you to cross to Detroit with a car just to fill up a tank, get a tankful of gas, and come back into Windsor and pay the bridge or tunnel fare. Somehow this does not seem right, Mr. Minister, and something has to be done to look into the pricing structure of the gasoline manufacturer-distributor because I know the gasoline-station operator is not making the money on it at all. He has his normal markup. In fact, I think during my comments earlier, I made mention of the high percentage of failures in gasoline retailers. They are struggling like the dickens to make the dollar. The type of contract that they have to sign, or leases that they sign with the gasoline distributors— and the manufacturers really have them around the throat and I know that they have submitted a brief to you, complaining—yes, they did, Mr. Minister. If they did not to you, then it was submitted to the committee on fran-

chising, and I would assume it would have ended up in your hands anyway.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They will be reporting to me again shortly.

Mr. B. Newman: I know, but their brief was submitted some time ago, so even though the committee itself has not reported back to you I think there has been sufficient time for some type of action on the part of government. I do not think we can keep waiting all the time. We are penalizing our own citizen if the gasoline distributor is overcharging the citizen which, according to the gasoline retailers, he is.

The contract that they do happen to have with the gasoline distributor is such that they make mention that the gas station operators are not even free to set their own hours. They are not free to buy the gasoline that they choose. They are compelled to buy designated brands of TBA—I forget what that stands for—and antifreeze at prices which are not always competitive.

They are not free to advertise their own names and are compelled to advertise the oil company. They are compelled to pay for promotional advertising programmes and contests sponsored by the oil companies.

Mr. J. Renwick: But that is free enterprise. They are all independent operators.

Mr. B. Newman: They are compelled to accept lease and contract changes. The only alternative available being to abandon their business. The operator considers he has two freedoms only—freedom to do everything his oil company suggests and freedom to go broke.

Mr. J. Renwick: He has got the same rights as the oil company. He can cancel in 60 days.

Mr. B. Newman: So, Mr. Minister, I think the ORGA, with their brief, I think it is high time some action was undertaken on behalf of the consumer as well as on behalf of the gasoline dealer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the points that the hon. member raised are very important. I have been informed since he started to speak that the report from the franchises committee—and that committee made a report to me about six weeks ago on their work up to that point. They did not report on this feature them—I am told that the report which is now approaching finality is ready for my consideration. I have not got it, I have not seen it, but I am very concerned about it.

I was in the House when the hon. member made these same remarks, to a large extent, and in the budget speech I thought he asked a question—

Mr. B. Newman: The Throne Speech. I said budget, I was wrong. It was in the Throne Speech.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I thought the hon. member had asked a question of the Treasurer about why the prices of gasoline in Detroit were so different and less than in Windsor, but perhaps it was just in his speech. I thought he questioned the minister about that.

This is something, I agree, which is certainly to be looked into and perhaps there is even a greater interest here in that a product is going out of the country. It would almost seem that it might be said that it was being dumped. I do not know. This does take place in perhaps a two-way arrangement. Generally we are the victims of dumping. I am told that some years ago you were able to buy bread or flour much cheaper in Britain from western wheat than you could buy it in Ontario or any part of Canada.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, that is Canadian freight rate structures—the farther you go the cheaper it gets.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You could buy it cheaper in London than you could in Regina. I do not know. But certainly I would undertake to look into the matter. I have some knowledge, as I say, from what I did a few months ago in another department, and I will be getting the report from the franchise committee and pursuing it.

Mr. B. Newman: I have one other item I would like to follow up on this topic, Mr. Chairman, and that is concerning give-away promotions as are undertaken by the gasoline companies. Is the minister considering my legislation barring or banning the promotion operation, the promotion gimmick—

Mr. Lawlor: I do not want to be nasty, but on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what has this got to do with the first four votes? I did not mind listening to the member on the first point which was completely out of order, if I may say so, but I do think it is piling it on a bit thick to do two in a row.

Mr. B. Newman: I will concede then, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants.

Mr. MacDonald: Can we have some clarification, then? Is the franchise issue in a later vote?

An hon. member: In the third vote.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is speaking as if this includes research and I—

Mr. B. Newman: Right, I was speaking on research, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, he started from research.

Mr. Lawlor: Whose research?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that it would come in this vote, probably item 2—research and advisory—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is where it is, I have a point I would like to raise, in that—

Mr. Chairman: With respect to the hon. member, the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) has been trying to get the floor since the previous speaker was up, if he wants to speak on the first four items of this vote—

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, the member for Windsor-Walkerville covered almost everything I wanted to say. I had been approached by local members asking me to bring this to the attention of the minister. I know that they do not like being forced to buy all these premiums that they have to sell and, as I say, the hon. member has covered what I was about to say.

Mr. Chairman: Very well. We are taking the first four items together. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I have two points I want to raise and I think they can and should be separated: namely the question of price in reference to gasoline, and secondly all of these other ramifications of the franchise arrangement.

Now, if I may go back to price. Frankly, I am very apprehensive about the answers the minister has given tonight. He says that when he was in his previous portfolio he had initiated certain studies, partly because of his interest as a northern member and partly because of his responsibilities as Minister of Justice. It went so far, but the Minister of Transportation and Communications is now in it, the provincial Treasurer is in it, whether or not this minister is in it we do not know.

On occasion when we have asked this government as to whether or not they were going to review certain price changes to ascertain their justification, we have tended, from as high as the Prime Minister, to get the reply that that is none of our business in this Legislature, that prices are part of the market place.

Now perhaps the minister will understand my apprehension. We have too many cooks, meddling in the broth. I suspect that we are going to get no answers from anybody. In fact the minister himself is one minister who got into it and now is out of it and three of his colleagues are mucking around in it. I think it is time for the government to make up its mind whether or not it has any obligation—and just let me say before I go any further that in my view it has an obligation—and if so, who is responsible for carrying out that obligation, to discover what goes on, to take one example, in the whole question of the pricing of gasoline? This is the free enterprise system, and the operation of pricing is a jungle at any stage. In this instance, it is an infinite jungle, completely irrational. If I may tie this in with the franchise issue, the minister is aware of the fact that every one of the major oil companies has got another company through which they will sell gas cheaper. They will sell it at such a price that this non-franchise dealer can retail it for less than gas is made available to some of their regular franchise holders. It is the same gasoline from the same company but retailed through another subsidiary.

Mr. B. Newman: Just a different name.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. Just a different name. Now this is a calculated kind of competition, and the exact purpose of it quite frankly I have not quite been able to figure out; but it seems to me that somebody is getting rooked in the deal. I know that the franchise holder, certainly the regular franchise holder of the major gas companies, is getting rooked, and I want to come back to that in a minute.

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the game the gasoline companies are playing?

Mr. Trotter: Making money.

Mr. MacDonald: And who, for example, is benefiting from this?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Gasoline companies. Profits going up and up—

Mr. MacDonald: These gasoline companies do not engage in this sort of game unless they are profiting by it. I think one could take that as the premise on which they are operating. Now, if they are profiting by it then the consumer ultimately is the person who is paying the bill. It seems to me that the minister who is responsible for consumer affairs is the minister who should be delving into this.

It may have Minister of Justice ramifications, but how the Minister of Transport gets into it I shall never know. He is not responsible for pricing. He is building highways and doing a few other things. Conceivably the provincial Treasurer might be into it. But it seems to me that this is the appropriate area in which it should be done. Ironically, this is the area where we are talking about it and this is the very minister who is doing nothing and three of his colleagues are now into the game. Now what is the explanation for it? Perhaps you would like to deal with that before I go on to the second.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to start out by saying that I have never, I think, in close to eight years that I have been here, said to any member of the opposition that it is none of his business. I might have felt that perhaps it was not in my purview but I never answered that way. I do not take that attitude.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean with regard to prices?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have never said that.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps I have used the wrong phraseology, but what the Prime Minister said on behalf of the government is that we do not know and we do not care. That is the operation of the market place.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Anyway I do not take the attitude that things that concern us in this House are not the concern of the opposition. I know you are as interested as much as we are.

Now I have to say this, I do think that what I said about the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the area in which he got involved as set out I believe in the Speech from the Throne, was in the cost of transportation of articles, such as fuel of various kinds, into the far reaches of the province and that he was going to look into that from his point of view as Minister of Transportation and Communications.

That was probably a large factor, as I found out in my investigation on my own last year. As to price control, I think I have to say honestly that I have no authority. I do not think any provincial department or any provincial government—

Mr. MacDonald: We are not talking of price control. Maybe price review, so you will let the public know what is going on and you may even find out yourself.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not so sure. I am not so sure that price control comes into this. I am not so sure that I may be bold to say that combines investigations might look into this.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. But I am making it easy for you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not going to take it easy. When I see oil coming from Iraq and Iran and Saskatchewan and the Gulf and Texas and South America and out in the Atlantic and it is all sold in Sault Ste. Marie or Windsor at the same identical price, I find it very hard to believe that it costs the same amount to process that oil from those far areas of the world. It has probably come very cheaply across the water, come from Saskatchewan, or come from the west—our own west or the American west—or from the American states, or from the Florida Gulf, or Mexico.

And I find it very hard to believe that they all come out at the same price when they come out of the same gasoline pumps in any area of this province or across the country. I am not so sure but that the investigation should not be there. Only from some of the things that I said to the oil executives last year, how do you justify that? How do you prove that?

Mr. MacDonald: Fair enough. I am sorry. I was misinterpreting your use of the words "price control." The government in point accepts an obligation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What I am saying is that when you get into that area of investigation I do not have the authority. If I had it, I think I would be keen to exert it. Let me just say this, further, on franchising. Yes, I have authority. We are studying it. The deals that are made, again we distinguish between the

implications of the product and the price at which it is sold. It is federal. Particularly that oil which is imported, and the price at which it is sold, is a federal authority.

If there is a combine, if there is unlawful arrangement in restraint of trade, that is a federal area. The deal that is made between the wholesaler or the middleman and the retailer, that is my area. If they make a franchise that is unfair, that is arduous, that is oppressive, that is my business, and I have a committee on franchises, which as I mentioned a moment ago has reported to me, and they have their report I understand lying on my desk tonight for me to read tomorrow, on these very things which have been raised by the member for York South, the member for Windsor, and others. I shall certainly follow up on that, and I think perhaps there is something I can do there. But if there is a contravention of fair trade practice or, if there is to be a price control, which maybe there should be, that would be federal. If there is to be an investigation as to the cost of transportation, the province could very well do something there, possibly by the way of subsidies to outlying or areas far from the refinery area. That, I think, is quite properly in the hands of my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Treasurer, who has to make the funds available.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister adds to my apprehensions when he says that the one area that his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, is looking into is the cost of transporting the fuel. That is only one of many aspects of the whole pricing trend.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right. I agree.

Mr. MacDonald: Why should he be doing one aspect of it and somebody else doing another aspect instead of some department—I suggest this department—taking a look at all of the ingredients in it? That is the query in my mind. And when the minister then adds, "I have not got the power to do it," look out to British Columbia. "Wacky" Bennett suddenly got angered at what was happening to some of the hinterland seats held by his own backbenchers; he set up a royal commission and he got the facts. This is a provincial jurisdiction. He did not have to wait to find out what the combines commission was going to do in Ottawa; as a matter of fact, I am certain a lot of things he found out in BC apply here.

I cannot recall the exact figures, but I remember two or three years ago—maybe it is five or six years ago now—driving from Sudbury through the Soo, I noted with interest that when I bought gasoline in Sudbury, the price was such and such. When I bought it at Blind River, or somewhere midway along the north shore or driving toward Sault Ste. Marie, the price was about seven or eight cents more. Do you mean to tell me that it cost seven or eight cents to transport it from Sudbury up to Blind River or some of the adjacent points? Of course not! That is why the Minister of Transportation and Communications is wasting his time; that is why one aspect of it has got to be tied in with all of the other aspects.

It is a jungle—manipulated, managed prices—in which the consumer ultimately pays; and if the government in Ottawa is not getting into it, you have a responsibility to get into it. The reactionary Social Credit regime out in BC was willing to do it; why do you not do it? And incidentally you should do it for precisely the reasons that Bennett di dit in BC; namely that a lot of these people in the BC interior were being rooked because they happened to be some distance from the main market on the coast. That is precisely what is happening to the people of northern Ontario whom presumably you, personally as well as a minister, are representing; so you have got exactly the same justification for getting into it.

Just let me say a word, if I might, on the whole franchise business. I am not going to repeat all of the ramifications that the two hon. members from Windsor have made some reference to. I asked the minister a question about this and he said he was going to look into it in the light of the franchise committee report and do something. Recently we have had an even more ludicrous manifestation of the kind of thing that goes on by the gas companies—in this instance Imperial Oil and some of its franchised dealers in the Richmond Hill area.

There was a lot of competition; in some instances, it was competition among some of their own people. So, suddenly they were placed on consignment at a lower price—I have forgotten the exact terminology now—far below what any one of them can operate on, because there was what I am told was an independent study revealing and authoritative that the margin which the gasoline retailers, the dealers, had to have to be able to operate is in the range of 10 cents. This was reducing it down to about four cents. In other words, they were being forced into bankruptcy. Now why should that kind of thing go on? Why would an oil company want to put their own

people—presumably working for them, whether as independents or working as some form of franchise—through this kind of arrangement, I do not know, but the gasoline companies have done it.

Every time they get into one of their irrational price battles it is the gasoline retailer, the man who runs the gasoline station on the corner, who has to take the rap. The mortality rate is just fantastic. At some time, somebody has got to have the courage to go in and civilize the oil companies by making regulations so that they have got to act like human beings, instead of a dog eat dog Chicago gangster kind of approach in which they abuse their own men, their own dealers, in this game.

I do not know how much longer the minister has to wait before he gets his report and has a chance to study it. I say I do not know how much longer he has to wait, because this kind of situation has existed for a long time. If I may refer to the question I put to the minister, the gasoline retailers' association has been asked by the retailers out in Richmond Hill, who are faced with this kind of a situation, as to whether or not the retailers' association could not on their behalf act as a negotiator. They have asked the department whether or not the department would appoint somebody who would be an arbitrator, a chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Should he ask the department?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This department?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Just let me quote from their brief:

> We told the Prime Minister, the Ontario Retail Gas Association was prepared to negotiate with the oil companies for a bill of rights for a service station operator. Up to this time no negotiations have taken place. We still believe that the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs should appoint a mediator to chair these negotiating meetings.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, but where is the request? I have not had it.

Mr. MacDonald: This request—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, but that is not a request to me. As they say, "We told the Prime Minister."

Mr. MacDonald: They have written letters to the minister. I asked you a question three weeks ago as to whether or not you were going to appoint somebody as a—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not believe they have it in a letter to me. I have not seen it. It has not come to my attention.

Mr. B. Newman: I made mention in my Throne debate speech, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You may have, but I am talking about a request from the retailers' association. I would like to find it.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not happen to have the letter here, but I do know that I drew it to the attention of the minister no more than two or three weeks ago that this request had been made and asked was the minister going to respond to it. He begged off on the grounds that he had not had a report from the francise committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not recall, if I may say so, that the request was framed in that way. I think the impression was, was I aware of the situation out in Richmond Hill, and I made some inquiries about it. I do not believe that I have received a request from the retailers' association. I may not wrong, but it has not come to my attention.

Mr. Ben: It says that they believe that, down in paragraph 23 on page 4 of the—

Mr. MacDonald: The appendix 7(a) and 7(b).

Mr. Ben: Paragraph 23, page 4. They believe the minister should appoint—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They believe the minister should, but all I say is that I do not think it has been brought to my attention. I am not making light of it. I just want to be clear on the fact that it has not been brought to me by them.

Mr. MacDonald: I assume the minister has a copy of these appendices to the ORGA presentation of the franchise committee. You will find in it letters to Premier Robarts in June, 1970, in which the Prime Minister said at that time, in replying to Mr. Langdon, who is the executive secretary to the Ontario Retail Gas Association, "The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) is investigating the degrees to which this matter falls under the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario and I have asked him to keep me informed about this matter."

In any case, I come back to the question I asked the minister two or three weeks ago. In light of the specific request in the ORGA representation to the franchise committee, would the minister respond to their proposal of appointing an arbitrator who could act as chairman for these negotiations?

My reasoning to the minister was simply this, that if the minister is not willing to try to resolve the differences within the family, so to speak, by at least appointing a chairman who might bring the partners together so that they can negotiate their differences, sooner or later you are going to have to get right into the game, right into the field.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I agree with you.

Mr. MacDonald: My suggestion was, in effect, making it easier for you. Appoint somebody now and call the two sides together and try to settle it. I do not know if the minister is aware of the fact that what has happened since then—the appropriate officials of Imperial Oil, of course, have written back and in effect said: "We do not play it that way at all. We deal with each one of our retailers individually and they are going to have no collective bargaining." So the ball is back in the minister's court.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I have not overlooked the hon. member's question. I have the report from the franchise committee, but it just is not quite as simple as he states. I do reiterate that I have not received a request from the retailers' association. Certainly, it has not come to my attention and I do not think it has been received.

There may have been something back in June, 1970, which I have not seen yet in the department, but the question the hon. member placed some 10 days ago was: "Would the minister appoint an arbitrator?" I do not believe I have any authority. I am quite certain that I have no authority to appoint an arbitrator to move into this specific situation and say to the oil company, "You will accept this arbitrator," and to the retailer, "You will accept this arbitrator and accept his decision."

There is no such power in my hands or in my department. When I come to answer the hon. member's question I will perhaps deal with it tomorrow in more detail and more fully than I do now, but that is not the way—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): What do you have the power to do?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Pardon?

Mr. Gaunt: What do you have the power to do?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could go on for hours telling you what powers I have and what powers I have not, but I have not got that one.

Mr. MacDonald: In this instance what power have you got to act?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I have not got that one.

Mr. Gaunt: I am talking about this instance.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not got that power. I just have not got it.

Mr. MacDonald: What power have you to act in this field?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I have any power to appoint arbitrators.

Mr. MacDonald: What power have you got in general dealing with the gasoline companies when they intend to strike?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would have to say that if their price arrangements, their dealer agreements were unconscionable, were misleading, were full of misinformation—and they are not—

Mr. MacDonald: They are obviously unconscionable when they set up competitors against their own dealers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But the question the hon. member asked a few days ago was: "Will the minister appoint an arbitrator?" I have no power to—

Mr. MacDonald: I am now talking about the broader picture. Let us get off that wicket.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know that. That is my point. It is a broader picture, and I am not unmindful of that. I am not unconcerned about it, but it is not something I could get up that day and answer. I could have answered and said, I do not think I have got the power, but I wanted to look into it. I want to get the report of my franchise committee.

I think perhaps that if the hon. member will give this minister an opportunity to examine this situation which—actually I have only had the department a couple of months, in fact three months, then perhaps we may find—

Mr. MacDonald: We will ask you a question 48 hours after the minister's estimates are over. That will give him 48 hours to read the report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not going to say "fair enough."

Mr. B. Newman: The hon. member is threatening the minister.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am just warning him. It is no threat.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will do my best in those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the minister that this situation is going to become worse long before it gets better. The price war in Detroit got to the point where 60 per cent, I believe, of the gasoline retailed in that city is now through non-franchised dealers. The oil companies are moving out of this field in many areas because of the bitter price competition, and they are putting on tremendous pressure now, as they are, as has been mentioned before, in the Richmond Hill area, and in other areas around Toronto where there is still a comparatively low percentage.

In the Montreal area the share has moved up to 34 or 35 per cent—it has increased 50 per cent in the last year—going to the non-franchised dealers. I suggest that the minister really get into this soon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder if the hon. member would just add to what he said? I am just interested to know—he says this trade is now getting into the hands of the non-franchised dealer; I wonder if he would tell me, first of all, where the non-franchised dealers get their supplies? How long they will be able to stay in business—

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, from the main oil companies.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Are they going to be able to continue as non-franchised dealers? Has it reduced the price of oil and so on? Or will they be frozen out after the situation has become static?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the situation with the non-franchised dealers is that they do not have credit cards, they do not have anything but gasoline bays. They do not provide extra service. They stay away from promotions. They do not have an advertised trade name. They go strictly on the product that they buy from the oil companies which is a good product, and keep all the extra trimmings out of it. And the public apparently does like this.

But the oil companies, at the same time, are trying to hold up their established business with their established dealers by taking on the responsibilities of setting selling prices —in the areas where there is a price war— actually having their dealers operate on a commission basis with them; these change from being a dealer who is buying perhaps at 42 cents and selling at 52 cents to where the oil company is paying them so much a gallon for actually operating the station. It is a reverse position. Those oil companies that I have talked to have indicated to me that, in their own defence, to hold their position, they have been setting up—as the member for York South mentioned—rival operations in stations where the business has been dropping badly on the traditional brand name.

They are setting up non-service bars where they just sell gas—no advertising, no credit cards—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Non-franchised?

Mr. Deacon: Non-franchised. And it is not the traditional name; it is Econo in the case of Imperial Oil and some other names for the other companies. But we are going to see more of this. There is going to be tremendous strife between the oil companies and the traditional dealers as they work their way through this. I think there is a role for the minister to play in helping through this adjustment period.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Under this head I seem to recall a study made some years ago in the Province of Alberta detailing, in great depth and volume, precisely what goes on in this particular industry, particularly with respect to the franchises and the relationship to our local service-station operators.

I have had many complaints down through the years from them—surveyed some of their contracts and found them to be the most onerous imaginable. Talk about unconscionable. Certainly it is unconscionable.

The young lady was just able to bring me the study that is involved. It is simply called: "Gasoline Marketing in the Context of the

Oil Industry Done Through a Royal Commission Study," I believe; a public inquiry, at least of the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Alberta—of all places—December of 1968, and that is a document which speaks for itself in its fullness as to what goes on in this industry.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And no action has been taken pursuant to that study?

Mr. Lawlor: You would not expect that government would, would you?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I wondered.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. MacDonald: They took action in BC.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the statements being made by all members here with reference to the retail trade, but it strikes me as rather pertinent to the discussion that very little has been said about the direct effects of all these deals on the consumer, and this is certainly the minister's responsibility.

For example, take the gimmicks that the ORGA objects to. When one considers that it costs the dealer from 0.4 to 2.7 cents a gallon, one can only assume that people who do not desire to save either coats of arms or imitation pieces of eight, or coins from all over the world, or hockey pictures or the like are in essence paying up to 2.7 cents a gallon extra for this. They, in essence, are being charged for something that they are not receiving. This certainly does come within the scope of the minister's department, Mr. Chairman, because these are consumers who, I submit to you, are being cheated out of two or more cents a gallon for every gallon they purchase. And what happens further with these price wars? How again does it affect the consumer after these small stations are thrown out of business, by their own sponsors almost? What is going to happen to the consumer, the person who buys his gasoline? Is he going to find less gasoline stations in his own vicinity? Is the price of gasoline going to come down or is it going to go back up? These are all his responsibilities, and to date we have been discussing here the plight of the station owners and I certainly sympathize with them.

I have had complaints from my own gasoline suppliers, and I might point out to the hon. gentlemen here that in order to find out what is going on in their ridings, they buy their gasoline at about 10, 15 or 20 different service stations within their own area. I certainly do, and invariably I get the same complaint: that they are compelled to buy these gimmicks, these premiums which they give away. They are the ones who have to pay for it. Most of them claim they never get their money back.

Surely, when they are being forced to do this, the least that the minister should do, is write to Mr. Basford in Ottawa and ask him to carry out an investigation in an area where he feels he does not have jurisdiction. It is quite conceivable that he may have no power to enter into this dispute whatsoever. I do not agree, because I feel that the consumer is involved. But suppose that his experts tell him there is nothing he can do in a way of direct intervention. Surely one of the things he can do is write to Ottawa and request that they carry out an investigation into the complaints raised by all the hon. members in this House, touching on the retailing of gasoline and gasoline products in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on these four items? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if the discussion on that particular topic is over, I would like to move on to a second point. As a matter of clarification, is the minister now in a position to give us the actual expenditures of his department for the year ended March 31, 1971?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In what?

Mr. J. Renwick: The actual expenditures, because the only figures we have are the estimates for 1970-1971. We do not have the actual expenditures, and I thought that with 2½ months having gone by, the department would now have the actual expenditures which it made during the year ended March 31, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the figures I have for the actual expenditures in the 1970-1971 fiscal year under vote 601—

Mr. J. Renwick: No, for the whole department; I was speaking about your whole department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, the whole department? The actual 1970-1971 expenditures for the whole department are $5,292,516.28.

Mr. MacDonald: That is $300,000 more than in the estimate book. Where did the increase come?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The large amount of increase came in salary adjustments. Then last year the department assumed the lotteries branch—I do not have the exact figures for that involvement—and there was the commercial registration appeal tribunal, which is the new establishment set up for the appeal from various directors.

Mr. J. Renwick: Could the minister give us the actual revenue figure for March 31, 1971?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I think I can, Mr. Chairman. I think I have it. Total revenues in 1970-1971—I am sorry; it was the revenue figure I gave the hon. member instead of expenditure. That figure of $5,292,516.28 was really actual revenue received in 1970-1971.

Mr. J. Renwick: The actual expenditures then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sorry, I do not have it in front of me. I can have it for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. J. Renwick: All right, thank you. I just thought we would have the opportunity of using the most up-to-date figures in discussing the increases in the minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, right!

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, in the reconciliation statement which appears at the bottom of page 89 of the estimates, that there is an item showing the transfer of the grants for credit counselling services to The Department of Social and Family Services. I would like to just make a very brief comment about the fragmentation of this problem of overburdened wage earners in the credit field. We now have the situation where the Attorney General deals with questions related to the division court and the operation of the division court referee, where in the small claims courts there are judgements out against debtors by creditors; and it usually involves an overburdened person.

Then we had, in this department at least, the motions of some concern about a credit counselling service on a strictly debtor-credit relationship.

Then again we have the federal government and the whole question of whether or not this government is going to ask the federal government to make part X of The Bankruptcy Act apply to the Province of Ontario. And now we find the credit counselling operation has been transferred to The Department of Social and Family Services.

I think what it basically means is that the overburdened wage earner who find himself in a tight credit position or under a burden of consumer debt that he cannot cope with, cannot find any adequate place to go for assistance.

If he goes to the credit counselling service it is a hopeless situation, hopeless in the sense that the law is inadequate to provide any avenue by which he can escape back to a sound credit position. They will tell him that he will have to go elsewhere. If he goes to any one of the social agencies they probably have no other recourse than to tell him to go to see Mr. Scott, the small claims court referee, on University Avenue so far as Metropolitan Toronto is concerned. He does not have available to him the alleviating provisions of part X of The Bankruptcy Act. Of course, we have then the overburdened small claims courts in the province.

Now it seems to me if The Department of Social and Family Services is going to take over, as it apparently has, this whole credit counselling function, then we have worsened the position of the individual overburdened wage earner who finds himself in an extremely difficult debt position. My only point is that I would ask the minister if he would consider very carefully the statements which have been made recently by his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa, the hon. Ronald Basford, on the question of not only the application of part X of The Bankruptcy Act as it presently exists to the Province of Ontario, and urge his colleagues and urge the government to make application so that part X will apply to this province. Will he also take this up with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa and show his interest in implementing the recommendations which that minister's committee has put forward about enlarging the area covered by part X of The Bankruptcy Act, so that it will provide a method by which a person, without going into personal bankruptcy, can in fact find himself a solution to his burden.

My understanding is that the basic recommendations at the present time of the most recent report of the minister's committee in Ottawa are in substance a pre-bankruptcy consolidation scheme by which an agreement and an arrangement can be made to consolidate all his debts through, say, the Public Trustee of the Province of Ontario. This is done in a way which would permit him if he faithfully lived up to his obligations over a period of three years, to come out

then at the end free and clear of any further burden of debt and give himself the opportunity to re-establish himself in the community as a consumer able to move on in a rehabilitated position.

Now it seems to me no matter what the credit counselling facilities of this government may provide, and they have been minimal to say the least, no matter what amendments they make to The Division Courts Act in the role of the small claims court referee, and he does a very good job within the limits of his authority, the only way, really, that the province can cope with this serious remaining social problem is for the government to request—and it seems to me it is this minister's obligation either directly himself or to urge his colleagues in the goverment to request—the application to the Province of Ontario of part X of The Bankruptcy Act.

I would also ask, as I said a moment ago, that he indicate to his colleague, the minister in Ottawa, the sympathy of this government for enlargement of the ameliorating and alleviating provisions of part X. I think it is a serious, crucial social problem which has to be dealt with on a unified basis and as a matter of policy of this government.

Many people are hurt by, well whatever the reasons may be and whether you or I think they are legitimate reasons or not legitimate reasons is relatively immaterial, but we are very much concerned that people be given an opportunity to rehabilitate their credit position in a fair and reasonable way; fair to themselves and fair to the creditors, who in many cases have been reckless in the advancement of credit to some of the persons who now find themselves in this debt-ridden position.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting subject that the hon. member raises, and I would be taking some time—I want to take some time to reply—to discuss these points. Seeing it is the hour of 10:30 perhaps I shall reserve my reply till we return to these estimates, which will be tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker, in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the House will continue with the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the motion for adjournment is put, could the minister give us any indication when the rather important bills that stand on the order paper are likely to be called for second reading?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was my thought, Mr. Speaker, that we would conclude the estimates of this department. The next department to be dealt with as far as estimates are concerned in the House is The Department of Revenue. I think I mentioned that earlier today. Perhaps after the estimates of this department are completed we could deal with some second readings.

I would like to get on with them. I do not know how long the House will take to deal with the estimates of this department but if we could succeed in disposing of them in a day or so, we might get to second readings perhaps by Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 7, 1971

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart, continued 2445

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2472

No. 60



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from the Whitby Senior Public School of Whitby and from the Sarnia Christian School of Sarnia. In the west gallery there are students from the Grandview Elementary School of Bethany and St. Edward School of Nipigon.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that today I have appointed Mr. Walter B. Williston, QC, a senior member of the Ontario bar, to act on my behalf in undertaking an investigation into the present arrangements for the care and supervision of mentally retarded persons.

Specifically, Mr. Williston has been asked to inquire into the adequacy of care and supervision of the mentally retarded with particular reference to the question of governmental and public responsibilities toward such persons when not subject to direct custodial care by the government.

Mr. Williston will be given a free hand in undertaking the study and will have complete and free access to both the personnel and facilities throughout the Ontario Hospital Schools which deal with the mentally retarded.

My decision has been triggered by the inadequacy and lack of proper legal and administrative rules for the definition of responsibility for these people.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that some months ago an inquest was held into the circumstances surrounding the death of a retarded person while working out from the Rideau Regional Hospital Centre. Then just a few weeks ago the same coroner who had conducted that inquiry made a public statement regarding another retarded person who had injured his hands three years after he had been discharged from our Rideau school. Both of these incidents have raised many questions regarding the supervision of retarded persons who are no longer residents of our hospital schools, as was the case with both of these individuals.

While these two specific cases have pinpointed our concerns in this area, they do more than that. They indicate far more significant and very topical issues of a general nature relating to the whole area of treatment and care of the mentally retarded.

While I have asked Mr. Williston to look into both of these specific cases, I have emphasized to him that I want him to provide us with some clear direction as to both government and public responsibilities towards such persons. Mr. Williston will be able to shed light on both the government's responsibility as well as those responsibilities which should be undertaken by the public at large.

I have chosen an experienced lawyer to undertake this study because he has both the training and experience to analyse the factual situation of these two specific cases. But more important, as we move into this whole area of human rights we immediately get involved in fundamental legal issues, particularly those concerning the civil rights of citizens, whether or not they are retarded.

I have asked Mr. Williston to report his findings and recommendations to me by August 15, at which time I will cause his report to be made public.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Williston will only be able to open the door on the larger issues in that period of time and we will need to have continuing studies on this subject. Mr. Williston's report will point out the direction in which we should be headed in assessing society's responsibilities to the mentally retarded.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

FARM DEATH OF ONTARIO HOSPITAL PATIENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the minister's statement, I would like to ask him if he is going to give the results of his personal investigation, as minister, into the matters at the Rideau Regional Hospital Centre before handing over all of this responsibility to Mr.

Williston? The minister may recall that he undertook to make such a statement in response to questions some weeks ago.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, everything we have in our files will be made completely available to Mr. Williston. One of my reasons, of course, for appointing him, was that as minister it was a responsibility that I felt I could not follow through adequately in that I was finding conflicts of evidence and disagreements as to the facts, and I wanted a good, bright, experienced, legal mind to squeeze the facts out and analyse them for me.

Mr. Nixon: Further to the same question, Mr. Speaker: I would agree that Mr. Williston is a good, bright, analytical mind and will do a good job in this regard, but the minister undertook some investigation himself. Is he going to make no report on that investigation, but rather hand it over to Mr. Williston until August 15, at which time we will have a report on the present situation in the two specific situations that the minister is aware of?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, as I said, my inquiry itself reached a point where I could not see it culminating in anything very valuable and that the material coming to me tended to be contradictory. I personally do not have the facilities of doing the kind of thing I want him to do, and that is mainly to get out on the ground —for instance, to take the transcript and report of the particular inquest and analyse it as only someone with his experience can. So I reached the point in my own efforts where my report would have been really unsatisfactory in that it was unbalanced. Who could I rely upon without myself getting on to the ground and, of course, as minister I do not have the capacity of doing that.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I accept that. A supplementary question: Since he has indicated in his statement that he wants the investigation to be somewhat broader than just these two cases and the circumstances surrounding them, does the minister not feel that rather than institute a minister's committee of one, the investigation ought to have the powers and the status of an investigation under The Public Inquiries Act? The minister has indicated that the finding will be made public; we have no objection to that—and that a time limit has been set; this we approve of. But surely the powers under The Public Inquiries Act would be useful to anyone undertaking a broad review in the public interest under these circumstances?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, of course, I pondered this particular question. The problem with a public inquiry is that it generally takes much longer and becomes much more formal; I wanted something incisive and immediate as a response. But from a practical point of view I might mention two things: that having had an inquest, we had the full factual background and support of the criminal and quasi-criminal fact-finding exercise there; and insofar as the second incidence is concerned, there will, of course, be available to Mr. Williston the facts and developments and investigations done by the police. So he is in a fortunate position of being able to call upon the arms of the police and the coroner system in his fact gathering.

But let me make this undertaking both to the Leader of the Opposition and really to Mr. Williston himself: that if he finds there is any difficulty in obtaining evidence under oath or with the production of documents, he will certainly receive from this government, through my recommendations, any further powers that he may need under The Public Inquiries Act. But all the documentation I can think of being available is in the hands of The Department of Justice, through the coroner system, or through my department. Therefore, I feel the need for powers of production is not there, and insofar as the investigation is concerned, as I said, we will give him those powers if he finds himself needing them.

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary: What about the protection of those involved in the hearing? I am thinking particularly of the special protections that are normally available, but which have been codified under the amendments to The Public Inquiries Act or the new Public Inquiries Act which is presently before the House. What sort of ministerial protection or legal protection is going to be extended to those people who of course will have to come forward with testimony?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: They will not have to; that is the point. It allows him to make his inquiries and, with his staff, to investigate informally. I really have not assessed the question of protection because

we will not be in the position of forcing evidence out of anyone.

Mr. Nixon: They will be public hearings?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No. They will be public only to the extent that Mr. Williston feels that will be useful to him. I am not directing him in any way as to whether he has them in public or otherwise. But, apart from the points I was making earlier, the coroner who investigated in the first inquest and who has since taken a very particular interest in the second case, has been in touch with me volunteering to support, give access to facts and do everything he possibly can from his point of view insofar as the investigation is concerned.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Further to my hon. leader's question, does the minister not think, in view of the fact that the findings of Mr. Williston will eventually be made public, that he might consider it appropriate to direct Mr. Williston that it is already the policy of this government in connection with public inquiry that any statements or answers made during the course of the inquiry not be self-incriminating?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that and ensure that Mr. Williston is advised of it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): By further supplementary: Is it sufficient just to advise Mr. Williston?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Williston by himself cannot give that protection; surely the law must?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a question?

ONTARIO RACING COMMISSION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Can he explain whether or not order-in-council number 1670, made public June 2, transferring the Racing Commission responsibility from the Provincial Secretary's department to his department, is in fact the beginning of the establishment of a new policy having to do with offtrack betting, and if not, what was the purpose of that transfer?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, the transfer of the administration of the Racing Commission to The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs is just, for the moment at least, for the purpose of administration. Policy discussions have taken place, but I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) or some other minister will perhaps announce that in due course.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Now that the Racing Commission does fall under the purview of the Ministry of Financial and Commercial Affairs, does this minister have the responsibility to undertake a review of the policies pertaining to the commission, both dealing with offtrack betting, and on a more general area, in the racing field?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that when I was informed—perhaps that is the word—that the Racing Commission would be directed to my department—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Informed! They do not consult with the hon. minister any more—they just inform him?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I said I chose that word—perhaps that was the word—if the hon. member was listening.

Mr. Lewis: That is all right. Hansard did not get that wink. It might be useful to have on the record.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have resolved to study it very thoroughly and make myself familiar with it. That is what I have resolved so far.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister advise us whether the transfer was a result of the recommendation of PIP or any one of the other groups that are supposedly studying government efficiency?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I believe it was a recommendation to this effect.

Mr. Singer: By whom?

Mr. Lewis: By those who informed him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: By the committee on government productivity.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I take it from the minister that the Ontario Racing Commission will now be discussed under his estimates presently before the House today?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I guess there would be no reason why it should not be.

Mr. Singer: With great reluctance, he guesses that, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh no!

Mr. Singer: Too bad we found that order-in-council.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: With no reluctance whatsoever. Certainly it would be technically right to discuss them under these estimates, but since it has only come into my department's hands in the last three or four days I doubt if I will be able to give very much information.

Mr. Nixon: On the other hand, the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) is not responsible any longer.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—I would like to have it fairly clear—it will then be a specific matter tagged on to the end of the minister's estimates for which there will be time for discussion in this House? We may never get to the Treasurer.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): If I might interject in this, Mr. Speaker, I made inquiries about it this morning and I have not yet talked to my colleagues about it, but I think the suggestion might well be that the vote would be left where it is, under The Department of Treasury and Economics, and when we reach that vote the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs would handle it.

I am not quite sure whether that is what is going to happen or not, but I think it would probably be inappropriate to ask my colleague, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, to deal with this matter later on today or this evening.

Mr. Lewis: How does the government do business over there? What kind of chaos is it?

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): It is easy.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A supplementary: Since there were only three or four of us here yesterday carrying on a dialogue, why would the minister not tell us about this order-in-council? Why all the secrecy about it?

Mr. Lewis: The minister did not know until this morning.

Mr. Sopha: In the extensive remarks the minister made in opening the estimates yesterday, why would he not mention that the Racing Commission was now under his department?

Mr. Lewis: Because the minister did not know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there was no secrecy. I was aware of the order-in-council when it was passed. I was aware that it was going to be passed before it was presented to cabinet. There is no question of secrecy. I did not think it would be necessary to tell the members because I find opposition members are pretty well informed on when orders-in-council are passed.

An hon. member: We like to hear it straight out of the horse's mouth, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The other reason is that, as I informed the leader of the NDP, I did not really feel that this was a matter for my estimates and I do not think the House would get much information from me because I have only had the matter for about three or four days.

Mr. Nixon: The Treasurer will help the minister with it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Treasurer, in his estimates—

An hon. member: I think the minister dealt with the Spadina parks yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In the discussion of the Treasurer's estimates, if the hon. members will accept that suggestion, I may join in. I think they will get much fuller information because I will be prepared to join in on those estimates on that vote.

Mr. Singer: Button, button, who's got the Racing Commission?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members are interested in getting information, I would suggest that is the way to pursue it.

An hon. member: The minister can give us a hand, too.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a last supplementary for myself, Mr. Speaker, I am not really satisfied with that, because the House leader has great difficulty eliciting from his colleagues the order of the estimates. The provincial Treasurer may not want to come on at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: And we have understood that—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A wise decision on the minister's part.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Treasurer would condescend to be here while we are discussing the Ontario Racing Commission under this minister's estimates and we could deal with it in the next 48 hours.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the suggestion is a sensible one. I am sure that it is probably technically correct that they will have to be dealt with under the estimates as printed and they will be dealt with when The Department of Treasury and Economics is dealt with at some time in the foreseeable future.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The future is never foreseeable.

PROVISION OF CAR AND CHAUFFEUR

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question, if I might, of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. In order to protect the peace of mind of Brigadier Wallace, could the minister assure that this block-long Cadillac and his grey-suited chauffeur would continue to be provided at public expense?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is pretty cheap of the member.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the minister sure of that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, that would not appear to be a matter of urgent public interest.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is a good question. It might be cheap but it is a good question.

Mr. Nixon: Cheap car!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the hon. House leader. Has he made any arrangements for the provincial positions that will be put forward at the federal-provincial conference next week to be made available to some standing committee of the House or for discussion by the Committee of the Whole House before the conference begins?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Prime Minister will be in the House shortly and will probably make a statement today with reference to that matter.

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister will make a statement today?

Mr. Lewis: We will revert again will we? Very organized group.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

HEADWAY CORPORATION AND OHC

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the minister indicate to the House which OHC proposals built by Headway Corporation were turned back for reassessment at the request of CMHC?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that a restrictive practice complaint has been lodged against Headway by a citizens' group in Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how that would concern my department.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that his department has given to Headway a larger amount than to any other group and at higher prices?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that a question or a statement?

Mr. Shulman: That is a question. Does the minister know or does he not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, then: Why has Headway been given such a large amount of work?

Mr. Randall: Because they build all over northern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: It is not usual for the minister to subside so mute in his seat. Maybe we can bring him forward.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the percentage of work they have been given? Can the hon. member tell me that?

Mr. Lewis: Why is Headway favoured over so many other corporations in the province that provide proposals? What explains it?

Mr. Bullbrook: Two out of three in Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want me to explain it?

Mr. Lewis: There is another one the minister read carefully to vet its contents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a few other things to do.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The minister can be sure of its substance.

Mr. Stokes: I think the minister was ready for that question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am ready for it; it is contained in other information that I expected I may have been asked. Is that all right? Is it all right to be careful how we answer questions?

Mr. Lewis: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that in 1970, Headway received 2.97 per cent of the total number of units started by the corporation. In order to do this, the company, I am told, had to make 58 submissions and was successful on 11 projects which totalled only 265 units, the size of a single project in a large city.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if the minister says that Headway had 2.97 per cent, he is including any building that is done in the city of Toronto; is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Trotter: But Headway does not touch the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does that prove?

Mr. Trotter: Is it not true that the projects built by Headway are in areas such as Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Sarnia and throughout Ontario, excepting Metro Toronto? They are not in Bramalea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question I answered, Mr. Speaker, was as a result of a question by the hon. member for High Park, or the hon. leader of the NDP, in which they asked me about the large percentage that this company does. They did not specify a certain area or anything of that nature, as far as I can recall the question.

An hon. member: But it does.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The supplementary question does.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as I can recall.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are not supposed to shoot until you see the whites of his eyes. Hold it, boys. I said, "as far as I can recall the question."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park was up on a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister not aware that his department has prepared a memorandum that has been sent out to both opposition parties, which shows the Headway Corporation built 68 of the corporation's 254 units outside of the large cities of this province and that it had 27 per cent of all the OHC projects in the small cities and towns in Ontario from the beginning of OHC up to date?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what this proves. If the hon. member wants to tell us what that proves, I would be very glad to hear from him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Can the minister explain how Headway Corporation continually, in advance of announcements by the corporation, is able to enter smaller municipalities and auction lands, sometimes six months in advance of announcements of proposed projects by the Ontario Housing Corporation? By way of further supplementary, would the minister advise the members of this Legislature where the leak is in the housing corporation to Headway or in his department or in Progressive Conservative Party liaison.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know whether that was a budget speech or a question, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it is a speech.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was the beginning of a budget speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question is, am I aware—

Mr. T. P. Reid: No, the question is how do they know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware they do know that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Find out about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right; if the hon. member would get up and ask me if I would find out if such is the case, I would be glad to answer him that I will do my best to find out, but to get up—

Mr. MacDonald: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But to get up and make a speech in accordance with what has been happening and merely preface it by saying, "Is the hon. minister aware"—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a huge corporation. I am not aware of every little detail that happens every day. If the hon. member would ask me a specific question and not make editorial comment, I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Could the minister, therefore, in connection with this request, ascertain how Headway Corporation, in advance of projects in the city of Sarnia and in the town of Petrolia, is able to enter some six months in advance of the announcement of the project and auction land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will find out if, in fact, that is the case, and if, in fact, the Ontario Housing Corporation has anything to do with it. I do not know who Headway Corporation is. At least, I do not think I know—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well it so happens I do not know who Headway Corporation is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the first time I ever heard the name Headway Corporation was when it was brought to my attention about an hour ago as a result of an article in the Star, which does not mean that I agree there is anything wrong with what they have been doing. I have not the slightest idea that they have been doing anything wrong or that anyone in the corporation has been doing anything wrong. The hon. member has asked the question. I told him I would get him that information.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary to the minister: I am asking, by way of information, whether he could ascertain whether any members of the board of directors of the Ontario Housing Corporation have from time to time done business with Headway Corporation, not necessarily in OHC projects but in other building concerns? Could that also be ascertained about a company that does more building outside Toronto than any other?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a pretty broad question, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly—

Mr. Lewis: The minister just has to ask the board of directors, I take it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, just a moment; let me answer it. It is a pretty broad question, whether they have ever had anything to do with any of the companies at any time.

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is quite a proper question to ask—

Mr. Singer: Ask them about the plumbing contract.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is quite a proper question to ask within limits. I will ask this question of the corporation officials.

Mr. Lewis: That is fine. I do not think it is a broad question; it is a specific question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it may have sold them slings in 1942, or something.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please!

Mr. Shulman: A specific question of the minister in question. Will the minister ascertain whether any member or former member of the board of directors of Headway Corporation is now working for the Ontario Housing Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: There are a lot of things he does not know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And there are a lot of things the member does not know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary question: Because of this criticism brought onto OHC by CMHC and members in opposition which has resulted mainly, in the view of many, from the bid proposal method of letting contracts, which does not necessitate contracts going to the lowest bidders, is the minister considering doing away with the present bid proposal method which allows—

Mr. Speaker: The question is not supplementary to the original. It is a new question entirely.

Mr. Good: —which allows such firms as Headway to get such a large portion of the contract?

Mr. Speaker: It is a new question entirely. Order!

Mr. Good: What do you mean it is not supplementary? Mr. Speaker, what do you mean?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. Prime Minister would like to make a statement. Do I have the agreement of the House to revert to statements by the ministry?

Mr. Nixon: We are usually asked to do this. Sure.

Mr. Speaker: We will add the time to the question period.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have some objection?

Mr. Lewis: I have an objection but it does not matter. It can wait.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Could it wait?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Go and do it out in the hall.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought the members of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, in particular, and the leader of the New Democratic Party would like to have as much background as I can give at this moment as it relates to the conference starting next Monday.

As the members know, the next meeting of the constitutional conference will be held in Victoria, British Columbia, from June 14 to 16. As I undertook to do, I should like to take this opportunity to review what was concluded at the last conference in February; to report on progress since then; and to inform the Legislature of the general approach which this government intends to take next week.

I must preface my remarks by saying that the negotiations are at a delicate stage. Because many of the proposals and comments that we have made and received from other governments are, by agreement of all participants, confidential, there are details that I am not at liberty to reveal at this time. Within these constraints, I should like to brief members as fully as possible on Ontario's view and expectations of the endeavours of the constitutional conference.

I want to begin by setting Ontario's priorities in the total context of the constitutional review. I do not want to convey any downgrading of the significance of what is under discussion in the constitutional forum. What I would like to convey is that the subjects now on the agenda comprise only one part, indeed they may be symptomatic, of other fundamental concerns in this country that are bothering Canadians and their governments.

In thinking about this, I suppose that these concerns boil down to the fact that we are all surfeited with the seemingly endless disputes in our federation about who does what and to whom. In far too many instances, jurisdictions are unclear and revenue sources are inequitably shared. As a result, confusion is rife both for governments and individual citizens they are responsible for serving. I have no illusions of a conflict-free society nor do I hold to a watertight compartments view of a federal constitution. What I am convinced of, however, is that there are aspects of our public affairs that are not in the order they can be, and should be, and that it is the responsibility of the governments of this country to correct this situation as quickly as possible.

This is why Ontario continues to take the view that we must proceed to resolve not only the means of how we reach agreements in our federation, but also the substance of the issues at hand. In the present work of the constitutional review, when we have completed what we are doing now, then in our opinion we must move on to a fundamental review of the distribution of

legislative responsibilities and, in conjunction, arrive at a more sensible allocation of the limited dollars available to carry out these responsibilities.

Ontario's insistence on taking a total and integrated view of such matters reflects a deep, logical and practical concern to get at the root of our problems. Be it on tax reform or in the constitutional arena, we have put forward constructive proposals with this view in mind. We shall continue this practical approach towards both our symbolic and our functional problems as we are confident that it is in this way that Ontario's continuing commitment to strengthening the bonds of our country is best demonstrated.

Thus we are of the opinion that while the subjects on the agenda in June are important in their own right, they do not touch on all the principal areas of the constitution which we believe must be reconsidered to meet the needs of contemporary Canadian federalism. In this regard, you will recall that since June, 1969, the constitutional review has devoted a great deal of time and effort to the consideration of many major areas under the distribution of powers. For example, substantial discussions have been held on the taxing powers of both orders of government, the spending power of Parliament, income security and social services, capital markets and financial institutions, and environmental management. We want to see this valuable start advanced during the next stage of the review. As well, we must find ways of adjusting our working procedures in order to accelerate this process, so as to ensure that the remaining items dealing with distribution of powers can be discussed and the whole acted upon within a reasonable period of time.

Therefore, we hold to the opinion that the constitutional review is of fundamental importance in that it contains the seeds of developing a more functional framework of federalism within which the many practical and pressing problems of the day can be solved with a minimum of friction and a maximum of effectiveness. Again, I would stress that it is for this reason that we view the close relationship of the distribution of powers to the financial and economic issues which underlie so many of the present-day difficulties of Canadian federalism. Some means must be found, and soon, to ensure that there is established a proper and continuing connection between the revenue sources and the expenditure responsibilities of each order of government. In our opinion, therefore, there is a tie between the constitutional problems and financial problems. To solve one without solving the other would be, in reality, to solve neither. Ontario continues to advance positive proposals to resolve both.

Let me now turn to the February agreement, Mr. Speaker, and review what has happened since then. You will recall that at the constitutional conference last February, the first ministers reached agreement in principle on a procedure to patriate the Canadian constitution, on a constitutional amending formula, and on possible constitutional changes in the areas of fundamental political rights, language rights, the Supreme Court of Canada, regional disparities, and mechanisms of federal-provincial relations. In addition, the conference agreed to modernize the constitution by adopting a new preamble and by deleting provisions which no longer have application.

Since February, all governments have been deeply involved in an attempt to turn this agreement in principle into more specific language. I am sure that all of you will appreciate the policy and technical difficulties entailed. Constitutional provisions have a certain permanence about them, and we must, therefore, consider carefully whether the proposals put forward fully carry out the intentions as expressed in February; whether they are an improvement on what we have and, most importantly, whether the will work to the mutual benefit of all Canadians.

The February statement of conclusions also identified certain policy problems, such as those concerning the Supreme Court of Canada and language rights, which were not resolved at that time. We have been discussing these problems and are considering alternative solutions.

In this connection, on May 31 and June 1, a meeting of ministers from all governments was held in Ottawa to consider proposals which have been advanced in the past two months based on the February conclusions. The purpose of the meeting was to resolve difficulties where possible and to refer any outstanding matters to the first ministers for their consideration next week. In considerable measure, we believe this purpose was successfully accomplished.

The discussions both at the policy and the technical levels have been intense and complex. Ontario has contributed fully to these discussions and will continue to do so. It is Ontario's aim, and I am sure the hope of all governments, to reach an agreement in

June on those constitutional provisions we are now considering. Let me add immediately that when we arrive at such an agreement, I can assure members of the House that the government will provide a full opportunity for the proposals to be discussed in this chamber. I look forward to presenting them for your consideration and approval. I also trust that they will be widely discussed in other public forums so that we can benefit from as many points of view as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally optimistic that we shall have very substantial agreement at the June conference, although some areas may have to remain for additional developments and consideration. I would not regard such an outcome with dismay or fashionable pessimism. It has taken three years of discussion to bring us this far in this important work and it would be desirable to bring it to a conclusion. But this may not be possible so far as every single item is concerned, and I am prepared to spend the necessary time on this phase of the review to ensure that the constitutional changes proposed are sound. Too much is at stake to take any other view or to press ahead with undue haste just to write finis to these undertakings.

I should like now to say a few words about each of the specific subjects agreed upon in principle last February.

1. Patriation: In the patriation procedure set out in the February communiqué, changes agreed upon by governments would be submitted for the approval of Parliament and each provincial Legislature. The Governor General would then proclaim the amendments on a date to coincide with action by the Parliament of Great Britain, recognizing the validity of the Canadian procedure.

The government of Ontario is satisfied with the outline of this procedure and is prepared to take action on the complementary action likely to be required.

2. Amending formula: As you will recall, the amending formula proposed in February specified three different types of amendment:

Firstly, those amendments which apply to the government of Canada, plus one or more but not all of the provinces, would require the consent of Parliament and the Legislature of those provinces concerned.

Second, those changes which would apply to the executive government of Canada or the executive government of a province would, with important exceptions, be made respectively by Parliament or by the Legislature of the province in question.

And third, all other amendments would require the consent of Parliament plus the consent of the Legislatures of a majority of the provinces of Canada, including at least Ontario, Quebec, two Atlantic and two western provinces.

We are satisfied that the provisions as set out in this amending formula will, when adopted, add an appropriate measure of flexibility and safeguards to the whole procedure.

The February communiqué made no mention of how a proposed amendment would be initiated. All amendments undertaken in the past have been introduced by the federal government. We believe either order of government—federal or provincial—should be able to initiate an amendment proposal, which would then follow the same procedure for obtaining consent as any other amendment proposal.

3. Fundamental political rights: The agreement on fundamental political rights, as outlined in the February communiqué, is very close to the position first put forward by Ontario in February, 1969. It would entrench in the constitution those basic political rights which are essential to the proper functioning of a democratic system of government; that is, freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; and the right to vote.

The communiqué noted that none of these rights is absolute, and included the condition that their exercise is subject to certain limitations necessary in any organized democratic society in the interests of public safety, order, health or morals, of national security or of the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

4. Language rights: On the subject of language rights, the February communiqué stated that French and English be declared the official languages of Canada and that any person be permitted to use English or French in communication with the federal administration, in any pleadings or process before federal courts and in the debates of Parliament. It was also recommended that federal statutes and instruments be published in both languages.

At the provincial level, it was agreed, with some reservations from other governments, that English and French should be permitted in the debates of the Legislature of any province, and that each individual should have the right to English or French as his main

language of instruction in publicly supported schools. This right would be conditional on the language of instruction chosen by the individual being the choice of a sufficient number of persons to justify the provision of the necessary facilities. Reservations were expressed because of the need to define what constitutes a sufficient number or the percentage of instruction in the main language. Work is proceeding to seek some resolution to these problems.

5. The Supreme Court of Canada: It was also agreed in February that the existence and independence of the Supreme Court of Canada should be entrenched in the constitution. Ontario has advocated that the court of last resort for Canada should be constitutionally established so that it is in effect the creation of all the governments in the federation. We believe that Canada's courts of final appeal should have an existence as independent of Parliament or of the provincial Legislature as is feasible.

The communiqué also noted agreement that the constitution should recognize some provincial participation in the selection of suitable candidates for appointment to the Supreme Court, while retaining the power of appointment itself to the government of Canada. For the same reason that we consider the Supreme Court should be a creation of the constitution and not of any single government of the federation, we think that the process of selection of suitable candidates for Supreme Court judges should be a joint endeavour of the federal and provincial governments. Given the function of a court of final appeal in a federal system, our prime concern is that Canada's Supreme Court should be, in its principal characteristics, in appearance as well as in fact, a truly national institution rather than a product solely or essentially of the federal level of government. We hope that the constitution will ultimately recognize this important principle.

Finally, in this area, the February conference recognized that the existence of the civil code in Quebec presents particular problems, and it was agreed that consideration should be given to ensuring that civil code appeals were heard by judges trained in the civil law.

6. Regional disparities: A further item in the February communiqué dealt with regional disparities. The conference acknowledged that the reduction of regional disparities was among the highest priorities of the federation, and that the written constitution should recognize this fact. It was agreed that the goal of equality of opportunity should be included both in a preamble to the constitution and in the body of the document itself.

Ontario's main concern in this area is that any such constitutional provision does not restrict the discretion of Parliament or of the provincial Legislatures in their efforts to reduce disparities. In recognition of this concern, the conference agreed that the obligation in the body of the constitution should not be enforceable by the courts and should not have the effect of altering the distribution of legislative powers. In brief, it would be a moral rather than a legal obligation. The concept of a provision of the constitution which is not enforceable by the courts is a new one in Canadian law and has proved difficult to translate into precise constitutional language. I am confident, however, that this can be done to the satisfaction of all governments.

7. Mechanisms of federal-provincial relations: The matter of intergovernmental liaison has always been of primary importance to the government of Ontario. It will be recalled that in September of last year Ontario presented its views on this subject to the constitutional conference in a paper entitled, "The Machinery of Intergovernmental Liaison in Canada." That document proposed that the constitution contain sections providing for annual meetings of first ministers and of ministers of finance and for additional meetings of both groups when necessary. The point of those proposals is to provide a basis for the consultation and co-operation which have become so crucial now and in the future for Canadian federalism. In our opinion, constitutional recognition of the need for intergovernmental consultation must be sufficiently specific to provide the basic framework for this process.

8. Modernization: The first ministers also agreed in February to undertake to modernize the constitution by adopting a new preamble, collecting a variety of statutes with constitutional import, and deleting any provisions which are no longer applicable. The final result of such a procedure will be a constitutional document which sets out the basic framework of the Canadian federation. It should therefore be comprehensive, yet as concise and organized as possible so that it can be read and understood by all interested Canadians. This process is complicated and is requiring a great deal of careful thought.

9. Social policy: At Quebec's suggestion the February conference considered the subject of social policy. Bilateral discussions have

been proceeding between the federal government and the government of Quebec on the programme aspects of this question and on any related constitutional implications. In addition, the federal and provincial ministers of welfare are continuing their review of this matter and will report their findings to the conference next week.

10. Unemployment and economic situation: As I already reported to the House, I have written to the Prime Minister of Canada to ask that the subjects of unemployment and the general economic situation be fully reviewed at the earliest opportunity. The present level of unemployment is so unacceptable and the general economic situation is so critical that I continue to regard this as a matter of the highest priority. In this regard, I can only say that I welcome the federal government's recent recognition and acceptance of our views as reflected in an undertaking to convene discussions of these matters at a suitable date after June 18 when the federal budget will be brought down.

Mr. Speaker, this completes what I have to say now about where we were in February, where we are presently and the approach that Ontario is taking. The task is very difficult, but it is the difficult tasks that are worth doing.

I said earlier that the government of Ontario looks with confidence to an agreement at next week's conference and that is what we are working toward. When that agreement is reached, that accomplishment will signal a positive conclusion to the first phase of the constitutional review, and Ontario will be ready to proceed quickly to a review of the distribution of powers.

Mr. Speaker: There will be 20 minutes added to the question period. I am not sure if the leader of the New Democratic Party had finished his questions previously or not. If not, he still has the right to direct questions.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Lewis: This area should obviously be opened up. I would ask the Premier if I understood his statement as follows: The government is essentially affirming all the contents of the February communique without at this point elaborating on them whatsoever except in the matter of providing an avenue for proposing an amendment by way of the province. He is saying nothing about social policy in point 9, and he is leaving unemployment and economic policy, as we understand it, until July? In other words, it is an affirmation of the February communique in large measure without any other further departures for the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this is basically correct. The February communique, which was agreed to by all governments in Canada, reflects the main area of discussion for Victoria. As I stated and as I indicated here, by and large, we were moving ahead in the directions of the February communique. The question of social policy is presently being discussed, I think, really, at this very hour in Ottawa. The question of the provinces having the right to initiate possible amendments to the constitution is something that has not been finalized. It is a position that Ontario has put forward for consideration.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the crucial area of social policy, will there be any background material or papers available to members of this Legislature prior to the Province of Ontario presenting its official government view?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I do not know at this moment just what part social policy will play in the discussions at Victoria, I cannot give the hon. member this undertaking. Certainly, whatever is discussed out there, whatever may be determined out there, all of it is subject to discussion and ratification by this Legislature in any event.

Mr. Lewis: A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Other than the confirmation of the February communique, does the Premier have any background material which he is taking with him to Victoria which would be of value to members of this Legislature to have in advance to know the position of the government of Ontario? Surely there must be some material which we can be privy to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, some of the discussions, of course, are bilateral; a lot of the discussions are confidential. Obviously there is a great deal of material that has been prepared by the various governments in Canada. I certainly am not at liberty at this moment to distribute material from either the federal government or the other provinces.

In that some of the discussions still are in the confidential area, it is doubtful that I will be able to provide for the members of this House much in the way of material, if anything, before next Monday. Certainly I

shall be providing to the Leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the New Democratic Party as much background material as we can within the undertakings that we have given, to brief them for their involvement as observers at the conference next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further supplementary of the Premier on his statement: I am concerned with the involvement of the members of this House, not just the opposition, in the decisions that will no doubt be taken next week. The minister is not going to make an occasion available before the end of the week to question, let us say, the advisory committee on constitutional affairs that had been referred to, I believe, three weeks ago; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have given this very careful consideration. As I say, in that a number of these matters are still being discussed on a confidential basis, and anything that is determined in Victoria is subject to discussion and approval of this Legislature, at which time all members have an opportunity to express their points of view, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the only approach that can be taken.

Mr. Nixon: That is a change in the position the Premier expressed three weeks ago. A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: On this whole matter of the approval by the Legislature of decisions or positions taken by the government as a whole, is the Premier presently in possession of a draft preamble which will be discussed at the meeting next week?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I could say I am in possession of a preamble. I think I am in possession of three or four possible preambles.

Mr. Nixon: On this matter, Mr. Speaker, the preamble that is agreed upon next week and the method of patriation and amendment will be subject to the ratification of the Legislature? I wonder if the Premier would point out how that would come about? On the patriation itself, as my hon. friend indicated, all we needed was a jet plane for that. Would it not be correct to say that The British North America Act will in no form be our constitution if, in fact, it is patriated? It will become a statute of Canada and the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is quite correct. I am not sure the member for Sudbury had not oversimplified it in saying that all we need is a jet plane to go to Westminster and back, but I have said I want to make abundantly clear that whatever steps are taken, whether it is in patriation or an agreement on the amending formula, they have to be determined by the individual provincial jurisdictions as well as the government of Canada. That is why there will be very ample opportunity to debate these matters here in this House.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker? The Premier laid considerable stress in his statement upon the distribution of powers, which I myself found to be a new thrust. As he goes to Victoria, I should like to ask him, in relation to the distribution of powers and the related financial responsibilities, whether he has some specific power in mind that he would either like to give up, or some power that he would like to obtain from the federal government. Has he in mind anything specific, about which he can inform the House, by way of a trade with the federal government?

Mr. Lewis: Like manpower.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, Ontario has given a great deal of thought to distribution of powers, and whether there will be time at the conference to put some of these proposals as the groundwork for what I believe should be the next step in these discussions, I cannot say at this moment. Certainly we have given consideration to some aspects of it. I must also add, Mr. Speaker, one of the prime difficulties we face as a provincial jurisdiction at this moment is finding the necessary funds to finance those programmes where we already have constitutional responsibility.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Any thought of giving some of them up?

Mr. Lewis: We would not opt out of our cost-sharing programmes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. MacDonald: Build bigger empires or expand the existing ones.

TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR MINING CORPORATIONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the provincial Treasurer? It has been so long.

Could I ask him when the submissions were made by the Province of Ontario to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa requesting the elimination of tax exemptions for mining corporations and a reduction in what they may claim by way of depletion allowances?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am afraid I would have to get that information for the member.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I understand that specific requests of that kind were made by this government of the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sorry, they escape me; I do not think they have been made during my time as Treasurer. I would have to get the date for the member.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the estimates yesterday it was revealed—and it was new to me—that there had been some change in the position of this government with regard to depletion allowances and to the three-year tax holiday. What is the position of the government, or to what extent has it changed from that which was enunciated by the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, when he travelled rather extensively around this province and was sharply critical of the Benson watering-down of the Carter commission proposals for elimination of this tax favouritism.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The position of the government is set out in the budget.

Mr. MacDonald: If the position of the government is set out in the budget, what specifically is that change as compared with the previously announced policies of the government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suggest that the member read the budget and then he will know.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: We were told categorically in committee yesterday that this government unexpectedly has requested that the tax holiday for mining corporations be severed in the Province of Ontario and that depletion allowance rights be reduced. We were told by civil servants, by the minister; they categorically asserted this major change in policy from the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. When did it come about?

An hon. member: It is not in the budget!

Mr. Lewis: In fact, it is not in the budget document.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would agree.

Mr. Lewis: Well, am I to take it that in fact is not correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be glad to get the information for the member.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, by way of a supplementary question, how can the provincial Treasurer conceivably not be aware of this? The provincial Treasurer is the man who is responsible for shaping and reshaping the tax reform policy of the Province of Ontario and making representations to Ottawa. How can the provincial Treasurer not be aware of it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would quite agree, and I would like to look into this matter and discuss it with my colleagues and the appropriate officials in both departments and accept their view of what was said or conveyed yesterday, because the message conveyed to this House by the former leader of the New Democratic Party sometimes gets a little twisted from the truth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. At least I know what is going on and the provincial Treasurer does not, if I can take the view of one of his colleagues.

My final question to the provincial Treasurer is this: If this government now is in favour of something approaching the Kierans position rather than the Benson watered-down position, which was attacked, have such representations been made to Ottawa in the hope that they might have some impact before the budget on June 18th?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member well knows the government of Canada last August, I would think it was, in effect turned this area back over to the provinces and washed its hands of those areas of the white paper. They said: "We are leaving this to the provinces." All of this and the tentative conclusions which we have reached, are spelled out in the budget. I would be the first to admit—I am rather surprised we have not been questioned on this before—the conclusions which are stated in the budget are not necessarily as definite nor as conclusive as we would have liked to have had.

The position we related in the budget was that after this matter was in effect dumped back in our laps, we went to work to see what the implications were of that action.

And the implications are very large and very varied. The effect from company to company is enormous. Basically I think it is fair to say that the larger companies, who in fact will earn more depletion allowance because they will be doing more exploration under the Benson proposals, will in effect end up paying less tax. The smaller companies, who are perhaps operating a mine and have not the capital or the information perhaps to go on and explore and earn more depletion allowance, unfortunately—or perhaps unfortunately—will end up paying a higher tax. This, as my friend would well know, could have some very serious implications on a number of the small mining communities in the north.

As I recall, there are some 50 or 60 different situations we have looked at individually, and all we have stated in the budget is that the total amount of money presently being collected from mining taxes should not be lessened, nor should the distribution be radically changed, and I think—I am quoting from memory—we reaffirmed our intention to encourage, through the tax system and otherwise, the processing of mineral resources here in Ontario or in Canada.

The fourth point is that I think we feel that we must take into consideration not only the tax effect on a specific company but also the community in which that company is located. That is not, I would be the first to admit, a definitive answer in policy, and we must in part wait until we see what Mr. Benson says on Friday week and the legislation which will flow. He has said that he is going to do something. We want to make sure of that. From there we will go on to develop more specific policies, but I am not in a position to indicate the nature of those policies beyond what is contained in the budget.

Mr. MacDonald: In light of the minister's statement, I have a final supplementary—a further supplementary question; perhaps I should not cut myself off. What exactly does the provincial Treasurer mean when he says that this whole issue was dumped back in the lap of the provinces? Because depletion allowances and three-year tax holidays are completely a federal jurisdictional decision.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right, but—I want to be clear on this; perhaps the former Treasurer can help me—but the original proposals would have taxed the mining companies and in effect eliminated or reduced the impact of the mining tax. The government of Canada said last August it was scrapping that proposal and reducing the corporation taxes to a level, I think, of 25 per cent—

Mr. Nixon: It was 15 per cent off.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —on top of which there can be provincial mining taxes, which are at the 15 per cent level now. But they retreated to a 25 per cent position. That was the essential change that was announced last August.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, for purposes of clarification: The retreat or the vacation of that tax field was made available to the provincial governments to do with as they saw fit, is it not true—might I put this in the form of a question to the Treasurer—so that the provinces, including Ontario, had the responsibility to decide how this tax would be used, whether it would be used specifically for revenue or whether in fact it would be used to encourage mining companies to undertake further exploration and development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right. And I would refer the member to the statement of the principles which we hope to follow in developing policies on pages 28 and 29 of the budget statement.

Mr. Nixon: This is not a definitive policy. He himself says it is not a definitive statement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think it is a statement of goals and objectives at this point without being specific, nor can we be specific until after we see exactly what Mr. Benson is doing next Friday.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: The Treasurer then feels that there might even be a retraction of the position that made the extra 15 per cent available. Have there been any discussions as to what might happen to that 15 per cent that was relinquished by the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not a question of straight relinquishing—

Mr. Nixon: Well, they made it available for the provinces to do with as they saw fit. Is it not true that the money could have been turned back to the mining companies if the Treasurer saw fit?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are not talking about any money now. Precisely nothing has

happened yet. Precisely nothing has happened.

Mr. Nixon: That is right, but the Treasurer had the power to make something happen if he saw fit.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. The member tried to say this in his budget remarks and he was completely off base. The federal legislation has not yet changed. It presumably will not change until next fall. We do not have 15 per cent at this moment to play around with or to do anything about. It has not been remitted from the government of Canada. The government of Canada has not passed that kind of legislation.

Mr. Nixon: They just asked the Treasurer for his advice?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, no. They have said that this is their intention.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): A question of the Prime Minister or the House leader: Considering the serious epidemic of cholera now surging through many parts of India and the very possible dire effects that it could have on mankind generally, because no man is an island to himself, will the government consider sending a couple of medical teams and finance them—if volunteers offer their services—to help in this very serious situation? Now, I am told that there is sufficient vaccine on hand but the medical personnel are lacking and the Indian government needs medical personnel to help them at this very serious time.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Let me reply to the hon. member by suggesting that this afternoon I use the facilities of my department to see what is available, to do a rough costing of it, and further undertake to bring it to the cabinet tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. K. Meen from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee considers that under the circumstances publication of the notice with respect to Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the City of Windsor, is sufficient, and that the bill should go forward to private bills committee tomorrow as printed.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CROP INSURANCE ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I might explain that this simply provides a broader extension of coverage to include non-insured agricultural crops when seeding or planting is prevented by excess ground moisture, weather or other agricultural hazards.

LICENCING OF FUR FARMS

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to licence and regulate Fur Farms.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to implement the transfer of the administration and control of fur farms from the Minister of Lands and Forests to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the amendments in this bill are complementary to the transfer of the administration of fur farms.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

CEMETERIES ACT

Mr. Good moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, The Cemeteries Act now requires that corporate owners of cemeteries and municipally owned cemeteries provide free graves for burial of strangers and indigents. This amendment would provide that such graves be marked with a small granite marker. Thus, the amendment would mean that indigents in Ontario would no longer be buried in unmarked graves.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order, House in committee of supply: Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

(continued)

On vote 601:

Mr. Chairman: We were discussing the first four items on 601. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I had commented last night about whether or not, in brief, the minister would urge on his colleagues in the cabinet and the government to make representations to the government of Canada to bring into effect in the Province of Ontario part X of The Bankruptcy Act in order to relieve overburdened debtors in this province who have, for one reason or another, legitimate or otherwise, been in a position of almost total submergence because of debt problems.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made some concern on this particular area as we were concluding our discussions yesterday evening and I have some words to offer in reply.

I think as part of his presentation he mentioned some concern about the transfer of the grant for the credit counselling services from The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs to Social and Family Services. That, I could point out, I think will make little difference in the effectiveness of the methods that are carried on by the credit counselling services. That was done mainly because, for some curious reason, the federal government will contribute if the grant is in the area of Social and Family Services, but does not participate and pay, as it does now with this arrangement dollar for dollar. So we were left with our own contribution only, but by transferring it to Social and Family Services the grant—the amount which we can make available for that service—is doubled.

Mr. J. Renwick: Presumably under The Canada Assistance Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, and there are several other features there, such as probation grants and so on, where we could get federal participation in very substantial amounts of dollars if we moved them to Social and Family Services.

I am very interested in that field because it was while I was Attorney General that we opened, I think, the first official credit counselling service here. The present Judge Vanek was very active in organizing it, and I think it is one which certainly deserves support. It is not that I am not interested in it that we have got rid if it, but in order to make more money available for it.

With respect to the bankruptcy matter, we discussed that. Before we went to Ottawa the possibility or the advisability of bringing into effect part of The Bankruptcy Act in this province had been under consideration here.

I may say that the matter was presented to The Department of the Attorney General for opinion as to the effect, simply because it affects the personnel, the work and the responsibility of the small claims court.

If the federal government, as it appears, simply left it to the province to adopt that part X and give to the clerk and officials of what was formerly known as division court—the small claims court—the added responsibility of carrying out the duties which that section of The Bankruptcy Act would entail, we would have to increase staff very greatly. The cost of administration would be very substantial. These are not necessarily obstacles which could not be met and overcome, but they were certainly there. In our view, for the present at least, we did not feel it was something that the province should do in bringing into effect the provisions of part X of The Bankruptcy Act.

We do have, as the hon. member knows, consolidation procedures where persons can consolidate their debts and get a substantial area of time, or period of time, in which to pay them off without undue strain, and this is carried on.

We have not come to conclusions finally in this, but I have some question in my mind as to whether it is altogether desirable to adopt what appears to be the coming federal

policy of extending the bankruptcy proceedings to the small debtor and letting him off completely, as they now suggest, after three years.

If he gets himself in debt, and finds himself unable to pay all his debts, there is a form of a consolidation or an arrangement whereby he pays through a period of three years, and then goes completely scot-free.

I am not sure that is an entirely wholesome thing. Certainly it would be a great lifting of the burden of unbearable debts from the shoulders of certain individuals, but I have some sympathy for the merchants or the persons who advanced the credit.

I know the hon. member said yesterday that often credit was granted without concern, and very carelessly and very freely. Nonetheless, if the person who gets the article—say the boat or the car or the television set or the appliance—if he has the use of it and if he could clear himself by paying for it or of obligation; paying off part of the cost of it in a period of three years' time, going on to own it free and clear of obligation; I am not sure that is altogether a desirable arrangement. I would like to think about a longer period of time.

In any event, we have not come to the conclusion that we should adopt part X even yet; certainly we want to look at those further arrangements suggested. We discussed this, I may say. The ministers from all the provinces were represented at Ottawa in a meeting with Mr. Basford on May 25 and 26. We discussed this whole matter very extensively and at length and all the ministers who were present took part.

Some of the provinces have adopted part X —the western provinces, I think; and I believe one of the eastern provinces. I did not make a particular note of that. But some provinces have reservations, as we have. Some are considering the matter as we are. At the moment I am not prepared to say that, as a matter of policy, I can assure the hon. member that we will adopt it.

I will assure him that we will give it very serious and further study. While some meritorious and worthwhile results flow from such a piece of legislation, in my opinion they are not all on the credit side of the ledger. That is my view at the moment.

I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—he is not here at the moment—asked yesterday and I promised to give him today the total expenditure of the department.

Mr. J. Renwick: I think I asked that question.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps it was the member for Riverdale. Well I have those figures. I have them in detail, I have them in total. The total amount expended in the fiscal year of 1970-1971 was $5,215,879.01.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would just like to comment briefly on what the minister said. We are committed in this party, insofar as we are concerned, to bringing into force on request in the Province of Ontario part of The Bankruptcy Act including, basically, the recommendations which have been made for its revision by the committee set up by the colleague of the minister in Ottawa, the hon. Ronald Basford.

The basic point which the federal government is making, and which I think we will in this particular instance adopt, is that persons who are overburdened by debt are of no value to the consumer society, which has been promoted by tremendous pressures put on persons to use their credit. The minister gave the example of the person who has the use of the automobile and then does not have to pay the debt.

For every instance that the minister puts forward, I am sure we can put forward legitimate situations where a person has bought a car on a conditional sale agreement. For one reason or another take a legitimate one, the loss of his job—he has had the car repossessed because he cannot make the payments. The car is sold at what may be a fair market price but a greatly knocked-down price. The debtor does not have the use of the car but he is subject to the payment of the balance under the conditional sale agreement.

An hon. member: That is so.

Mr. J. Renwick: As I said last night, I do not think there is any great merit in the minister or myself deciding whether it is a legitimate or illegitimate case. The fact of the matter basically is that the whole reason we have bankruptcy and insolvency legislation, and presumably the reason it was given to the federal government when the constitution was established, was to provide a method of rehabilitation for persons whose debts have overreached them.

It is quite true that for every legitimate business which has gone under you can probably cite an improper business which has gone under, but they also have had the benefit of the alleviating provisions of The

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act. We do not spend a great deal of time worrying about whether they should or should not have overextended themselves or gone into business, or what the reasons for their apparent business failure may be.

I think it is very important to recognize that when we have persons who are generally living at the margin of poverty, we find them in a very destructive personal position if they are not able, in some way or other, to rehabilitate themselves.

I will give you one example which I had quite recently, very similar to the car instance which I put forward. It was not the question of the loss of the job. He bought a used car on time. The used car was a lemon. That is another question. He took the car to have it repaired. They did not repair it. Instead they sold it, or purported to sell it, and claimed the balance against him.

He came to see me. He could not understand what had happened to him. He had the car for about one month and he suddenly found: (a) that he did not have a car; and (b) that he owed all the money for it and the car would not go.

He may have had other remedies, but you know as I do they are protracted remedies and take a lot of time.

His question to me was quite simple: "Do I stop? Do I give up my job and go on welfare or do I keep my job and try to struggle through with these payments?"—bearing in mind his responsibilities to his family.

All I am saying is that whether you couple with a rehabilitation scheme under part X some kind of course in credit use so that the person, when he is again able to go out free of the burden of debt would have the benefit of the experience and whatever he could learn from such an educational course—or whatever else you do in addition—I think it is fundamentally in the interests of this community that the few people who are substantially submerged by their debt obligations be given some method by which they can be rehabilitated.

I really do not think that the minister and I are all that far apart on the question. I just ask, as I asked a year ago at the time when the minister was the Attorney General, if he would continue his study on the need for bringing into force in the Province of Ontario part X of The Bankruptcy Act.

In a province such as this I do not accept the proposition that there would be an undue increase in the number of people required to administer such a scheme. Certainly the scheme could be administered either through the present court system, at the county court level. Through the officers of the public trustee is another possible alternative; or through an enhanced status for the division court or small claims court referee to deal with these problems.

I think there is often a tendency when a valid social objective is put forward, when people are absorbing an idea, to give as a reason the administrative barriers that stand in the way of bringing it into force. It would seem to me to be worth commenting that five or six, as I understand it, of the 10 provinces now have part X in force. I think only Newfoundland and New Brunswick and Ontario and Quebec do not have it in force.

I think in a province where available figures indicate that, say 40 per cent of departmental store purchases are purchased on time—it must be a substantially similar figure for automobiles and other consumer durables which are purchased on time—where immense advertising pressure is put on people to use their credit; where the finance companies day in and day out, by radio, television and through the news media indicate the way in which you keep up with the Joneses in our society is to borrow; and when you look at the marginal losses of the finance companies and the banks with respect to personal debt obligations from personal default; when you find that the reserve for doubtful debts or reserve for bad debts in finance companies is extremely low in terms of the total volume of business which is done; I think it is time we took the social view and said this is not an economic problem, this is a social problem.

Part of the margin and the burden of it can quite legitimately be borne by those companies which spend their time exhorting people to use their credit. I do not deny that credit is a valuable part of our society, but those companies which exhort people to use their credit can certainly afford the marginal losses which they might incur by some reasonable method through which a heavily burdened debtor, for whatever the reason, could rehabilitate himself.

Indeed there is something to be said for the proposition that in the long run under such a scheme, the creditor might very well get more money than he in fact gets at the present time on a three-year scheme with a forgiveness proposal at the end for whatever balance may then be outstanding. With those comments, as I say, I do not really think we

are all that far apart. I think it is urgently needed in the province.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the first four items?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have just a few specific points under the items.

Last year there was the rearrangement of the estimates. Now that I see them—I was very strong for them—but now that I see them I do not know whether I am quite as taken with them as objects representing concepts of the budget.

Last year this department spent moneys for conferences and conventions in the sum of $5,000 and a further sum of money on special investigations to the tune of $10,000. Could the minister indicate how this was picked up in the present heads of subjects? It has tended to get lost.

First of all, I would like to know where it appears in the estimates and how much was spent? How much is proposed to be spent in these two regards?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Was the hon. member looking at a particular item when he asked that question?

Mr. Lawlor: Bear with me for a second.

If the minister would look at the estimates for 1970-1971 he will see under main office these two items to which I was making reference; which have now, of course, under the new arrangement, been lost. At least they are somewhere here, but I suspect it is hard to say where—the first subject under the main vote last year.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not sure I got the question exactly, but in my estimates under vote 601, for services, we have the item of $11,200. That is in the main office.

Mr. Lawlor: Did the minister follow me in saying that under main office of last year's estimates the services, of course, were not mentioned? Maintenance, basically, I suppose was picked up into services. Other things may be in services also.

I can hardly think that services would cover the situation with respect to what were called, item 4 and item 6 in the previous year's estimates. I am saying I have no doubt they are somewhere here, but they have not disappeared. Just where are they; and secondly, how much are they?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed that in the item of services, the amount of $5,000, which is not broken down further, is for conferences and conventions.

Mr. Lawlor: I see.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have that, but it is now spelled out as a specific item, except under services. I have a breakdown of expenditures last year on research, if that would be helpful to the hon. member; and the detail on how that money was spent.

Mr. Lawlor: Just bear with me for a moment. On conferences and conventions; in the last full budget statement on this—that is the March 31, 1970, budget statement—you had allocated the sum of about $5,000 at that time. Do you know how much you spent? It was $1,940 on that particular thing. Why do you continue to budget so large an amount for conferences and conventions?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think those items are variable from year to year. One year you may attend very few. Another year, you may have a conference where you want to provide certain services and facilities for ministers and officials of similar departments and other provinces to come here and hold conferences with us. I think $5,000—while it might not be needed—some $2,000 was spent last year—I do not think that is an outsized item to ask for.

Mr. Lawlor: I think you could tell in advance a little bit better. It is just a small sum so I am not going to press it. Under research, how about special investigations?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Last year—perhaps this will help now if I tell the hon. member what was spent under research through the year ending March 31, 1971. A total of $110,814.60 was spent on various projects, of which some were research.

There was a mutual fund report which cost $560. We prepared a student film which was a research project, which proved very successful. In fact that film has been made available to other provinces which have found it very useful in consumer information and education. That cost was $3,329.88.

We had a consumer congress, here I believe it was—no, we did not have it here, but we took part in it and provided some assistance. That was $525 which was a form of study and research.

We got out a senior citizens' guide which was based on research and the information obtained. That cost $2,268.26. We had actual costs on the testing of upholstery material—

I think most of that went to the Ontario Research Council. That was $15,821.81.

There was auto insurance research, $1,422.88. The Insurance Advisory Board which was constituted by my predecessor and which carried on studies and held meetings and which is still active, last year was carried on at a cost of $21,261.

The Insurance Claims Settlement Committee was likewise under way last year and is still continuing. Last year its expenditures were $20,922.

The committee carrying out a study on franchises is also active and still continuing; we were talking about it yesterday. The expenditures which it incurred last year were $40,480.22.

For outside legal and advisers service, the small amount of $1,102. A total of $110,814.60 last year expended: all of which I think is properly classified under the heading of research expenditures.

Mr. Lawlor: I would hope some of these studies and the results flowing from them might be available to interested members. For instance, an extra copy of that mutual fund review, or a summary I think, would be quite valuable. I have not seen it and was not aware that the minister had it.

Secondly, in the area of—I think it was the first item that the minister mentioned—an auto insurance study that he is making; is there any material available to members of this House as to what he is exploring and what he is coming up with?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not made anything available as yet. I have legislation in the course of preparation, which I hope will be before the House before too long.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That is interesting. Would the minister care to comment?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not going to talk about it until I have it cleared before the House.

Mr. Lawlor: I noticed in the minister's last public accounts statement that several amounts of money in research are expended upon outside lawyers; but rather than delay the matter—if you take the separate items, McMillan Binch; Fraser and Beatty; Tory Tory Deslauriers, this will require us going back to find out what justification there was—I think I will omit that particular procedure today to get on with these estimates.

On personal administration—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Those items to which the hon. member refers and which I have in front of me, that was 1969-1970—

Mr. Lawlor: Right!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —not even the year ending March 31, 1971. In that particular year the department was headed first by the member for York West (Mr. Rowntree); and then by my predecessor, the present Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence).

I think there were some substantial legal matters that they were dealing with at that time. I do not think the hon. member will find that type of expenditure occurring to the same extent—

Mr. Lawlor: In the future.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: For instance, one of the items that comes to mind is Whiterock Estates, which was quite a study and required quite a bit of legal assistance.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They are back in business again. They have full-page ads again.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That does not obviate the necessity of seeing what they were up to when they started.

Mr. Singer: I agree; but what are they up to now?

Mr. Lawlor: Turning our attention to personnel administration, I think the minister will agree this is a new heading under this vote—a completely new area, which is costing $70,000. Why is it new? What difference is there in the estimates that would require this new sub-department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps I am almost the newest person of the department; but I do not think that is a new item, I think it has been in the previous estimates over the years. This year's estimate is $69,800. That breaks down into: salaries and wages, $57,600; employee benefits $4,900; transportation and communication, $1,400; services $5,300; supplies and equipment $600. It is almost entirely the maintenance and payment of salaries of employees.

Mr. Lawlor: I must repeat my statement; it is not in previous years' estimates. It does not appear. It may have been part of the total picture within the first vote, but show me where it existed in any previous estimate. Like lotteries administration, which we are coming to in a moment, It appears as a new heading.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed it was always included but formerly was covered in administration services, but there was a requirement by Treasury Board that we show personnel as an item in our estimates.

Mr. Lawlor: And where do administrative services show up? Under main office vote?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes; the third item, financial and administrative services.

Mr. Lawlor: Which again is repeated in this particular thing.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Only you have made a nice division—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is broken down further in our present estimates, I guess, than it was before.

Mr. Lawlor: Well I was just interested in the setup.

That is as far as I am concerned with the first four items, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on these first four items in vote 601? Item 5, public information services.

Mr. Lawlor: Well just one word in extension of what I had to say yesterday with respect to communication with the general public, about giving them advance warning as soon as sharp practices in a community come to the ear of the department and having a monitoring and warning system.

In other words, carry this out in a deeper way. I sometimes see the better business bureaus performing that function by way of ads and otherwise, but this department does not seem to be doing this on any extensive scale.

I do not mean the across-the-board stuff the minister was talking about; I mean particularly sharp practices. Tell the homeowner to be on the watch for particular kinds of salesmen or that there is a passing off of a particular product, and that they should keep their eyes peeled. That sort of thing might be extended in this department. It would certainly be a valuable service, saving untold amounts of money to the private citizens.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like, very briefly to mention our caravan, which will across the whole province and be available not just in the major cities but in the towns and some hamlets in the province.

The mailings we send out in goodly numbers to people would reach them on such matters. This one of May, 1971, is headed "Pyramid Selling." I do not know whether the hon. member would like to see it or not.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh yes, I have all of those.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The only other thing I would mention, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned yesterday, are the branch offices throughout the province, where we maintain staff to assist people and give them advice and information. These things are all part of the public information service.

Mr. Lawlor: So far, so good. Nevertheless, I would think that you could be of considerably greater service than you presently are with respect to telling people to beware of the dog.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I agree.

Mr. Lawlor: So let us keep it in mind.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add to that.

I am not exactly sure what the member for Lakeshore meant by being beware of the dog. I think the member for Riverdale yesterday alluded to the fact that perhaps constitutionally it is not your responsibility. But I often wonder, in conveying to the public your desires in connection with consumer protection, if we should not be protecting the public before they become consumers. In the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale—and I think, on behalf of many members of this House if not all of them—he exuded concern for the public when they find themselves enmeshed in debt and so weighted down with financial obligations that they really cannot see any end to it at all.

What concerns me is the general attitude of both federally and provincially oriented financial institutions in their advertising programmes, which seem to say to the public in this respect: "Do not worry about having to pay it back. Enjoy the luxury of life now." I do not know whether government really should undertake the function, but perhaps for the reply of the minister, I record as a question whether really we do not have some concurrent obligation in connection with assisting people before they become enmeshed in the whole aspect of enjoying things before they can afford to repay?

I sometimes wonder—and I recognize that perhaps you do not—but I am not sure in this

respect whether you have any constitutional right to intervene, for example, with the chartered banks in Canada.

It seems to me, as I see them on television and as I hear them on radio, having regard to what is almost a monopoly position that they are fortunate to have acquired in this great nation, that in undertaking their new attitude—when I say "new," within the last 10 years—of seeking out personal loan availability, they do so without, I think, a discretion and concern for the welfare of the public at times.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): They are cute though; are they not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think some remarks are called for here.

I agree with much of what the hon. member said, that prevention, in short, is better than cure. If you can prevent the individual or the citizen from getting into a desperate situation financially, this is good. We do that, as I pointed out yesterday, to a very substantial degree where the product is a bad product. Where the advertising is misleading or false, we check it. Where the sales—what is the word they use, the sales pitch—is a wrongful one, we stop that if we can. We try to warn the public of it—such as in the case of pyramid selling, as I mentioned yesterday, and referral sales.

We went to the news media and pointed out to the public the dangers of getting involved with these sort of people. The gilded item they were supposed to be buying with great prospect of profit was a hollow, rotten piece of fruit that did not pay off.

We do that.

Now to go further, as the hon. member says, I do not know how far a government is expected to go—or a minister of a department—and to say, "Do not take credit; do not get into credit. Neither a borrower nor a lender be," as Shakespeare had one of his characters say—

Mr. Lawlor: It was Polonius.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was Polonius to Laertes.

Mr. Lawlor: He was a very stuffy guy.

Mr. Bullbrook: So we know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was in "Hamlet," yes.

But that has changed today. The whole economy is run on credit. Credit seems to be the thing. The theory is that if you can buy the piano and have your children learn to play it while they are growing up it is far better to have it then than to wait until the child is 16 and is beyond the day when you can have her enjoy it; at which time you have saved the $500 to buy it.

The same with the car. You enjoy it at the time and pay for it as you are using it. I do not know what the hon. member's experience is, but I know that in my own when I did not have the cash, I still wanted a washing machine—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —to save my wife from using a washing board, and I thought it was worthwhile buying it and paying for it while she used it rather than have her go through that drudgery. So there is a field for credit.

Whether you can find the point where you say, "Stop, do not get in any deeper," is a problem. You can get in so deep that you cannot get out; but I do not think I can find a place where you can get a government to step in and say enough is enough.

The hon. member for Riverdale says—he spoke just a moment ago—that the reserves which banks and financial institutions have for bad debts is very small. I take it from his argument that there really are not going to be very many people who get in so deep that they cannot get out reasonably, because the financial institutions which sell and advance credit and encourage it find, apparently, that they are doing business and they do not have to put much reserve by for those who do not pay. There are some individual bankrupts, as the hon. member pointed out. He suggests we study that and do something about it; but he made quite a point of the fact that there was really very little bad debt under which the financial institutions were suffering.

Mr Bullbrook: If I might just continue for a moment in that connection about the percentage of bad debts for financial institutions, and in particular the chartered banks, their asset position is so monumental that a small percentage for bad debts, per se, in the context of money in relation to an individual might be insignificant in connection with the holdings of the Royal Bank of Canada or The Bank of Montreal. But it is monumental in connection with the obligations of the individual.

I know the minister sympathizes with it. I am much taken with the comments made by the minister in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that he did not want his wife—he personalized

it—to use a scrub board; he wanted her to have a washing machine. And of course it goes without saying that the provision of credit in our economic system has enabled us all to enjoy certain benefits of life while being able to pay for them.

The problem is this, and what comes through to me and concerns me more than anything else—I think perhaps I am asking the wrong person about this because I do wonder whether constitutionally you do have the right—you know, I listened to the Royal Bank having a young lady sing to me in the morning and sing to all my constituents, "We look after you at the Royal Bank," You see, there is created there an aura saying in effect, inherently and tacitly, "We will let you have credit for any worthwhile purpose."

The worthwhile purpose, as a result of the less than conservative attitudes of the chartered banks over the last 10 years has gone from investment opportunities to motor boats in the lobbies of the bank. What tacitly is involved in that young lady's singing "We will look after you at the Royal Bank," is until it comes time for you to repay us, and then we will look after you. We will really look after you."

Perhaps the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that they do not have to set up too many great reserves in connection with bad debts because they have ample methods of collecting the obligation to which they are entitled. Now, entitled how? If it is a direct involvement by a suppliant—I suppose that is not the appropriate term—but a person going to a bank and saying in effect—which was the normal, usual and traditional aspect of lending —"I want this essential. Here is my income possibility. I want to start a business. Could you advance me credit?"

Nobody can take issue with a bank in that connection saying, when the time comes and you must repay, "We want to be repaid." I have less than sympathy for Avco Delta when I see their television ad, with a handsome young man with his tousled-haired little babe running around in the best cashmere sweater inferring, in effect, that the good life and the cashmere sweater come from Avco Delta. Not bad; at about 26.4 per cent per year, the good life comes.

I exhort you to consider within the framework of your ability not only to protect the consumers after they consume credit but really, to bring to bear the efforts of government and more importantly the efforts of your department in saying: "Do you serve the public interest by singing the jingle, "We will look after you at the Royal Bank"? and creating, in effect, what is not an equalization of the creditor-debtor obligation, but almost an insidious invitation to the public to utilize the bank's ability to lend, without really a heartfelt concern as to whether the public has the ability to repay it.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 5 agreed to? Item 6, lotteries. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister could give us an assurance that the purposes and objects of the New Democratic Party are charitable for the purposes of a lottery either on the basis of the relief of poverty or the advancement of education or as otherwise beneficial to the community?

Perhaps the minister would let us know whether it would be possible to work out some method by which a party which depends upon so many small people in the province for its finances could have the benefit of the lottery scheme?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think we have been very broad and generous in our interpretation of what are charitable purposes as well as—the words in the code are "religious and charitable." We have lotteries which we have approved and licensed for such things as putting a turf on a football field, building an arena, the great art lottery for art purposes, educational purposes, we sort of put the interpretation of that under charitable. And I think, if the hon. member would care to look at the words of the Speech, or the debates in the House of Commons when the Minister of Justice in Ottawa was changing the code to give this jurisdiction to the province, he was speaking at some length on the interpretation of religious and charitable objects and purposes. There are a lot of old English cases which interpret that quite broadly too, so we adhere to that.

I have felt that political parties should not get involved in running lotteries for their purposes, however admirable and exemplary they may be, and I was at pains to send out a letter to the clerks of all municipalities where one had been licensed and then I took action to notify them all that I did not think they could go on. And not only the New Democratic Party may have been disappointed but I know one organization within my own party which was constrained not to carry on such a lottery and to pay back money for tickets which had been sold.

I think that policy is wise, because there are, of course, across the province, a great many local political organizations. I feel, and I have always said, that I did not think government—and I am speaking of government as an organization, as an institution—it goes against my principles, at least, by thinking that governments should establish a lottery and raise money by way of games of chance for government purposes, whatever they may be, educational, health, social, welfare, whatever.

I think that the citizen should have the understanding and the feeling and the knowledge that for those things which government is doing, and for which it requires money, he must contribute his share under the taxation system, however that is arrived at, so that he has an interest in the action of government, in the spending of that money.

I do not think it is good that in that field at least the citizens should feel you can get something for nothing, because that is, in a sense, behind the theory of the lottery or the game of chance. If you take the chance, and for very little risk, you may get a great windfall. I do not think that is good in government affairs.

Now, the small lottery for charitable or religious purposes has always been accepted, although the code language before the recent change two years ago actually would have forbidden any of the ones that were carried on. As someone pointed out yesterday, many of the people who carried them on in religious and charitable organizations were not prosecuted although many of the games that were adopted, many of the lotteries, were strictly speaking illegal.

Mr. J. Renwick: We were better off under the old system.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, you had a very generous Attorney General. In interpretation I think he was quite generous.

Mr. J. Renwick: And a very easy-going chief of police of Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He did not direct the police forces to hound and pursue people who were engaged in charitable and religious purposes, let me put it that way.

Now I do not think, however—I do not want to prolong this—I do not think it is good. I was saying the other day in the House and to the news media, I think we have seen the lotteries—all of which are under the direction and control of the department, with some of that responsibility for licensing delegated to the municipalities—we have seen them proliferate and grow to a very great extent.

There are four particularly large lotteries now going on at the same time in this province for very large amounts, where the prizes, I think, exceed $100,000. And there are a great many small ones licensed by various municipalities. Last year, as was pointed out here a few days ago, there were some 30,000 lotteries conducted in the province with prizes of $22 million. I think that that perhaps is getting up to the level where one might almost say it is enough. I think it may very well be that the government perhaps will have to become possibly selective in not necessarily choosing between one and another but saying to the municipalities in those lotteries where the prizes are under $3,500, "If you have one or two or three going in a municipality, say of 10,000 or 15,000 or 20,000 people that is enough. Until that one is ended and the prizes are awarded, there should be a limit." I am thinking of that. The way this thing proliferates, I think there has to be a limit or every other person you meet on the street will be selling you a lottery ticket.

In any event, to answer the hon. member, I am treating all parties alike, and I say as far as I am concerned the political associations for all parties should not run lotteries for their political purposes, however admirable and commendable those purposes may be—and I think they are all very admirable.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have two comments to make—one partly facetious, I suppose. I have had occasion in another context to study the preamble to the statutes of Elizabeth I, where one has to go to find out whether or not it is charitable or not and the cases that have followed on since that time. I have a suggestion to make, of course, that if we could find the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party co-operating in a given constituency, my guess is that we could jointly run a lottery that would fall within the ambit of a charitable purpose because it would not be for the sole purpose of advancing the ends of any one political party but for advancing the purposes of all three.

I submit in a spirit of co-operation to the members opposite and to the members to my right that if their candidates would like to get together in the riding of Riverdale, we

might be able to work out on the basis of, say, the proportional vote that was cast in the last election how we would share the profits if the three candidates would work together to conduct a lottery in the ridings.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Sounds very reasonable.

Mr. J. Renwick: The interesting thing is that, as a strictly legal matter, my guess is it is a charitable purpose on the basis of the Bonar Law trust and the other English cases which have been followed. Therefore it seems passing strange that what the three parties could do collectively in a given constituency, if my legal theory is correct, no one party could do because of the outmoded rules of the English law courts dealing with the administration of charitable trusts. I commend this to the House as a solution for the financial problems involved with parties.

Mr. Nixon: A spontaneous outpouring of funds from all the little people.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly it would be all that you would require to put forth your position.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right, and I am quite sure in the riding of Riverdale we could run a very substantial lottery very successfully if the parties and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs would co-operate. Would the minister tell me what the revenue was for the year ended March 31, 1971, for lottery fees?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The 1970-1971 revenue, administration and departmental, which includes lotteries, was $115,000. I have not got lotteries segregated by themselves. I will have to get that for the hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, perhaps at some point. I noticed in this report, for example, that for the year ended March 31, 1970, the fees are shown at $1,500, but it was during that year it came into force.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am just curious as to whether or not the anticipated revenue from lottery fees is going to equal the amount which has to be voted for?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the revenue is in the neighbourhood of $75,000, which is the amount we are asking to administer.

Mr. J. Renwick: So it will about offset—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It offsets the cost.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a word on lotteries. There are two or three points that I would like to bring up. One of them is: I understood the minister to say that he had some misgivings about educational institutions utilizing the scheme; that the wording of the federal code and his order-in-council makes reference specifically to charitable and religious organizations.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Might I be permitted to just clarify that? I do not have misgivings really. I think our interpretation certainly has been wide enough to encompass educational institutions, perhaps educational objects and purposes, and those have been licensed and they are carried on.

I say this, however; it is what I was trying to say the other day, and what I hope I made clear, and I will try to make it particularly clear now. I feel that if the lottery situation grows, enlarges, proliferates into a lot of lotteries as great big lotteries across the province—some of which we have now—that if we are to adhere to the rule that the government of Ontario should not, as the governments of other provinces have done, set the lottery for its purposes, to raise funds for its governmental objects, then it seems odd to me that where we support our colleges, we support our schools, we support education generally with very vast sums of taxpayers' money, if we can allow a school or a college or an education institution to go out and conduct a province-wide lottery that raises hundreds of thousands of dollars for its purposes, I think that there comes a question where one might well say: "Well if you are going to have to do that, why do you not get into the field yourself, you as a government, you as a province?"

We have not done that, but I think that if you are going to allow the institutions to raise funds for educational purposes in very large ways, in very large amounts, then perhaps you do not have much of an argument left to say the province should not go in and occupy that field, and then perhaps not grant lottery licences to these separate, individual institutions. This is the question that crosses my mind.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, we can get into pretty invidious debate on this.

As I understand it, certain of the Catholic high schools, to keep themselves going until you fellows come across, have felt it necessary to launch into lottery schemes which are fairly extensive. But this is brought about, not because the educational institution itself is anxious to get into this field, I am sure, but because of the dearth of funds and the improbability of their continuing to operate next fall and in future years, anywhere commensurate with what their liabilities are. So, in other words, by a particular policy of government you bring it upon your heads in another way. I would ask that you put no crimp on them for the time being.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Every school, I am sure, every school board in the province—public, separate and private, and so on—would very well say: "We could use more money, we do not have enough money to operate on." All our school boards were asked to curtail expenditures. Some of them grieved in trying to do that. If you allowed one, I am sure you would have every one, and once you admit the licence to one what argument have you got to refuse the other? If you once say to one school: "You can have a lottery to build your football field or to put up a rink or to buy a statue of ivory or to buy the books," for whatever purpose, it is educational; and once you do it for one, I could see every school, with great justification saying to me, to the government, "You have licensed such and such a school, now give us a licence." And as I say, every second person, as you went down the street in every town in this province would be selling you a lottery ticket. So I think some consideration has to be given to rationing, perhaps, on a population basis or something of that sort. I was not really trying to say that education was not commendable and that it did not come within our interpretation. I was simply saying that this is a field in which the government has a very substantial responsibility, and provides a very large amount of money, and I fear—at least I do not fear, but I do not like the thought that there might come forward in addition to government participation, a lottery from, let us say, a large percentage of the schools, saying, "We want a lottery too." I think we could get overwhelmed.

Mr. Lawlor: All right, one can quite concede the main point made by the minister. He nevertheless knows that there is deep-seated and long-lived discontent and grievances which, in my opinion, are well settled, and which are driving certain areas of the school population into lotteries at the present time. I think the alleviation must come from another quarter than from using the device, perhaps of legislation, to foreshorten this. In any event, as the minister well concedes, education has always been, under British law, well within the terms of charitable purposes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right.

Mr. Lawlor: Secondly, the other area I wish to explore for a moment is the business of prizes. First of all, in prizes under $3,500, the local municipality is the chief, and prime, and plenary issuing agency. In prizes over $3,500 the local municipality is invariably consulted; and in both instances the initial application is made through their offices. In the case of the ones under $3,500 I am not clear as to whether or not a reference comes back to you for any form of approval. My feeling is that their approval is final and that you have nothing to say about their disposition of it. For the ones over $3,500, of course, coming through their auspices, their approval is a prerequisite, but your approval is the final one. I am interested. That is the first area.

The second area, precisely in line with that, is when a particular lottery—wishing to become province-wide, let us say, or to encompass a good number of the citizenry—goes from municipality to municipality in the first instance, applying in each case for a licence. If, in each case, the licence is under $3,500—in other words it is the same lottery—do you have some role or function to perform in that regard by saying, "No, we do not want the proliferation of this lottery over a wide area. Even if the prize is small we still do not want it to enter over what you have got for the territory."

Secondly, what kind of imposition, if any, do you put upon the second, third, fourth, fifth (if any) municipality, which is approached with a lottery over $3,500, with respect to your permissions? In other words, do you convey to these other municipalities, where the applications have been made, that you have no intention of granting permission for that particular lottery—I mean, to expand into the other areas?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all the application is made to the municipality whether it is under $3,500 in prizes, or over. If the prizes are over $3,500 it is

referred to the department which then examines the application and grants or refuses the licence. Those under $3,500 are granted by the municipality and in that case the province, in order to maintain knowledge and information and have control, requires a report; and that report shows the organization conducting the lottery, when it is complete, the total gross receipts received from the lottery, the application of the funds which were received, and the total value of prizes actually awarded, the administrative costs actually incurred—an itemized list—the total value of the proceeds actually donated for charitable or religious purposes, and the balance, if any, which is being held in trust. Then if there are any donations, and so on—

Mr. Lawlor: Pardon me, does that come directly through to the province from the agency?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This report must be filed with a lottery licensing officer within 30 days of the holding of the lottery in accordance with the terms and conditions under which the lottery licence was issued, pursuant to schedule A of order-in-council No. 274—

Mr. Lawlor: In other words it goes back to the municipal officer who forwards it on to the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right. Now the other question which the hon. member raised: I think the system, may I say—and I would like to say it now because I seem to forget to say it—I think in the experience we have had it has worked, I believe, very well in the roughly little better than a year's experience that the department has had. I think it has been well administered, I think it has given almost everybody concerned with it in the department and outside, satisfaction in the way it has been operated.

But to go on where the large lottery—I think the best example perhaps might be the service club, or one of the best examples: Its lottery would be licensed through a number of municipalities, perhaps several throughout the province. In each case the municipality is asked for its approval. If the prizes are over $3,500—and it would almost always be the case with such types of lottery—it, of course comes into the department. But the municipality where the tickets are being sold gets an application, and this is true, I think, of all those big lotteries; I have named four of them now. I do not think you would have a situation where say, a lottery handing out prizes of less than $3,500 or under would bother trying to sell in more than one or two municipalities.

We have a very good good control, excellent information. We find that the lotteries are well administered. There is a variation but it is not great, in the administrative cost of certain types. A service club, of course, can run the lottery with very little cost because its members are all dedicated to selling the tickets for charity and they do not have to do a great deal of advertising or pushing. The lottery for the arts group —I have forgotten the name—had somewhat professional people to assist them and a certain amount of substantial advertising. We found that their costs were growing—their administrative costs were growing. This is one of the things you get in that type of big provincial lottery, where a lot of money could go, unless it is carefully watched. For instance, an ill-conceived advertising campaign, which might not even be very effective, could use up a lot of the proceeds which would be obtained.

I have very detailed information here regarding lotteries. I have the actual ones—some of the big ones and the small ones, what money was taken in, what was paid in prizes, the administrative costs, the percentage of the administrative costs to the take and the amount which went to charity; and this we have, I may say, for all our lotteries and it gives us at a glance, the situation that is going on.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue my questioning, last year the minister registered 30,000 of these lotteries in Ontario, and my first question is: How many has he registered in 1971? The second point I want to make is: What happens? What kind of sanction has he got to those lotteries that do not pay out the money and prizes, or keep what he might consider an exorbitant amount in their own treasury, or for administrative purposes? Is there, within the terms of his order-in-council, any form of reproval? Sure, the minister may not approve of them the next time up but maybe they would not care about that. They have done well enough as it is. What does he do in those circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What was the first question?

Mr. Lawlor: The number of lotteries.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: How many do we have going on in Ontario today? At this point, 16,000 in round figures.

Mr. Lawlor: There were 30,000 last year.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There were 30,000 last year altogether. Now, as to prosecutions, I do not—there has not been in my experience, as far as I am aware, in the time I have been in the department, the prosecution of anyone, or the taking of anyone to court in a lottery. Perhaps someone from my staff could let me know.

Mr. Lawlor: Where would the minister have the power? Where is his authority?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think if money were taken in and not applied to the purpose for which it was obtained, I think we have—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister would use the regular Criminal Code procedures in fraud and—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sure I would find it in The Criminal Code.

Mr. Lawlor: All right.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about this. As the minister knows, even though he and his advisers feel that a certain application does come within the guidelines which he has set forward as one that can be financed through a lottery, the individual municipalities have the power and are using it more and more frequently to disagree with him. For example, it is not legal, as I understand it, to sell a ticket on the Hamilton lottery to buy turf for their football field, in the city of Brantford or in the city of Guelph, because local bylaws have been passed which prohibit the sale of these tickets in those particular areas. In other words, the minister shares his decision as to whether a certain lottery is acceptable or not, and the councils of a certain municipality may decide that they are not going to expose their citizens to the need to pay for the turf on the football field in Hamilton. I do not think I know of any municipalities which have restricted the sale of lottery tickets for the Art Gallery of Ontario, but there may be those few people in the province who would feel that this is the sort of thing that should be paid for out of direct government funds.

There is a strange dichotomy in the morality of the government. Essentially they seem to feel that there is something sinful in a lottery which is balanced, if in fact its funds are used only for purposes of education or community betterment. My own view is that the one fund which could, I suppose, clearly be supported as being for community betterment—although there are those who object even to that and I happen to be one of them from time to time—is the consolidated revenue fund of the province.

The minister is, I think, presently shaking up his powers in order to operate offtrack betting in this province. I am just projecting that, Mr. Chairman; I am not at all sure what government policy will be, but I see no alternative. After all, offtrack betting is now established in every community and the number of offices opening day by day is accelerating rather than decreasing. Everybody, including the former Attorney General, the present minister conducting his estimates, has been afraid of what would happen if this proliferated without proper government control. Now, I do not want to talk about that specifically, other than to relate it to revenues which can come from lotteries, a form of gambling.

Mr. Chairman, my view is that the government somehow is confused in some moral judgement having to do with lotteries. I feel that the present hodge-podge of administration, no matter how effectively the administration has been established over a few months, is leading us into a very confusing situation indeed where the minister—and I do not want to get involved in his decisions, because he says that buying turf for the football field in Hamilton is whatever that phrase is, and I do not want to argue with those people, obviously, about that and neither does the minister; I do not want to argue with the Art Gallery of Ontario, other than to say that this is a form of revenue that is being used in essence by the municipalities for programmes they do not want to fund out of their regular revenues. I feel quite specifically that the goal and the aim of public policy should be to round up all of these means of revenue production and put them under the direct control of this minister or somebody else—maybe the Attorney General or somebody else; I have no real objection to it being under Financial and Commercial Affairs. But look at it hard-headedly and realistically as a means of public revenue.

I feel that the minister, even in his answers here, is being forced more and more toward the rationality of that acceptance; that he is saying, "If you are going to be accosted by somebody on the street three or

four times, selling something for a local programme, or if you are going to look at the funding of certain programmes for schools as being educational under the terms of this regulation, then people are going to say, "Well then, why doesn't the government make better use of it themselves?"

I doubt very much if you are going to be able to continue using this present form of regulation in which the approval for certain lotteries is well justified and for others the justification is a little thin, particularly when so many municipalities are second-guessing your judgement. And this is going to happen more and more frequently, where it is not just a matter of municipal approval for a small lottery. It is supposed to be province-wide approval for a larger lottery after it has been considered by this minister, but then this approval is rejected by specific municipalities who do not want to get involved in that kind of door-to-door financing of a project in another municipality.

I just wanted to raise this point because whether or not the minister is going to allow further discussion on, let us say, the Racing Commission responsibility at the end of this vote No. 1 remains to be seen, but it is of the same type, it is a form of substantial revenue associated with gambling. The time when the government should justify its connection with the gambling operation by the direction of all its funds for, let us say, some purpose that is puzzlingly designated charitable, I think, is getting to be past, that time has passed.

Many other jurisdictions have been able to move into this type of financing, not as the underpinning of any great major specific programmes or even with earmarked funds, although it might be helpful, that if there was some contemplation of the direct application of revenues from this sort of thing, it could be earmarked for hospitalization or Medicare or education, or anything like that, there would be no particular objection. But I for one feel that the government is having a difficult time in justifying its administrative decisions in this regard because it is basing them on very infirm principles indeed. I just want to go on record as expressing my view in that regard and I would like to hear what the minister has to say.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, from his remarks, feels that perhaps the government should establish a provincial lottery. Perhaps the government will consider that policy. I have not felt up to this point that this is going to be a very satisfactory method or give a satisfactory result. I think that perhaps those governments which have gone into that area have not been enamoured of their experience and have not greatly profited by the proceeds. However, that would be a matter for my colleagues to discuss and whatever that policy might be, certainly if it was government policy, I would accept it and go along with it. I have not found any that the hon. member mentions. Let us make it clear to him I do not feel we have difficulties at this moment in our department. We have not faced difficulties in the administration of the lotteries. The experience has been good. We have control, we have knowledge. It has gone along very well.

Mr. Nixon: Are there only two big ones?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Four, there are four large ones—I think I have the names of them somewhere. There are four which I consider large, where the prizes are over $100,000. One is the North Middlesex Arena Fund Raising Committee.

Mr. Nixon: That one has been approved?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That name is descriptive—yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: The William Stewart Memorial Community Foundation.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Not "memorial".

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, strike out "memorial", and that I said it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The other one is the Junior Chamber of Commerce Turf Fund, in Hamilton.

Mr. Nixon: One that the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard) is selling.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is licensed, so she—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the one the Leader of the Opposition has some tickets on.

Mr. Nixon: I did not buy them in Brant, it is illegal there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is, number three, the Kinsmen Clubs of Ontario, and that is a provincial wide lottery operated by the Kinsmen who, of course, are here, there and so on, with their clubs in various towns and cities. Then there is the Co-ordinated Arts Services. Those four.

I say again, we do not have problems, we do not have difficulties in administering the lottery system. I do think that perhaps we can look forward to problems arising, not perhaps with the department but with the citizen when he finds that this number were to increase, say, to 150,000 or 200,000 lotteries in Ontario, which could happen, I suppose, if you let every school and every town and every church and every club, of whatever kind, political, social or whatever, have a lottery. Once you start one you have a very hard time saying: "You do not qualify", or: "We cannot allow you unless you put it on some ration basis." That is all I was suggesting.

Mr. Bullbrook: You have begged my leader's question, really.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not had any trouble. I have heard of these bylaws passed by towns or cities saying: "Do not sell here." I have never had to examine them, I have not had anyone complain that they were broken. I do not know what the municipalities' rights are to enforce them, I do not know that any have been taken to court. None of them have been brought to my attention.

Mr. Nixon: That would be an area of concern to you?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They have not been brought to my attention.

Mr. Nixon: They have been referred to the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, the mere fact that you tell me about them does not greatly energize me or get me started. If somebody complains or a municipality says it is having difficulty in preventing these tickets being sold, I would perhaps have to look into it. I presume they got legal advice from their solicitors. I do not know whether they can enforce that bylaw or not. Nobody has brought it to my attention other than in a general way talking about it here in the Legislature. We have had no problems.

Mr. Nixon: Well, as an interested citizen, will you kindly have your staff look into the legality of such a prohibition and inform me as the member for Brant, because I am bringing it officially to your attention and I would like to know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I shall.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): It seems to me we are getting into a terribly involved area in lotteries when we get into a situation where municipalities have local option, and if you want to run one of these general lotteries such as the Kinsmen Clubs, you must obtain 900 and some-odd permissions to sell tickets.

I believe the ROM has sent out 900 and some-odd letters to different individual municipalities and they received some 360 or something back. One day I heard a gentleman inquiring about this on a radio show, and the problem I think is that if the ordinary citizen picks up a book of tickets in A municipality, and he wanders into B municipality, and they do not have permission for selling these tickets, does this mean that a perfectly reasonable citizen who is doing something he thinks is charitable in selling tickets is subject to breaking the law when he is in that other municipality?

I also think we are getting into a terrible area when we allow only local option on $3,500 lotteries, because what is happening is that when a very large lottery of $100,000 or more is available to the public in a given municipality, they are certainly going to take the advantage of buying the greater chance for the same money than they would get with their own local charity. And they are going to depreciate the local charity function for charitable foundations, and things of this nature.

I do think that we should have a provincial lottery. I have said this before and they wrote it up in the Toronto Telegram, the type of lottery that I favour. I do believe we should have a provincial lottery. I think also that charitable organizations should be allowed to sell their tickets on a provincial lottery and obtain revenue in this fashion if they are qualified.

But I think we are going into real chaos when we allow a lottery such as the Kinsmen Clubs to be sold by Shell service station operators across this province, when Texaco or Esso, or some of the other stations cannot sell them. So we are getting into the other feature of gimmicks for gasoline stations and all this sort of thing in the lottery business. I think we are getting into a very dangerous area and I think it is an area that the province must clarify its policy on, and really look at these serious parts of this problem as I see them.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to add, and while adding I want to compliment the initiative taken by the hon. member

for Victoria-Haliburton in expressing this, because I interjected to the minister during the course of his reply to my leader that he begs the question, but the essential question is government policy and you cannot beg it today, while we entertain debate on the propriety of the expenditures that you invite us to support by saying it is a matter of—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I say to the hon. member, I cannot state government policy today other than I have stated it here, which is, and we have been operating it for a year, and that is clear government policy. If he is asking me to forecast what government is going to do in this field in the way of a national or state lottery, provincial lottery, I just cannot do it and he knows that. And there is no use telling me that I am begging the question. I just am not in a position as a single minister of this government to forecast a future policy of this government. We have a policy which we are carrying out.

Mr. Bullbrook: I beg the question. I say that the minister most respectfully begs the question. He does not beg the question as to what future government policy will be, he begs the question put forward by my leader as to the propriety of the position that his administration takes at the present time in connection with the feasibility of utilizing the returns from gaming for the public good.

The fact of the matter is, and I cannot recall the decision, I think it was one of Lord Denning, where he exhaustively assessed the English common law in connection with gaming and what he called, I think, "the concurrent adverse social effects in relation to gaming."

Now what has happened here is, as I read it, that the federal government, which has the constitutional responsibility for assessing gaming laws has said, having regard to certain specific value judgements, if I might say that the province wishes to make: "We give them the opportunity to not only license but promote, if they wish, lotteries within their jurisdiction."

That is the basic question that is put to the minister in connection with the voting of these funds, as I see it. I concur entirely with what the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton has to say, in that there must be established government policy. He supports the question of perhaps a universal provincial lottery. I happen to have inclinations that way. But we do not ask you for your policy. What we ask you to consider is this—I was amazed, Mr. Chairman—I think perhaps the members of the House might be amazed in this respect: Two years ago, during the course of an annual visitation to what is known in Sarnia as the Chemical Valley Retirees Association, I was talking to them, and then we had a dialogue. And at that time there had been publicity in connection with the licensing of a casino in the Sarnia area. I did not look at it with much attraction, frankly. I must say I show my own small "c" conservatism when I say I am not that attracted to the concept of a border casino in the city of Sarnia. That is again a matter of policy for the government of Ontario, and if I form part of the next government, a decision that I might be happy to be involved in making.

But you know I asked the senior citizens, I said to them: "What about the concept of a casino in the city of Sarnia?" And frankly I expected from them, because of the certain small "c" conservatism that one finds over the age of 69—as a matter of fact I might say that you find it over the age of 40, I am finding right now—but you know their reply without reservation was this: "We are all for it." And I said: "Why? Why are you all for it?" And they said: "Because we want some relief from the undue burden of taxation."

Now, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the minister, it again begs the question to talk about the proliferation of licensing from 30,000 to maybe 150,000 because I ask and invite his comment in this connection. If he does establish a policy that in effect is this: that since there is not this tremendous moral repugnance that we experienced for centuries under the English common law in connection with gambling, and if in point of fact the federal government has removed that repugnance and said to the province, "You can, and you are the ones constitutionally who have the right to assess whether it is for religious or charitable purposes," the dichotomy is this—and I use the phrase of my leader—the dichotomy is this, what greater charitable purpose in this province than the taxpayers of this province?

That is essentially it, and I say to the minitser, "You do not invite proliferation from 30,000 to 150,000 if you attempt to use the gaming device to relieve the taxpayer of the burden. He might well have money available to assist some of the charitable organizations that need direct assistance." I say to him, for example, I personalize; if my particular portion of corporation taxes—make it personal

income tax, I am sorry—if, because of some business involvement, my corporation taxes, municipal taxes, and certainly retail sales taxes, were lessened to a great extent as a result of revenue-producing attitudes and policies on the part of this government, especially in connection with the enigma that goes on now in connection with offtrack betting, surely I might have some surplus money available when they come to my door, to say, "Yes, here is $5." There does not have to be that proliferation of lotteries for charitable purposes.

This is, I think, the response that the hon. Leader of the Opposition did request, and I see a necessity frankly for a direct response by the minister because we are voting here money to administer his lotteries branch. How far does the lotteries branch go? He cannot tell us what policy will be but surely he can say to us, that this province at the present time has adopted a position that it regards certain religious and charitable objectives as worthy of detracting from the old position, or taking away completely, or ameliorating the old position, that gaming was essentially immoral. And if we had agreed to that, the minister then says, "No." I say this—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I simply follow the language of the federal law which is the Criminal Code and which says "religious and charitable purposes and objectives." We interpret those but the law is clear on the interpretation and we simply follow the law.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister follows the law but the fact of the matter is the government are the persons who are vested with the ability—the provincial authorities are vested with the ability of enacting legislation that delegates certain rights to municipalities and retains certain rights within the province to assess what constitutes charitable purposes. You make the decision as to what constitutes a charitable purpose. Certainly you do.

I put it directly to the minister then. He says where there is an application for a lottery licence there is no responsibility for him to assess whether it is a charitable purpose or not. Am I correct in this? I say that he must assess it, that it is charitable purpose to fall within the exemption under the Criminal Code. The minister has to do that and since he does that he makes a moral judgement. That is where the judgement is made. There is an essential judgement made there that the repugnance experienced over centuries in connection with gaming is gone and if that repugnance is gone and if the minister is prepared to accept that responsibility in assessing for charitable purposes, why not go the whole way and philosophically that is where I say the minister only goes halfway, and that is the point I suggest most respectfully that was put by my leader and not replied to by the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose one could agree with the hon. member up to a point, that we do occasionally perhaps have to say, "The objects for which you are asking to run a lottery or a game of chance are not religious or charitable purposes within the language given to us by the federal code of the Parliament of Canada. But it is very seldom that we have to exercise moral judgement. These lotteries come forward and invariably they are for educational, cultural, religious—"

Mr. Bullbrook: The moral judgement has been exercised in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Our mind is not being given to moral judgement; it is simply given to the administration to see, as I say, that those purposes come within the law. That is there for us; but that law is interpreted too. The words "charitable" and "religious" have been widely dealt with down through the years in British courts, in our courts, in our debates in the Houses and in the statutes of Elizabeth, referred to by the member for Riverdale, and from that day henceforth. We have those decisions.

There is no great moral judgement required. We are concerned with administration to see that the right people, competent people are running them, how the money is collected, what portion is being used for advertising and promotion, that the money is properly paid over to the recipient and so on. I would say that in not one in 500 is there any question of the object or purpose; I did have one to the associations of all political parties, when I spoke to the clerks of the municipalities. In my view, I think those objects can scarcely be considered religious or charitable, commendable as they may be, I think I said. I hoped that they would follow my thinking; as far as I know, they have all done so.

But we are not making moral judgements. I am not making any moral judgements.

Mr. Bullbrook: Will the minister permit me to speak, since I permitted him? I never said he was making moral judgements; I said the federal government made a moral judgement, based on English common law, which

has said for centuries there was something essentially morally wrong with gambling. Not so much gaming per se, but those that they call the circumstances collaterally adverse that affect people in connection with gambling.

The federal government made that moral judgement; the minister does not make the moral judgement. But once the moral judgement is made—and it has been made as a result of the amendment to the Criminal Code—if in point of fact you can assess the building of a swimming pool by Kinsmen Clubs as a charitable purpose, I regard charity as nothing other than the doing of public good for other than profit motivation; that is all it is.

But surely to goodness, as my leader said, what greater charity is there than the consolidated revenue fund? What greater good can be conveyed to the people of Ontario than lower their taxes? I would say to you —and I probably must bow to the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), who could guide me here—that surely to goodness you could undertake a statute that says in effect that for the purposes of the Criminal Code the Province of Ontario does regard the consolidated revenue fund as charity. I do not see why you could not do that.

I just want to clarify: I appreciate it. I do not say the minister makes a moral judgement; it has been made for him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We do not even have to make a moral judgement if the Province of Ontario wants to run a lottery. The Criminal Code says we can. We do not have to make any judgement. We just have to say we are going to run it for own purposes —for the consolidated revenue fund or whatever. There is no moral judgement involved.

Mr. Bullbrook: You were saying there was.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. I say there is not.

Mr. Bullbrook: You said that in the province you were making—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I say this—and I am not going to prolong this; I would like to sit down sometime and debate this with the hon. member in perhaps more congenial and cosy surroundings than in the confines of this House.

If you had a lottery booked by the province or the state to raise funds for the purposes to which we now devote taxes and supposing you took in $1 million or $10 million, I wonder if you could find out from whose pockets that money came, whose pockets were poorer as a result of that lottery?

I wonder if you would find it came out of the wealthy person's pockets or out of the pockets of the persons who are presently paying the taxes. If you put the balance sheet up and took the small taxpayer, who is having difficulty paying taxes, and if you could pursue and ascertain from whose pockets that money came, I wonder if you would not find that those taxpayers whom you seek to relieve would really not have taxed themselves more heavily than they are presently taxed.

Mr. Bullbrook: I do not intend to continue this debate. I want to say this only because I must record my feelings on this. I say that the minister did make a moral judgement. But I say I agree with him in this respect.

I would love to see the federal government plug loopholes in The Income Tax Act where there are no $150 million under the administration of a Bahamian corporation. I would rather assess those people here than a lottery any day, I agree with the minister there.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a brief comment on this. I had not intended to speak on it, but my own feelings about these matters parallel to some extent what was said by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs in the just preceding statement.

I am not at all taken by the prospect of having lotteries run in the Province of Ontario for the purpose of providing tax revenue. I do not see, to begin with, how municipalities would ever be able to determine budgets and try to budget future expenditures if it were left to some chance sale of lottery tickets in order to raise the necessary funds.

I would think that in the matter of the Hamilton lottery, the one for the turf fund, that in the broadest interpretation of the Act, it may fall within the concept of being charitable, or perhaps even educational, since the use to which it is going to be put will be at least in part an educational use, made available to schools and children for their particular purposes during the school year.

I think that in terms of providing tax revenue, this can only be done by proper taxing. We in the Province of Ontario do not want to start now to involve what inevitably becomes the poorer people taking a chance on becoming rich, frankly knowing full well

that the chance they are taking is almost non-existent. There is no opportunity really for them to win, as very, very few people ever do. We take from the pockets of those who can least afford it to provide a reduction in taxes for those who can afford it quite well.

I would suggest to the minister that rather than do that, we embark on a programme of revamping the tax structure in order to relieve the tax burden on the poorer people. Then, if they want to buy lottery tickets on some charitable fund-raising effort with an eye to winning fabulous sums of money, perhaps they will have additional money in their pockets with which to purchase the ticket.

As I say, it is not a matter of moral judgement. I frankly think it is up to the individual whether he buys or not. But I would not want to be a municipal officer or municipal official—for that matter I would not want to be a government official, trying to budget for the coming year based on the projected sale of lottery tickets.

I do not think that is how you begin to raise money. I do not think it is equitable. I do not think it provides for a reasonable tax structure. I think, if anything, it destroys the very thing we are trying to do and that is to provide a tax structure that assures people pay in accordance with their ability, and that certainly would not do that.

I hope the government never gets to the point of running lotteries to subsidize the consolidated revenue fund, even recognizing that statement by the member for Sarnia that there can be no greater charity than the people who are paying the taxes. This may well be so, but that can be overcome by a rather drastic and much-needed change in tax structure.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, there could be a greater charity—the poor devils who cannot even afford to pay the taxes.

In any event, I would like to point out to the minister in extension to what the member for Victoria-Haliburton had to say, there are some curiosities in your present legislation—anomalies if you will—which do have an aura or a touch of moral judgement on your part about them. Just to clear the record on the thing, I think the minister will agree that one of the difficulties they had in bringing the legislation into being was section 177 of the Criminal Code, as to whether or not gambling was a gaming operation rather than anything else, and there was a moral judgement implied.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I take it when the hon. member says there are anomalies in the legislation, he is talking about federal legislation?

Mr. Lawlor: Well, all right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I have any.

Mr. Lawlor: Your legislation is under section 179. You were worried about 177 as to whether or not—you are driven, in the light of 177, to take all elements of skill, all elements of real assessment, completely out of your lottery scheme in order to bring it under 179. We will come to the restrictions that you felt you were obliged to impose upon this in a minute. The matter had to become pure chance and that is one of the requisites. Now you may say it is a requisite under the federal statute; it is a requisite which you also, within the terms of your judgement, had to face and affirm—that there could be no element of skill. It had to be pure chance.

Secondly, when you then came to determine how the pure chance operated, you did not let it operate across the board. You did not let it operate, for instance, in the area of lacrosse games; or in the area of soccer where numerous ethnic groups are. You restricted it very carefully. It was only in the area, for instance, as far as football games and hockey games were concerned, that you permitted this element.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says, "You did this and you restricted that," but please make it clear that he has not talked about me at all. I had nothing to do with that law; I did not sign it; I did not sit in the House to counsel regarding it. I only deal in this jurisdiction and I accept the federal law and try to interpret it and administer it the best I can.

It used to be that I had the criminal law to administer but now I have a section which comes under this department regarding lotteries and games of chance. I did not make that law. I would just ask the hon. member to say, if he likes—I would be glad to have him say this—"You have a law which is, in my view, curious, which you get from the federal statutes." I just want to keep the record clear that I did not claim a law to run lotteries.

Mr. Lawlor: All right, all right. Explain to me what Department of Justice it was that you referred this whole matter to? The federal department or to your own?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Criminal Code—I had, as Minister of Justice some months ago, to administer that law, but they did not make it; it was entirely federal. Here it is actually a part of the code; it is not The Lotteries Act. If I have part of the code to administer, and it is a civil procedure—it is really procedural, defining what games can be carried on; the objects for which the money may be obtained by way of chance, that is, religious or charitable—I do not even have to interpret those because, as I say, there has been a long history of interpretations. All I am saying to the hon. member is, I delight in hearing him talk about his philosophical views of the law, as long as he makes it clear it is the federal law he is talking about.

Mr. Lawlor: Come, come now, Mr. Minister. You know, this is the question; I have before me and in my hand a rundown of the machinations that you went through in Ontario vis-à-vis the federal government with respect to the initiation of this scheme, in the course of which you mentioned what I mentioned a moment ago, about the federal law, No. 177.

Then you said, "We felt it was necessary therefore"—and this is your department—"to discourage the licensing of these schemes until a legal opinion could be obtained from The Department of Justice." I took that to mean the Ontario department. I could be wrong, if it is a federal department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was only my predecessor getting my opinion when I was in The Department of Justice.

Mr. Lawlor: It may be very well true and that is what I suspect. He went to see you and you said, "Now, listen, if it is pure chance, that is fine. If it is not pure chance, and this mixed element of mixed qualifications and professional skills is involved—no, it cannot be done under the lottery scheme as we envisage it, or under the Criminal Code as it is."

Secondly, you must have made a further determination. Nowhere in the federal legislation is the Grey Cup mentioned. Nowhere is the Stanley Cup under purview. It does not say that wagering or lotteries that are dependent upon the first goal scored after the third period begins in the Stanley Cup game are permitted under the legislation. You have to make that kind of determination for yourself as to where and when it was permissible and where it was not permissible; and that, I suggest to you, the fact that you came down hard on two areas, and as I said, neglected or for the nonce at least ruled out other areas, was a kind of a judgement—a moral judgement—that you had to make.

Of course, I would find it somewhat more than anomalous if you had permitted lotteries upon horse racing. Then you really get snarled and snafued in your own toils, as to pari-mutuels in horse racing and the possibility of lotteries operating under it. But there is nothing, it seems to me, intrinsically against that. Why should not somebody take out a lottery that a particular horse is going to show that day and put the money on it in that form? What intrinsically is against that? Except that you might argue that we already have our legislation and our laws governing the horse racing events and we do not want them extended beyond the present area of operation.

Then, thirdly, as an anomalous thing, you do permit organizations which are not charitable in any sense of the word—I do not know how many of these you have permitted; I do not take an exception to it, please, I am just pointing out the curiosities, the way you do things—if you permit organizations that are by no peradventure of the mind charitable to operate a charity, you do it on a once crack, to give them a single crack at it.

If some organization wants to do something that you deem to be charitable in a neighbourhood, but it is not itself, then you say, "Sure, we will give you permission to do this on one occasion." I would very much like to know if you have permitted it in the past and what organizations were involved. As a matter of fact, I would ask the minister if he would be prepared to table the list of approved charitable organizations as of 1970.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be quite willing to prepare such a list if the hon. member will afford me the time. I do not know what time it would take my officials to get that ready, but we will do it promptly. We would be glad to give him that.

But if it is begging the question I am not going to beg it, if he wants to get into a question of begging moral judgement, because I do not feel very often that we are called upon to make them at all. We simply administer a law which I think is quite clear as to our powers and what we may do and we are simply engaged in the administrative processes here and very very seldom do we ever do a judgement as to what is—

Mr. Lawlor: Why hockey and not soccer? Well, I will not prolong it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that there is a moral judgement exercised every time there is a lottery draw.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Because it is you who allows a lottery, you are really making a moral judgement in a sense that you are allowing charitable organizations or these other types, to raise funds strictly by this means versus the voluntary giving system that has been previously in operation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But it is the law.

Mr. Deans: Just one question, if I may. I wonder if the minister could tell me, just for my own satisfaction, in the case of the Hamilton lottery—the one that is being run at the moment—how was the determination made as to its suitability within the definition of a charity? What evidence was presented that this was indeed a charitable organization?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Generally I would say—I could get something more specific for the hon. member—but generally the judgement that is made in the department is on benefit to the community.

We have a publication relating to lotteries and it deals with the order-in-council No. 27470, which was passed by the government. It is available for municipalities and municipal officials. It starts off:

> Interpretation.
>
> 1. In the section set out herein: (a) charitable object or purpose means any object or purpose for: (1) The relief of poverty; (2) Education; (3) The advancement of religion; or (4) Any purpose beneficial to the community.

To answer the hon. member's question, the criteria that my staff used would be that of No. 4—beneficial to the community.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister; the budgetary item is $74,000 for carrying out the functions of this department. Is there any revenue?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The revenue, the fees, are set in the licensing of the lotteries to match the expenditure. We anticipate revenue to about balance that $74,000. We have it designed so as to pay for itself.

Mr. Gisborn: Might I pursue this question just for curiosity and information. I take it that the minister, through his officials in this branch, is aware of the function of the Hamilton Astroturf lottery? They have given tickets to be sold by various organizations, trade unions, community councils, other charitable organizations, and as they sell their tickets, they get an amount of money back in two ways. One, in having one, two or three tickets —I forget the number—from each book, plus a cash payment based on the amount of tickets sold. Is that in keeping with the regulation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, sir. That is in order, to apply a certain amount of the cost, or a certain amount of the proceeds, to the promotion, advertising and sale of tickets.

In connection with this, I might just let the hon. members know that we have detailed reports on all of these, particularly the larger ones in detail. With respect to the Hamilton Junior Chamber of Commerce turf fund committee, I read from the report which my staff gave to me:

> The objects or purposes to which the proceeds of the Jaycees' turf fund committee lottery are to be donated fall under the category of purposes beneficial to the community.

That is the one I mentioned to the hon. members a few moments ago.

The main objective as listed is to pay for the cost of artificial turf in the Ivor Wynne Stadium in Hamilton so that it may be used for amateur and high school sports activities. All of the net proceeds will go for athletic facilities for all the students.

To date the Jaycees have obtained letters of permission to sell tickets in 75 communities in the Hamilton, Toronto, London, Kitchener, Stratford area. I do not know what date that was, but it was fairly recent.

Mr. Gisborn: That is all a matter of opinion, but it is still your report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They have 180 groups currently selling books of lottery tickets. The distribution involves service and community organizations including Certoma, Mardi Gras Society, Burlington Band Society, Parents Association, the Conservatory of Music, the Shrine Oriental Band, Little League groups and so on. So we have very detailed information about lotteries of this and other kinds.

Mr. Gisborn: Would it fall within the regulations that a member of the Conservative

Party was selling the tickets and retaining the benefits from it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not know anything about the politics of who is selling those tickets. I suppose all political stripes, colours and opinions are shared by the people who are selling the tickets for that lottery. I would hope so.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): So that is where you are getting your candidates!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not inquire as to their politics, except if it is a political association; that is the organization itself.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I also do not want to prolong it, but I have got to make this comment.

I doubt very much whether the statement that you just made is legally correct. Let me make this point: The very fact that you issue a licence does not determine the criminal or non-criminal nature of the lottery.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Which statement is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. J. Renwick: The statement which you just made about permitting the turf fund—the Jaycees one in Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The beneficial agreement?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You think that does not qualify interpretation?

Mr. J. Renwick: Let me make the first point. I do not think the mere fact that you issue the licence determines whether or not it is or is not criminal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I agree.

Mr. J. Renwick: Presumably a person could lay an information; the matter could be a matter of charge into it. The court would determine the substance of whether or not it was or was not an offence.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would immediately agree with the hon. member on that statement.

Mr. J. Renwick: Right. The second point is that the Criminal Code says that it is for a charitable or religious organization to conduct such a lottery; "the proceeds from the lottery scheme are to be used for a charitable or religious object or purpose." The minister has indicated that is a matter of what the law is. The law is as stated in the four rules laid down by Lord MacNaghten some many years ago: the relief of poverty, the advancement of education, the advancement of religion, and, in addition, a fourth category called "any purpose beneficial to the community."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is what I read.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, but it is a matter of law—and I point this out because I think you are in serious error on the question of the Hamilton one—that it is not every purpose which is beneficial to the community which is charitable—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is true. I agree.

Mr. J. Renwick: —but only those which are charitable within the intendment of the statute of Queen Elizabeth. I doubt very much whether the provision of artificial turf for amateur and high school use in the stadium in Hamilton is by any stretch of the imagination within the charitable intendment of the fourth classification laid down by Lord MacNaghten. I would suggest that it is not any purpose beneficial to the community, but only such purposes beneficial to the community as are within the charitable intendment of the statute; therefore I think that the interpretation made by your department should be reconsidered.

I do not make this from the point of view of trying to quash any particular charity —all I am saying is that you are giving an interpretation that is so broad you are going to have great difficulty yourselves, because you are going to be the ones who are going to have to say that there are a wide number of things which are purposes beneficial to the community. Whereas the courts in England, on the question of the administration of charitable trusts, had to give a very limited meaning to this fourth class of purposes beneficial to the community.

I would suggest seriously that the matter be reconsidered. On another instance and for an entirely different purpose I just happened to have had to consider the very point, and I think my colleague the member for York South said to me what the purposes were; then the question came up and you read what the purposes were. I simply say to you that my guess is that it is not a charitable purpose in connection with that particular lottery and that the matter be seriously reconsidered as a legal question by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the point made by the hon. member. It is one of the things I had in mind. I did not want to get into a discussion of our criteria, really. It is one of the things I had in mind when I spoke earlier about this matter the other day. I do want to review it, and I think it is important that we do carefully review the criteria we use to judge, particularly that item four, regarding certain purposes which are of benefit to the community.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 6 carry?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I just take a moment? There is this one item of the minister's salary, and I just would like it reiterated by this party that I am delighted the minister remained within the government and holds this particular portfolio which, as he said in his opening remarks, covered many areas which formerly fell under his jurisdiction. And in the development of the field, particularly with securities work and that type of work, he was instrumental in leading to the division of responsibility between the Attorney General and this minister. I think that all of us here consider that the minister is a reasonable and fair minister of the Crown and does a first-class job.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say how much I appreciate those words, and I am glad that the members are going to allow me my salary. I really do appreciate those remarks.

Vote 601 agreed to.

On vote 602:

Mr. Chairman: I think this vote is broken down quite nicely into programmes of activity; we will take the vote item by item. Vote 602, item 1, Ontario Securities Commission: the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my remarks on the Securities Commission are going to be extremely brief. My first question is, will the minister give us the names of the members of the commission and the salaries paid to them?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will have them in just a moment.

Mr. Lawlor: While the minister is looking that up, there is another point, kind of a broad point, which I thought I would bring up under this vote. The amount that you show is actually expended for the 1969-1970 year does not correspond with the figures given in the public accounts for the same period. This particular problem occurs throughout the estimates, and I would like to make a test case of it right here as to why the figures are different.

I refer to page 6-2 of the last public accounts at our disposal, which shows the amount expended was $939,178.41. Now that is off your figure, or the figure that you put into this book, by something in the region of $55,600. Could the minister bring those two figures into line?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would you give me both the figures please?

Mr. Lawlor: In the figures that you are showing under vote 602, where you give your comparative statement, you show the 1970-1971 estimates in one column, you show the actual expenditures for 1969-1970 as $994,831, but when you look at the public accounts figures for this vote for the Ontario Securities Commission programme the figure that emerges is not $994,831 but $939,178.41.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: While my deputy is securing some information on that point, to answer the member for Riverdale, the members of the Ontario Securities Commission: chairman, Mr. E. A. Royce, salary of $36,000; Mr. Bray, $28,000; Mr. Gundy, who is on the commission, a member of the commission by virtue, not necessarily by virtue of his being superintendent of insurance, but as our composition of the Securities Commission requires and calls for the superintendent of insurance to be there, he has a salary of $30,000; Professor Willis, who is a part-time member, and Mr. Strathy, $6,000 each; Mr. Greely, recently appointed, is on a per diem basis of $60 per day.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, my comment is—and it bears no relation to the present members of the commission at all, because I think that when the government policy is to use this salary level as part of its overall administration, we can only be grateful that there are men of the capacity of the members of the commission, some of whom I know, and respect for their ability, that they are prepared to serve at that level.

What I am really saying to the minister is that regardless of whether other members of the Legislature think that $36,000 is an adequate figure of remuneration or the lower amounts which are paid, I do not think that the Ontario Securities Commission can afford

the luxury of not competing in the private market for the top security men who are available to run the commission, and you can only do that within the field of men—for whatever reasons are immaterial—who attract substantially higher incomes in the downtown investment business, whether it be in the insurance companies, whether it be in the investment dealers, whether it be in business, or otherwise.

Now, I want to make this point, that the value of the commission to protect the investors of the province, to ensure that the market mechanisms function properly with the provision and the wide use of capital resources, both of which are required, requires in my opinion, a complete reassessment of the salary levels, or the fee level, which is paid to members of the commission. I know very well and I am only going to quote briefly what has been said in the special study which was done by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the US a few years ago when it reviewed the whole of the securities market. I think the comments, in two sentences, very much point out my concern about the position we have arrived at. I quote from the letter of transmittal of part 2 of the report of the special study of securities market for the Securities and Exchange Commission, which was published in 1963.

> As we stated in our letter of April 3, with respect to the study and report generally, the total picture emerging from our studies is one of basically strong institutions, subject to many specific weaknesses and abuses. The faults and defects disclosed in the study do not call for public alarm as to the basic integrity of the securities markets but neither do they permit of complacency.

Those two sentences mirrored the position, as I take it, that we have arrived at after much soul-searching and great difficulty in this province: that basically the security institutions, the market institutions and the investment and financial institutions are at this point relatively strong.

As the minister said in his opening remarks, he used the term which has become commonplace when referring to the investment market, "It is a sophisticated business." I think if we are going to have that sense of vigilance and concern to make certain that existing customs which may be long standing either in the over-the-counter markets or on the stock exchange in the province or in the method of investment in natural resource development or in any other of the areas in which investment takes place, are wise we have got to have men who are tough, able and skilled, who on their own terms could compete within that investment community.

Indeed, it may very well be that the ability to be vigilant in this field requires the gradual development of a system that men will move from the investment community into the Securities Commission and back out again because of this high degree of expertise which is required.

I think that the tone of the Securities Commission will be determined in the long run by the policy of this government in the dollar value which it places upon the services of the men whom they attract to the commission.

I do not take it to be a useful statement to say that everybody takes a discount if he enters the public service. There may well be an element of that. I believe and I am totally convinced that you have got to have on this commission, in a very short period of time, men in their late 30s or early 40s who are skilled operators in the financial and investment markets; who are tough and knowledgeable about all the intricacies of the game.

Otherwise we are going to accumulate, as we did in the years leading up to the Sixties, a number of hidden problems, customs and usages which persist until some point when they blow up into public scandals or public detraction from the integrity of the securities markets and the whole of the investment field.

I am simply saying to the minister that insofar as I am concerned, so long as we have a market mechanism such as this; so long as we are dependant on flow of capital and the allocation of funds, and so long as we are dependant upon the investor confidence, which is dependant in turn on the integrity of the financial marketplaces, then we have got to be able to have top people. I reiterate what I said at the beginning. I am not speaking about the present members of the commission who, for various reasons, have entered into this field, or accepted this responsibility in the field of public service at the particular levels at which the government has established for their salary.

But I am impressing on the government as a matter of policy that they have got to review, in the light of the comments which I have just made, the essential necessity of establishing the salary level, or the income level of the commission, on a competitive

basis with the top men in the investment and financial markets. That is not $36,000 a year, and it certainly is not $28,000 a year, and it certainly is not, for a man of the skill and ability of Professor Willis, $6,000 a year. I think the province is simply lucky that they have men of the calibre that they have got at those levels. It is wrong in principle and I urge the minister to reconsider that aspect of it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree with everything that the hon. member has just said, and that he has put those remarks on Hansard for the record. He has my assurance that my sentiments and his entirely coincide in that area.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1. The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if this is the place to bring up the matter about which I wrote to the minister a short time ago, asking about the right of an individual, who is a salesman and has his licence cancelled for a period and is unable to get a reason from the commission for the cancellation of that licence. I wrote the minister I think a week ago about that.

I also wanted to find out about the question of the problem faced by salesmen who undertake the securities course, who write it and fail it. What period is there for them to continue to be a salesman?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, as to the first item, I think I recall the hon. member bringing to my attention the matter of a salesman who had been refused—a licence, I believe it was.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that the salesman had a licence, but his licence was cancelled for 30 days. He tried to get the reason why, a written report on the situation. He was unable and has been unable to do so.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This was some time past.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, it was some time past.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was told that there is no case where a reason will not and is not given; that the person is entitled to his right to know. The Securities Act, 1966, as amended in subsection 5 states:

> —where the direction, decision, order or ruling made after a hearing adversely affects the right of a person or company to trade in securities, a person presiding at such hearing shall, at the request of such person or company, issue written reason for the direction, decision, order or ruling.

So in the law, he has it of right.

Mr. Deacon: So, Mr. Chairman, all a person needs to do, then, is write to the commissioner requesting a written reason for his suspension at that time and he will obtain it. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He had a hearing, I take it?

Mr. Deacon: He did not give me details of that. I just understood he was advised his licence was suspended for 30 days and he has not been able since to get a reason for it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps, the hon. member would be good enough to bring that matter to my attention again and I will check it out thoroughly. I think, perhaps, something turns on how long ago this may have happened, because the Act from which I read is 1966. That was the Act which I had some part to play in bringing forward to this House. I think the procedures prior to that did not have such a provision in it that I read, the right in law to have the written reasons. If the hon. member will be good enough to bring it to my attention and remind me of it again, I will pursue it through further.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the first point is that the man would like to know the reason. I know now he has the right under law to obtain it. The second point is that of the problem faced by a person who is a salesman and who, on his own volition, undertakes to take the securities course and then, although he has had his licence and has been approved as a licensed salesman for a long time, fails that course in examination. He does all right, and did all right in this particular case in the assignments, but he failed the final paper. Therefore he found his licence was cancelled.

Normally, as I understand it, those who are in certain aspects of the securities business—I imagine it is under the broker-dealers—can sell securities before they pass their examination and they have an interim licence arranged. The complaint that this particular individual brought to my attention was the fact that although he had been in the securities business for many years, when

he had failed his examination, he was no longer qualified to act as a salesman, although others could act as salesmen during the period of time they were taking the course.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They have a probationary licence.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, probationary. He felt that under the circumstances he should have the opportunity of a probationary licence for a period before he rewrote the examination. I wondered if such is the practice now with salesmen if they can have a probationary licence if they failed an examination?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the general question of an applicant having failed; I would take it from that, having perhaps indicated his disqualification, or his lack of qualification to be a salesman, the member is asking whether it would be proper to say, "Notwithstanding that you are not qualified, we will give you immediately another probationary licence so you can try again in a year, or six months, or three months—whatever."

I do not know what the policy of the commission is in that regard. I think they might be justified in saying, "Not immediately; you cannot have a probationary licence." If you would give me this particular case, I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reasoning I felt, on this case was that sometimes an individual does have a bad morning and will miss an examination. There should be provision for a probationary licence for at least one retaking of the examination or the rewriting of the examination during this period, I would urge the minister to take this under consideration.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I shall do.

Mr. Chairman: Item No. 1 agreed to? Item No. 2.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I just have two comments on item No. 1.

Would the minister like to comment about the present relationship between the Commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange in light of the lengthy discussions we had on other occasions? Secondly, would the minister like to comment about the minister's or the government's present position on the whole question of a national securities' administration?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the first part, I may say to the hon. member and to the members of the House, Mr. Chairman, generally, that I have been looking at the relationship of the Securities Commission with the Toronto Stock Exchange.

When The Securities Act 1966 was drafted, I recall so well the section which we inserted there giving the province—yes, I have The Securities Act for 1966; the section was section 139. I do not think I need to read it to the hon. member, but generally that section gave to the province, through the agency of the Commission, a wide authority over any stock exchange—and that would be particularly the Toronto Stock Exchange—operating in this province.

The Stock Exchange Act—I have not got it before me—provides for the participation of the commission to a degree in its board of directors—no it does not; it is not that way.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, there are two main members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Two public directors.

Mr. Sopha: Two public members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Two public directors.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, who are complete supernumeraries.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, they come from the nomination of the president of the stock exchange—

Mr. Sopha: One of them announced that everything is just great, just wonderful.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —to the cabinet. Their nomination must be approved by cabinet before they are appointed, and that is perhaps not as large a measure of control as the hon. member for Sudbury might like to see. But what I would say to the House is this, that since coming to this department I have been looking at The Securities Act and at The Toronto Stock Exchange Act. I have had conferences with the president of the Toronto Stock Exchange and some of the directors, and with the members of the Securities Commission at my office with respect to this matter of direction, supervision, control, government, government participation in and knowledge of the operation of the Toronto Stock Exchange.

At the present, I think the hon. member is aware of the state of the law. The commission, however, does, under the present arrangements, exercise a very close liaison, a very close examination of the operations of the Toronto Stock Exchange and, I think, with very good effect.

It is drawn to my attention that there is in The Securities Act, in that same section to which I referred, section 139, subsection 3: "Any person or company who feels aggrieved by any direction, order, or decision under any bylaw, rule or regulation of the stock exchange in Ontario may apply to the commission"—that is, the Securities Commission—"for a hearing and a review thereof"—and section 28 applies to the hearing and the review; that is the procedure of sections—"in the same manner and to the hearing and review of a direction, decision, order or ruling of the directors."

That is the amendment inserted in the Act in 1968 and 1969.

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps the minister may let me ask him a few specific questions. There are four categories of the authority of the commission where it is in the public interest to make any direction, order, determination or ruling, and certainly at this time I am not interested in the last two of the categories. I am interested, however, in whether or not the commission in the exercise of the power given to it by The Securities Act has issued any direction, order, determination or ruling, with respect to the manner in which the Toronto Stock Exchange carries on its business; or has it made any such direction, order, determination or ruling, with respect to any bylaw ruling, instruction, or regulation, of the exchange, and if so, what is the nature of any such direction or order?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am told there have been several. I have not got the details as to the nature of them, but perhaps I can have that in a moment.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, I would be quite happy—again I am not interested in prolonging it; I am interested more as a matter of information—if the minister could make a note either later in his estimates or by letter to me, advising me specifically of the direction, orders, determinations or rulings, made under subsection 2, items (a) and (b) of section 139 of The Securities Act. I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps I will have that when we return after the adjournment at 6. When we return this evening I think I may have that then, but I certainly will undertake to get it.

Mr. J. Renwick: If I could turn to the second part of my comment to the minister, the member for Sudbury spoke at some length on this question of a national securities administration and came out strongly in favour of it. I have some reservations in my mind about it. I tend to think that perhaps the Cansec proposal is a stepping stone. I am, however, very much concerned whether or not anything but a national securities exchange can deal adequately with the operation of the multinational or global corporation in the Province of Ontario, through, for example, the Toronto Stock Exchange.

I would like the minister to advise us whether or not the statements which were made—and the date escapes me, but I believe it was in November of last year in Ottawa—made by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), indicated that this government was not at the present time prepared to grant authority in the securities field to the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, one has to speak somewhat generally about this. I think it is general knowledge that there certainly have been conferences between the securities commissions of the provinces, where such commissions are established and carrying on. They have gone far towards uniform procedures, uniform regulations and rules, and have had as an objective a uniform arrangement.

Now, a good deal of progress in this direction has been made. It is my understanding that the federal government did not participate in some of those conferences, and did not show a desire to do so, but it did indicate some desire to establish possibly, or to at least explore the possibility of, a federal securities commission.

The proposition or the proposal, however, which seems to have come from the federal people—I do not know for what reason it would be framed in this way, except possibly so as not to offend political sensibilities or the attitudes of provinces as to the trespassing in their jurisdictions—is that there be a two-tier approach; that the federal securities commission would have certain powers in certain areas, where it would be primarily, and perhaps absolutely, concerned and able to direct, and that the provinces might exercise certain powers with their securities commissions underneath that as a second tier of securities commission government regulations.

When we went to Ottawa on May 25 or 26, two or three weeks ago, it had been suggested by Mr. Basford that the 27th of that month,

after the two days of our financial and commercial discussions, would be used for discussion of this very subject. For some reason, that had to be abandoned and we have not returned to that subject. But it is a very live one at the moment.

We have had discussions ourselves about what we might do to pursue Cansec—that is the co-operative body which would embrace all provincial securities commissions. I think the federal government indicates that it is not anxious or particularly desirous of getting into Cansec which so far, therefore, would be limited to provincial co-operation, adjustment and agreement.

I think it would be our view that perhaps there is a role for the federal government even in that organization which is provincial now, and the federal people seem to have shied away from it. I suppose one has to contemplate that if the federal government were to make a decision and pass legislation—at least certain legislation—asserting its right to enter this field of security regulations, it might very well be able to establish, if it became a question before the courts, that it has a certain right, and jurisdiction, and power to do so.

But I think that is not the attitude of the federal government and particularly the minister, the hon. Mr. Basford, to proceed in that direction, as I understand it at the moment. He seeks to achieve something by way of co-operation and agreement with the provinces. It is a matter that perhaps will take a little time to work out, and I just do not know how fast progress may occur, but the provinces, particularly, are working very assiduously themselves to achieve as much uniformity as possible in their securities commissions.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 1?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the Americans have done well, that has been really laudatory in their approach, has been in their regulation of the securities market. Franklin Roosevelt showed his surpassing genius as far back as 1931 or 1932 when he selected the biggest buccaneer of them all. And I do not defame a dead man here when I say that when Joseph Kennedy was selected by Franklin Roosevelt to inaugurate the new regulation of securities, he took a man who knew every trick in the book, and he had used them himself to amass a fortune—that part of the fortune which at that period of Joseph Kennedy's life, he was not amassing from the bootlegging of scotch whisky. He perhaps got a start in scotch whisky.

But he put Kennedy in charge and Joseph Kennedy really is the progenitor of securities regulation in the United States. I have never read at any time, or heard any person ever complain about the methodology adopted by the Americans in that field. They have, as a result, what they call the "big board," which seems to be unimpeachable in its integrity. In fact, the chief criticism of the Wall Street market is that the companies have to be too sophisticated. They have to be too successful to get on. I think the minimum, if memory tells me, is that they must have a profit of at least $1 million a year to be members of the big board.

As I said yesterday, the Americans, the fiercest natives of the planet for the concept of private initiative and unrestrained freedom in the market place, those same Americans are content that they subject themselves to the stiffest regulation, the stiffest regulation of the securities market. I also read, because I am very interested in this subject, that it is very commonplace for people to work for a period of years for the SEC and then to go out and find very lucrative positions in the private sector, as sort of an extension of their career. They have that grounding, that background with the securities commission and that sort of gives them the passport or the visa for an expansion, extension of their career in the business world. Now the United States—200 million people—I do not know how their marketplace could operate, really, if the regulation of the trading of securities was otherwise than on a national basis. I really do not see how that country could do it with 50 separate jurisdictions as against our 10 and the federal government, 11.

Perhaps, that in itself, that American experience, as I have abridged it, has so commended itself to me that I am absolutely convinced that we should follow the parallel. That is one American custom we should adopt and we should regulate securities on a nationwide basis.

On the contemporary scene, of course, there is a much more compelling reason for a single jurisdiction to regulate the trading in securities under the impact of the multi-national corporation, the new business conglomerate—Canadians of course are much affected by the activities, and indeed the suzerainty, exercised by the newly emerging multi-national corporation that comes here—and I would want, as we emerge into that

type of environment, I would want the federal government to be the body that would impose the restraints, that would determine the conditions under which those corporations come into our country. I really do not believe that they ought to be allowed to come in here subject to the laws of 11 separate jurisdictions. In some of those jurisdictions, of course, the laws relating to the marketing of securities are very primitive indeed, very primitive. Some are almost nonexistent.

You might say that Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Alberta, are the four provinces that have anything in the way of sophistication of security law. Now, that is one aspect. Let me turn to another aspect.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is aware too, that the States of the Union all have their securities commissions. That it is really a two-tier securities arrangement.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, but very minor key, very minor key it be.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is what exists over there.

Mr. Sopha: No, but very minor key it is. The interstate commerce laws—let us turn to that aspect—

Mr. J. Renwick: It is not minor.

Mr. Sopha: The trade and commerce laws of our constitution has been a very vitiated instrument compared to the interstate commerce aspect of the American federal constitution. The federal government in the United States in respect to the governance of interstate commerce has had far more jurisdiction than our federal government here.

That, of course, is partly as a result of historical accident that overtook us in the decisions of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, but I do not want to be diverted down that road. I wanted to turn to another aspect.

What is happening here, of course, is that Ontario, in recent years, has been exercising and imposing a very sophisticated regulation upon the marketing of securities. In the result, a good many companies are seeking other fields which they find more fertile and greener because the restraints are not as sophisticated as in Ontario.

Some of them might end up on the Canadian Stock Exchange, for example, in Montreal, where they find that the environment is a bit more flexible than they have in Ontario. They might end up on the Vancouver Stock Exchange. Now I do not think that bodes well for Canadians. I do not think that bodes well when there is a choice to the individual.

I think it far more rational, far more compelling that one jurisdiction ought to have the responsibility to say whether the company does this in Newfoundland or it does this in Inuvik; that it is going to be subject to the same regulation relating to the marketing of securities.

We have—there is another feature here that is historical—we have not—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Let me just finish—

Mr. Chairman: It is 6 o'clock. Did you have more to say?

Mr. Sopha: —so I will not have to take the floor. We have not been very venturesome in our investment behaviour. I would want an encouragement of Canadians on a nationwide basis, and education of them by one jurisdiction in order to make us more investment conscious so that, perhaps, we can end up owning a bit more of our country.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be further discussion on item 1?

Some hon. members: Yes.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

Appointment of W. B. Williston to undertake investigation of care of retarded, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 2477

Investigation into farm death of Rideau Regional Hospital patient, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Singer 2477

Transfer of racing commission responsibility to Financial and Commercial Affairs, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sopha 2479

Provision of car and chauffeur, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Bullbrook 2481

Ontario position at federal-provincial conference made available to standing committee, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon 2481

OHC proposals built by Headway Corporation turned back for reassessment, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Good 2481

Constitutional conference to be held in Victoria, statement by Mr. Davis 2484

Constitutional conference in Victoria, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Sopha 2488

Ontario request to eliminate mining tax exemptions and reduce depletion allowance claims, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon 2489

Financing medical teams to combat cholera in India, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Downer 2492

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Meen 2492

Crop Insurance Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 2492

Fur farms, bill to licence and regulate, Mr. Stewart, first reading 2492

Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 2492

Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Good, first reading 2492

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart, continued 2493

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2521

No. 61

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 602, item 1. Is there any further discussion on that?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, as we adjourned, the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) was asking about hearings and decisions and orders of the Ontario Securities Commission, and through the dinner hour, I have been able to obtain some information. I am not sure it is entirely complete, but in May, 1967, the Ontario Securities Commission held a hearing, I believe that was a public hearing, to consider proposed minor amendments to the commission rate structure of the Toronto Stock Exchange, and then in the fall of 1969, there was a public hearing re the manner in which the Toronto Stock Exchange exercised its discretion in the delisting of mining companies.

In the spring of 1970 there was a complete review by the Ontario Securities Commission of the new Toronto Stock Exchange bylaws with insistence on the principle of natural justice, pursuant to the recommendations of Mr. Justice McRuer, with provisions for notice for the procedure on hearing and appeals—these among other items, in the direction of the commission at that time.

In April of this year, at the Toronto Stock Exchange annual meeting, an amendment to the bylaws regarding an extension of powers to exercise discretion over customers' accounts from directors or partners, through sales and generally, was permitted to lapse—this was held for further examination at the request of the Ontario Stock Exchange.

I am told that, in general, all the bylaws and regulations of the Toronto Stock Exchange are reviewed in the public interest by the Ontario Securities Commission.

That is not entirely complete but it gives an indication of the work of the Ontario Securities Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) was asking about the discrepancy, or the difference, between two figures. I thought I had it at hand. Anyway, I recall that the difference between the two figures that he mentioned—as we show it and the figure actually arrived at—was due to the fact the Treasury Board required us to review our estimates and to add to—it is really a bookkeeping item, or a way of showing it—the pension benefits of employees, which changed the figure. These were added as a charge for our actual expenditure.

That is the explanation. It is only a few thousand dollars but it is the way we had to set it up in accordance with the new rules regarding the showing of estimates.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, the minister's comment about the extent to which the commission has involved itself in the affairs of the Toronto Stock Exchange, I think, points up the point which we made at the time that section 139 was enacted, and that is that there is not as yet that sense of distance between the commission and the exchange which would lead us to believe that, in any way, the commission stands off and, under any circumstances, gives a direction, order or determination or ruling about affairs of the exchange. Everything is still operated in a very cosy atmosphere and I think it is that particular part which does not need any further emphasis from me, which is, and has been, of concern to us.

I put on the record, I believe in 1966, a lengthy proposed amendment to section 139, which would have endeavoured to mirror in our Securities Act the kind of sense of distance reflected in the distance between The Securities Exchange Commission of the United States and the exchanges which operate in the United States. But I am going to leave that because I do not think it is a matter that requires any further elaboration by me.

The minister did make two or three comments about this question of a national security administration and the member for Sudbury replied. I do not know whether or not the minister has any concern about the importance of the multi-national or global corporation insofar as it affects investor confidence in the financial institutions which operate in the Province of Ontario. From the remarks he made, I consider that he did not indicate it was a matter of any great importance to him. Well, I would just suggest to the minister that the role of the multi-national corporation or the global corporation, or whatever other name one wants to call it by, plays a signficant part in the economic life of the Province of Ontario and therefore, of necessity, must play a significant part in the operation of the financial markets in the province.

I think that is one aspect of the question of whether or not there should or should not be a national securities commission, which has not received the attention of this government which it should receive. I urge the minister to give some consideration to what his government is going to do about the multi-national corporation insofar as it impinges upon the financial markets in the Province of Ontario and investor confidence in those markets—particularly because we are subjected to the continuing operation of subsidiary corporations which have little, if any, obligation to disclose their financial affairs to the government of the Province of Ontario if, by chance, they happen to be companies incorporated under the laws of this province. We can come back to that again.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the hon. member; while I have indicated that we are looking at this situation and considering it, studying it, and discussing it with the federal government, particularly the minister who is responsible for it—he might be called the opposite of myself in this field—at the moment at least, we would be entering on an unknown area in knowing just what a federal securities commission might accomplish in this area, that this province or the other provinces with this province, or alone, might do.

We have quite wide powers to deal with the securities of any corporation, whether it is local, provincial, federally incorporated, or whether it is a global or multi-national corporation. I think, perhaps, we might assume that there would be a strong and well-qualified securities commission at the federal level if such were to come about. But it is something that we have to speculate about.

I do not want to be political at all in saying this, but some of the things we see the federal government doing in our economy in the fields in which it has been involved—in banking, in finance, in bills of exchange, in interest rates and so on—I cannot say that I am overly assured or enamoured of the way in which they perform. To say, as the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) suggests, let us have a national securities commission, I have that reservation. We wonder whether they would do the job as well as we might like it done.

There are good reasons to argue and submit that with the broader scope they would have in the country, the whole field—certainly we agree that securities and the securities market flow across the borders of provinces without any restriction or obstacle whatsoever —I am weighing in my mind the question of whether we should suddenly give up a field in which, I think it is fair to say, our Securities Commission is doing a pretty good job.

It has certainly been strengthened by our laws and by its personnel over the last few recent years to risk the game by giving it all to the federal government—this is something I wonder about.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think I share the view of the minister on that. My view, my hesitation, about a national securities administration for the country, certainly at this time is because of a lack of confidence which I have in the federal government in that field. I do not mean lack of confidence other than the lack of expertise that is involved in it. I am not suggesting for a moment that they could not build up the kind of expertise which is required for that purpose.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Province of Ontario has, during the years of the 1960s—with good reason because of the disasters that befell the province—been in a sense a pathfinder in modernizing the laws relating to corporate activity and securities work in the province. Indeed, the federal Corporations Act reflects in many ways the work which was done in the province. Sure, there were variations, but the basic thrust of their amendments to their Corporations Act was taken from the work which was done in this province. I still think that the Province of Ontario has that kind of pathfinder role. And, therefore, on a very pragmatic basis I say that it does not appear to me, on that argument and using that thrust of the considerations involved in it, to be the time when

a national securities administration should take place.

Secondly, I do not denigrate to the same extent that the member for Sudbury does, the blue sky laws of the individual states of the United States. It is quite true that the Securities and Exchange Commission in the United States provides an overriding jurisdiction, supported under their constitution by the interstate commerce provision. It is also true that the major states—California, New York, Pennsylvania and a number of others—have their own blue sky laws which they consider to be an additional supplement to investor protection and, indeed, there are men who spend their lives being expert only in the blue sky laws of those particular jurisdictions. So in a sense it is also a two-level operation.

But, having said that, I think that we are in a position which the United States is not in, and that is the impact of the multi-national corporation on the financial markets in Canada which are mainly in the provinces such as the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec.

I think the point which the minister made earlier is a very real one. I think it is not just a reluctance to tread on provincial toes which keeps the federal government out of this field, because I do think if they wanted to they could frame legislation which would have an effect somewhat similar to that of the securities legislation of the Congress of the United States.

It may well be that our trade and commerce clause has been emasculated in past times, but I think Professor Laskin, as he then was, Mr. Justice Laskin, as he is now, has indicated that in all likelihood the trade and commerce clause is about to have a rejuvenation in constitutional law. Indeed, the chicken and egg war may be the first step toward the rejuvenation of that particular power.

I have certainly thought that there was an apt exercise of legislative power which would give the federal government a role in the securities field if it chose to exercise it. The contra argument, and the argument which I put to the minister, is the question of the multi-national corporation that I alluded to before the dinner recess and to which the member for Sudbury also alluded, because we are singularly subjected to the pressure of those organizations upon the nation state, if you want to put it in those terms—more so than the United States, because the United States is the home of many of the multi-national or global corporations.

The federal government, being in international law a nation state, and having a role in the international community, which the Province of Ontario does not have, it seems to me, has this pre-eminent position to deal with the question of multi-national corporations. But I do not think that they can deal with the question of multi-national corporations because they do not have the thrust or the drive to do so at the present time. I think again, this province can be a pathfinder, not to final solutions, but to do a great deal to analyse and study the impact of the multi-national corporation as such.

I am not talking about foreign investment in an isolated dollar sense in Ontario. I am talking about the decisions which are made with respect to the use of capital and which affect the capital markets in the Province of Ontario. The minister's opposite number in Ottawa, the hon. Ronald Basford, has, in attendance at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris, indicated very clearly that Canada supports a study of the multi-national corporation from the point of view of trying to resolve these problems.

No one is very happy with what has been done, but certainly the last comment of his which I have is one which he made in 1970 —that is the hon. Ronald Basford—in which he, speaking in Paris in May, 1970, had this to say:

> The increasing importance of multi-national corporations is also a phenomenon associated with rapid international economic growth. At the last ministerial council meeting in February, 1969, the secretary-general stated that the OEDC would have to look into the many aspects of this development including technological transfers, the influence on financial and commercial flows in levels of employment. In response, my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, suggested that such an examination should have high priority and be conducted with a view to developing internationally-recognized ways and means of reconciling the various important interests involved. It is not without concern that we note that since then, considerations of this problem have been extremely slow. We should like to reiterate the importance we attach to this matter and express the hope that a multi-disciplinary and well balanced examination of multi-national corporations can be accelerated, perhaps under the direct guidance of the secretary-general.

I am not quite as ambitious as all that. I think that there is a very useful role with the expertise which is available in the Province of Ontario, with the ability of the Province of Ontario to compel the attendance of witnesses by invitation—because they would come—to carry on our own study in a more-or-less microcosm as distinct from either the whole Canadian scene or the world scene or the OEDC scene, to find out just exactly what the financial and investment policies of the multi-national corporations are so far as they affect the economic viability of our life.

We all know about the impact on employment and we all know that that has a lot to do with investor confidence and what should be done in this province, so far as disclosure is concerned, by companies which are subsidiaries of global corporations, by the investment institutions which market in many ways the securities of global corporations in Canada, by the extent to which Canadians, or people in Ontario, are investing through the New York and European markets in the shares and securities of the parent corporations, and the whole ramification so far as it has an impact upon the decisions made by the life insurance companies, by the pension trusts, by the mutual funds, by the trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange, by the failure of disclosure by subsidiary companies of global corporations and a whole mass of other things which I am quite certain many other people could elaborate.

But it is that particular aspect of it which leads me to believe that there has to be an awakening of interest by the federal government in the securities field. I tend to believe —it is a creative thought—I tend to believe that it is a positive contribution by the Province of Ontario, the concept of Cansec, as a way of solving the problem. But I think it has to have the initiative and motivation from this government, and particularly from this minister, to give the impetus for Cansec to have that added dimension of an expression of concern about the impact on the financial institutions in the province, the financial markets, of the multi-national corporation. If I may just, in concluding my comment about this, fill in, in reply to the minister's question, that, in my view is kind of the missing link which gives the other argument as to why the federal government has a very real role to play—reasonably soon, I think—in this field of securities legislation. I do not know what the answer is. I certainly do not believe that it is a simple problem of turning the whole thing over to the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor: (Lakeshore): The hon. minister will remember I asked a question as to the discrepancy, as I thought it was, between two figures.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought I answered it.

Mr. Lawlor: Well if you did you passed me by in the night, I can tell you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I thought I answered it. The difference, as I indicated, I think just a few moments ago, was that in setting up the figures we had to adjust them at the request of the Treasury Board to include employee benefits in our expenditures, which were not shown in the lower figure quoted, and those employee benefits make up the difference. That is the answer.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, how on earth can the Treasury Board, after the event, after the public accounts in front of us have been closed for two years, make recommendations of that particular kind? It is most misleading and most improper that they should do so, but I will not push the issue.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I do not. I think it is quite correct to say that the figures do not change the public accounts—totals, but we were required to show employee benefits in those areas, in those items, for purposes of comparison and for information. But total expenditures are not actually changed in the way of expenditures except that we are charged with employee benefits.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1.

Mr. J. Renwick: I only have one other comment on this particular item 1. I would just like to ask the minister, so far as Ontario is concerned, where we now stand with respect to the implementation of the recommendations of the Canadian committee on mutual funds and investment contracts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed that our people are preparing a draft following the recommendations in co-operation with the other officials who took part in that, and that this will be discussed at a meeting which is arranged to take place in Montreal in two weeks' time.

Mr. J. Renwick: I hope, following along the discussion that the minister and I had just a few minutes ago, that we are not going to wait in the Province of Ontario for some all-embracing 11-jurisdiction scheme before we implement in the Province of Ontario those portions of this report which are specifically applicable to the operation in Ontario of the investment funds.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My own attitude, Mr. Chairman, would be that we would not wait. We would hope of course to accomplish a good deal together, but I am aware of the recommendations. I think they are important. I think we should achieve as much as possible in co-operation with others, and I would like to see the results of the conference being held in Montreal. But as far as I am concerned, my answer would be that we should get on with what we can accomplish in the implementing of those recommendations.

Mr. J. Renwick: I want to express my concern to the minister, and I hope that this government will not participate again in a report which is developed in secrecy, no matter what the pressures may be and what the argument may be in favour of private hearings about public investment matters. I simply think that the report is weakened to a large extent by the comments in the foreword which go on to say of this decision:

> We decided not to hold public hearings because we believe that greater benefit could be obtained from the submission of written briefs, from personal interviews and meetings, and from replies to questionnaires. This decision was supported by members of the mutual fund and investment contract industries, with whom we discussed it.

Well, I cannot imagine why they would not agree that it would be better to keep it private, but from the point of view of the public interest I think it was a wrong decision and a most unwise one, particularly since many of them were concerned that the publicity which would result from public hearings might adversely affect their operations. I think that that is probably the lamest excuse that I have ever seen incorporated in a report for holding private meetings. They go on to refer later on:

> We do not believe that the absence of public hearings has in any way inhibited the comment made to us. Without the unstinting co-operation of the organizations concerned, our work would have been much more difficult, the Canadian Mutual Funds Association and its staff made a particularly valuable contribution on behalf of its members.

Why, even the people who wrote the report were hung up, because earlier on they simply said: "Unfortunately the final document"—that is the document from the Canadian Mutual Funds Association—"was not received until the preparation of this report was almost complete."

Well, I emphasize again that matters of public investment policy are matters which are open for public discussion, and if those persons who have special interests, in a financial sense, in the profits to be made from that industry do not learn and learn very clearly—and no doubt government insists that they learn very clearly—that these are public matters, and the suggestion in some way or other that investor confidence is going to be enhanced in the financial markets of this province by hearings such as this not being held in public shows a complete lack of understanding of what we have been talking about for many years in this Legislature about the need for public disclosure, public information, public discussion, and public concern about the questions which are involved.

I think that the report itself is probably a passable report, but I simply say that I hope that this is the last of such reports that this government will be associated with without clear and specific instructions that the hearings are to be held in public and that people can have an opportunity to hear what is said and to make their contribution if they want to make it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but go considerably along the road indicated by my hon. friend. I think, too, that there is a great deal to be gained. I am not sure that everything that was discussed there would be as fully discussed or as much come out of the discussion. If it were entirely public, you might not get the participation or submissions.

I am not quite familiar enough with the nature of those discussions, in which I did not take part, to know for certain that the conference should have been entirely open, but I generally agree with his comments. I think this is a field in which the public is interested, in which there should be nothing secret, because the public has a right to know. I am not called upon to say this, but

the conference we had at Ottawa at the behest of hon. Mr. Basford last month was a discussion of financial and commercial affairs.

It was held without the press, without the news media being present. I did not make an issue of it, but I felt that there was nothing that we discussed and nothing that came out in that meeting, which was a full, free and open discussion by Attorneys General, by Ministers of Financial and Commercial Affairs, by the federal minister, by all of us, of the things we were doing and of the things we were trying to achieve—our aims and our objectives—and of things we had accomplished—there was nothing in that whole two-day conference that could not have been said with the greatest effect and much more effect publicly, so that the people might know what we were doing.

There was nothing secret about it. I was a bit disappointed that conference was conducted in that way. At the end of it, we had to take a little time to prepare a news release, which was very short and brief. I suppose it was comprehensive in a way, to the degree at least that it covered the subjects we discussed and very generally the things we agreed upon. But even where we disagreed—and there was very little area of disagreement—I think it would not have hurt if the whole thing had been in the public's eye and right under the public spotlight.

So I am inclined to think along the same lines as the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, agreed to. Item 2, programme administration, agreed to. Item 3, prospectus filing. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: I only have two comments. I would ask the minister if he would give some consideration to requiring the filing of a prospectus with the Ontario Securities Commission in the case of land development subdivision sales.

I am thinking, for example, of Whiterock Estates, and whether or not it would not make sense to say, perhaps by a special section of The Securities Act, that, in fact, the investment by a citizen of the province in a real estate development such as—is it Whiterock?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Whiterock.

Mr. J. Renwick: Whiterock—and I am sure there will be many more such developments in the Province of Ontario—amounts to an investment by the person who is buying the lot in the development, not only in the lot itself, but in the whole of the financial operation of that development, namely, how it is financed; what the agreements and arrangements are with respect to the servicing of the development; what the underlying responsibilities of the various persons are from whom he buys the property and what is the extent of the title and other potential sources of finance available to the developers and promoters of such schemes.

I do not think that it would be an untoward analogy to say that an investment by a person in that kind of a land development scheme is equivalent to the investment in the shares of a public company in the Province of Ontario. It may well be that some form of land prospectus is required and should be obligatory to be furnished in the Province of Ontario to any prospective person who is invited to participate.

I have been somewhat concerned to hear on CBC radio, and elsewhere, the come-on advertisements to come and buy a piece of Canada, having regard to the previous difficulties which we had in this House about Whiterock Estates. It does seem to me that it would be possible for the commission to devise a simple intelligent form of prospectus which could be furnished to any prospective buyer which would give him accurate information about the promoters, about the financial arrangements, about the arrangements with the municipalities and other groups in order that a person could be protected to the extent possible by adequate and full disclosure of the venture in which he is being asked to participate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like to comment very briefly on that. I think the suggestion may have merit, as I think about it quickly—and I will pursue it—it seems to me there is quite a difference really, and there are some areas of similarity, in investing in land offered by a body such as Whiterock or some other group like that.

But you are not buying shares in a promotion; you are buying a piece of land which, if one is really anxious to know what he is getting, he may see. They know where it is; they may see it on the map; they can see it on the ground; they can see its location and examine its nature, and so on, and its relation to other areas.

Also, there is this to be remembered: that any subdivision is subject to a considerable amount of supervision, control and regulation by various departments of government from the point of view of health, sanitation, sew-

age, communication, roads and other services. So that there is the opportunity for someone in this province in buying land in this province, particularly if it is not in the far reaches of the province, to see it on the ground, and see what they are getting. So perhaps the need is not quite as great as if these people were arranging a promotion for the development of land with the holding out of the prospect that a lot of money, or some money, could be made by an investment in a type of security. There is a difference.

I am told, however, that with respect to foreign land, where offers are made for the purchase of land in foreign areas, a prospectus must be filed with the department under The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, which administers that sort of thing. We do not have such for the local subdivider or the local promoters of land sales.

But I think the suggestion may have some merit. I know there was concern in the department, certainly at the beginning of Whiterock's operations, and a very considerable investigation carried out. I will pursue the suggestion the member has offered.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, if I could just add a word to this. This has brought up a very worthwhile subject in that while present plans of subdivision do have the approval of The Department of Municipal Affairs, where the problem is arising all across Ontario at the present time is in such instances as the Blue Mountain concern, others down in the Flesherton area, where plans of subdivision were simply filed in the registry office before subdivision control was required in that area.

People have bought these lots and now find problems in getting a building permit—I know of one particular instance where, at the owner's expense, hydro must be brought two miles; the specifications for septic tank use requires a $2,000 additional outlay. And I think this is the type of thing that when land is sold—I think this is the point the member for Riverdale has in mind—something similar to a stock prospectus should be given to the purchasers where it tells you you can or cannot build on this without doing this or without doing that.

In the case of the chalet lots in the Blue Mountain area, people bought them and when the developer did get enough flak back that no one could build on them, he is now selling them at half his original price and simply stating, "Well, you cannot get a building permit for a year or two." Maybe they will never be able to get a building permit on the lots.

When the lots were originally sold this was never brought in for the simple reason that prior to subdivision control all a person who owned the land had to do was to get a surveyor to drive in his stakes and then register it in the registry office without any concern or any consideration or contact with The Department of Municipal Affairs. The people who have bought and are buying lots, such as those which were subdivided prior to subdivision control, who are now being stuck with the fact that they cannot use their land for the purpose for which it was bought. I think that something could be done, probably through your consumer protection department, so that lots being sold—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I appreciate the point that the member is making, and he is correct, I am sure, in the statements that he makes. I do not want to just dismiss them out of hand, but they are irrelevant, I think, to my estimates in that he mentions first of all that the subdivisions were prepared and filed prior to subdivision control, which laws now are in existence. The review of those subdivisions really lies within The Department of Municipal Affairs, and if now a subdivision were submitted there would be the consideration as to access, sanitation provisions, health and so on, size of lot, roads and all the rest of it.

I do not want to try to escape responsibility. There may be something in the suggestion the hon. member for Riverdale made, where we could pursue something in the way of a filing, in the nature, probably, of a prospectus, but I do not think it is relevant to charge it here in this debate of my estimates with the situation which arose some time ago and in which we have enacted subdivision control bylaws. I am sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is aware of the situations, because I have discussed them with him actually, and so have other members in the House. I do not want to be abrupt about dismissing these comments but I do not think they are relevant to these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3. The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What is the forecast revenue for the prospectus filing? Does it cover more than the item of $281,700?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What is the question?

Mr. Deacon: What is the forecast revenue from prospectus filing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I can, I will get it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the main point I want to ascertain is whether or not the cost of operating this is covered by the fees. I do not feel that this should be a burden on the taxpayer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can answer specifically to the question, but in the figures of last year, the Ontario Securities Commission revenue was $834,769.74, and we estimate for this year a revenue of $957,000. The estimated expenditure for 1971-1972 runs slightly over that, but pretty much in balance. I presume that is largely prospectus filing, but not altogether.

Mr. Deacon: What is the current longest period—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have some additional information here now: the revenue statement for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970. Total $829,556.20.

That was made up of brokers' and salesmen's licences—this is with the Securities Commission—$565,941. Filing fees—that I think would be prospectuses—$227,328, and I am leaving out the cents. The sale of bulletins, Acts and legislation—$36,285. A total of $829,556.20

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to give me an idea of what is the length of time it now takes for the commission to deal with a prospectus application for filing, from the time it is submitted to the time it is—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer to that question is 20 working days, much faster than the SEC. It is about a quarter of the time that the SEC takes to do it.

Mr. Deacon: In the organization's chart it shows that the minister has at one side the Ontario Securities Commission and down below on the chart, the organization, it shows that the Ontario Securities Commission comes in again with no direct line between the commission box at the top and where it comes in underneath the operation of the department. I cannot quite understand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There should be that line that the hon. member misses, and he is perceptive to draw that to my attention. There should be a line showing its direct communication up from the Ontario Securities Commission to the chairman and then, of course, the chairman reporting up to the minister.

Mr. Deacon. Mr. Chairman, the reason I brought this point out is the other box shows there is no direct connection between the appeal tribunal—I cannot think of the name of the new McRuer appeal group—and the operation of the department, the reason being that it was important in the eyes of Mr. McRuer that there be no direct connection beween the appeal group to which one appeals and those who make a decision which is being appealed.

Now in the case of the Securities Commission, there is a link, as the minister has just explained, and therefore when someone is appealing to the commission he is appealing against the decision that is made by the staff of the commission, and I cannot quite understand why it is we still have this situation and there is not an independent group to which an appeal can be made if someone feels he has not been given a fair decision. He cannot go to an independent group for an appeal. He goes to the commission which, in effect, has made the decision he is appealing against.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the procedure that is followed, and I think the hon. member is aware of this, is that the decision is made by the director.

Mr. Deacon: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Then there is an appeal to the commission, and beyond that to the court.

Mr. Deacon: But, Mr. Chairman, I thought the reason for setting up these appeal procedures on the other part of the organization of the department was to have no connection between the responsibility for operating the department and the appeal board. In this case, the director is operating under the direction of the commission. He is not operating under the direction of the department.

He is operating under the direction of the commission, and therefore we still have a situation in connection with security appeals that we avoided when we changed the whole situation in the other part of the minister's department. I would appreciate the minister's comment on that, because I do not think we can have the same impartial decision when we have the commission, in effect, considering appeals that are against the decisions of its own staff.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I quite understand the hon. member's puzzlement or question. As I understand it, the commercial registration appeal to the bureau, which is shown on the organization chart, is independent.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, that is correct. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the commercial registration tribunal on that side of the chart is independent of all the registrations staff down below, but on the other side it becomes the Securities Commission. The Securities Commission is the appeal body.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: From the director.

Mr. Deacon: From the director? But the director is employed by and responsible to the commission for his operations, so those who are appealing this case are appealing to the board that is in effect responsible for the direction of the commission. We have not the same impartiality or the same objectivity in this particular situation as we had in the other—at least we are liable not to have.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the answer to that problem is—if I can make it clear to the hon. member—that the commission and nobody sitting on the commission has any part or takes any part or has any part to play in the original decision, so that it comes up to the commission, to persons who have had no part in the original decision, not a member of the commission, not a person in any way employed by the commission. True, it is a part of the department, it is part of the staff, but the official who makes the decision is no part of the Ontario Securities Commission nor does the commission have any part to play in that original decision.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think that the same thing is true perhaps in the departmental structure before, that the people to whom the decision is appealed really did not make the decision that was being appealed, but what we have endeavoured to do by that appeal board was separate them completely from the responsibility for the direction of the people who made the decision originally.

The Ontario Securities Commission is responsible for the operation and the employment of the staff. The director is responsible to the Ontario Securities Commission. It is not a commission set aside or an appeal board set aside from the director.

There is a line between that box of the Ontario Securities Commission and the box down below which says "Director of the Ontario Securities Commission." The minister told me there should be a line because I asked him originally about this in the organization structure. Therefore I am pointing out that we have, in my view, a situation that is against the McRuer principles.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can see the hon. member's point, but I can only say that I think the separation is clear, definite and exact in that, as I previously stated, the person making that original decision, from which there is an appeal to the Ontario Securities Commission, is no part of the commission and there is no involvement by the commission in that original decision, and the persons who therefore stood in appeal are really a court of appeal.

Mr. Deacon: I am sorry I cannot seem to make the point clear that the commission employs the person who has made the decision down below—the member of the staff. The director is responsible to the commission. The policies are directed by the commission. The chairman of the commission is a full-time commissioner working with the director as part of his staff—one of his staff—and his people who work for the director are part of that staff.

You have a line of succession of authority and you are appealing to a senior authority, I agree, but there still is responsibility on the commission's part to support the decision of its employees.

Mr. Chairman, I might just at this point add that I have spoken to the minister before about several members of the investment community who in the past have expressed reluctance to complain in any way to the commission because of their fear of reprisals that might result. They do not feel that they dare incur any displeasure. The minister has indicated he would look into this.

One of the basic reasons for this is the direct connection and the responsibility of the commission for the director and the staff down below.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I see the hon. member's point but I look at the procedures set forth in The Securities Act—I am reading section 3, subsection 3:

> Every direction, decision, order or ruling made pursuant to an assignment—

that is an assignment of authority:

> —to deal with a matter under subsection 2 of that section is subject to review by the

commission under section 28 in the same manner as if it had been made by the director. The person who made the direction, order or ruling shall not sit on the hearing or review thereof by the commission.

Perhaps one can argue that there is still some overriding feeling in the person making the decision that he is acting as an agent or an employee of the commission. He is not an employee of the commission at all. He sits as an independent person, makes his decision on the merits of the case and if there is an appeal from it—not found satisfactory—it then goes to the commission, which reviews it as a trial de novo, as we say, a complete new hearing, and without any involvement of the person who made the original decision at all. I do not know that I can say anything more, except that I think that is a good procedure to follow. All I think we come down to is that I disagree with the hon. member if he does not find that satisfactory. I think he is being unduly sensitive about what I do not think is that sensitive an area.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried. Item 4—the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering where we would discuss in these estimates the investigation of the handling of pension funds. I know we are talking about the Securities Commission but, talking about the fact that—do not shake your head, Mr. Bray. I want to find out something. This is a members' meeting here. The majority of the billion of dollars transacted in stock exchanges is—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would permit me, first of all, I think I will tell him that this does not come within the department at all. Pension funds are with The Department of Treasury, and it will be—

Mr. Sargent: No, no, the point I am going to make—please let me finish my point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me continue for a moment.

Mr. Sargent: You have not heard my point yet, please.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You asked about pension funds.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. I want to find out something first.

An hon. member: Let him ask his question.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Let me ask my question first, then you can talk.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have a point of order, then.

Mr. Sargent: All right, have a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was going to point out—and I want to say it now—that it ill behooves the hon. member, much as I respect generally his performance here, when I am getting information, negative or positive, from my staff and they are nodding to me in a negative way or an affirmative way—

Mr. Sargent: He shakes his head as soon as I get up.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think he has no right whatsoever—

Mr. Sargent: I certainly have a right. He works for us. Do not forget, not for you. It is for us.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He has no right to comment when I am getting information from members of my staff, to chastise them or reprimand them or speak to them in any way in this House. If I cannot be free to do that, I want Mr. Chairman to rule on it. I think the hon. member should address his remarks to me, and I will get the information. My staff must be quite free to communicate with me by word or by a nod or by written communication. I will protect them from that sort of interference. I make that point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister is quite right.

Mr. Sargent: I think the minister has enough moxy to decide whether my question is right before he shakes his head, and the minister bounces up when he shakes his head.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You have no idea what he was telling me.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why are you so sensitive?

Mr. Sargent: I want to find out something, involving millions and billions of dollars, about our people in pension funds. The majority of the money that goes through

stock exchanges comes from these sources. I want to find out how we can investigate the pension funds across this nation. There is a bill going through the United States Senate to investigate pension funds. Most of the people never receive the money in this economy of ours. Ninety-five per cent of those involved in pension funds do not get their money out of it. I want to know how we in this economy—where we can talk about it in the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Under the superintendent of insurance, Mr. Minister, would it be appropriate there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, all I can—

Mr. Chairman: I believe he is talking about insurance funds.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What he is asking is about pension funds and how they are invested and how people get them paid.

Mr. Sargent: I want to know how this department can investigate pension funds of this nation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We do not have pension funds.

Mr. Sargent: I know you do not have pension funds. Why do you not grow up?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that there are three million Canadians today, who have a stake in over 4,000 pension funds in Canada, and 95 per cent of them will get no money out of them. How do we investigate the handling of the money? If it cannot be through your department, then what department can we investigate these through?

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): That is right.

Mr. Sargent: The surveys across America reveal that only a handful of people who worked 15, 20 years for these firms—and we are now in a branch economy of the American firm; if it is happening down there, it happens up here. So 95 per cent of our people will get nothing out of the pension funds in this country in which we have over $10 billion invested. Now where in this House can we talk about investigating these funds if not through your department? And the majority of these funds go through the stock exchange and the Securities Commission, which should be investigating the source of funds, and so on.

So there is an area some place where we can talk about this. You say we can talk about it in insurance. No way—not in insurance. This is the bread and butter of the people of Canada in the amount of $10 billion. Where do we talk about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the hon. member's rather discourteous language to me, I will try to answer him. We in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs do deal with insurance companies, with credit unions, with financial institutions of one kind and another, with stocks, bonds, securities—particularly stocks through the Securities Commission—of all sorts of equity investments.

It is true that insurance companies particularly have large pension funds. Many industrial and manufacturing firms that issue stocks have pension funds. Many municipalities are investing pension funds to a certain extent in equities or stocks. Insofar as the securities and the stocks that are offered come before our Securities Commission for review and examination; insofar as the prospectus of a company issuing stock is concerned or its meeting the requirements of our market in securities—we do check to that extent. We do require certain standards to be met, and we do require certain information to be given and to be disclosed on the prospectus, on the annual report, on the auditors' report which is part of the annual report, and so on.

But as for checking a pension fund of a company, this we do not do. It may be invested in a dozen or 20 different types of securities or equities or bonds; it is not a part of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs to take that particular pension fund, or any pension fund and, as such, analyze and examine it.

Now, when the hon. member stands up and says there are billions of dollars in pension funds and people are not going to get paid, I think he is probably being a bit exaggerative, because—

Mr. Sargent: I will send you these facts right away from the American findings of these surveys.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, as far as I am aware, we in this province or in this country have not had complaints of that nature, that the pension funds are being defaulted from. Is that some American publication the hon. member is reading?

Mr. Sargent: I am not saying they are defaulted. It is in Businessweek and U.S. News and World Report. In the last three issues they have been featuring this terrible state of affairs. And you know nothing about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Can the hon. member cite me in Canada or in Ontario a single case where somebody has failed to meet his pension obligation under this fund?

Mr. Sargent: All right. A couple of questions, then I will close this off. In the area of the Prudential Assurance Company—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Can you or can you not?

Mr. Sargent: —what department would investigate that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, when it defaulted, The Department of Justice possibly did—and that was a finance company, not a—

Mr. Sargent: I know that. And in what area can we talk about this?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, if it is alive and doing business we would have certain things to do with it. If it is in bankruptcy, it would be the trustee in the bankruptcy.

Mr. Sargent: Is that your department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If it was a case of fraud or misrepresentation or misuse of funds, the Attorney General would be pursuing it.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister then finally advise me about the programme to put in a guaranteeing of vesting, which means guaranteeing to an employee a share of the company's pension fund, even if he leaves it? Would he think about giving minimum standards of vesting?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I see what the hon. member is driving at.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir, and where do we talk about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Companies of all kinds —industrial, mercantile, particular manufacturing and so on—have various pension funds—

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —which they build for their employees and which usually are negotiated by employees' associations and representatives of the employees. Those are of all kinds and nature. The only ones, I think, in which government particularly and actively is involved are those that are arranged by municipalities, through OMERS and those arrangements. I do not know that in examining those funds we do other than examine—if the company is issuing stocks or investing stocks, it is assumed that those stocks are marketable securities. I am not sure that we particularly have an interest in that.

There is the Ontario Pensions Commission, which has this whole field at its behest to deal with it, but we do not deal with it in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs as such.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister investigate it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Only in the way that I have indicated, that we are dealing with particular securities, particular equities, particular stocks.

Mr. Sargent: Finally, then, if we wanted to bring in legislation to have investigation of the use and misuse of these funds, where would we start?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). The Treasurer of Ontario has the Ontario Pensions Commission in his department.

Mr. MacDonald: Page 330 in your book.

Mr. Sargent: But the minister could not investigate it through the securities department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member for York South is assisting me by—

Mr. MacDonald: Page 330 in your book.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —holding up the accounts and he states that it is at page 330 in the Treasurer's estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 carried. Item 5, registration. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a point on the record and in extension of what the hon. member for York Centre was saying about balancing your budget and making this department pay for itself. I think the minister will agree that the discrepancy within this vote is the Ontario Securities Commission, wherein the largest single sum of money is in registration fees, brokers' and salesmen's licences amounting to $565,000, which is the largest item, I say, going into your revenue position of $829,000 as of March 31, 1970. You

expend from this department about $100,000 and if you add in those employee benefits provisions here you expend about $150,000 more than you take in through the Ontario Securities Commission and all its amplitudes.

I wonder if in that particular area it would not be of some value to review your fee structure for brokers' and salesmen's licences—and for filing fees for that matter, but we are on this particular area at the moment—and at least have that particular item come into line. I know your overall budgeting shows your revenue slightly exceeding your expenditures, but if the moneys are available from this source surely this would be highly beneficial to the Treasury with respect to any number of other departments—such as your former department, Justice—which do not and cannot even come anywhere close to bringing in enough money in revenue from their own sources in order to alleviate the taxpayer of the province.

That is one thought that I want to leave with you. The other one is on registration. How many registered salesmen of securities are there in the province at the present time? And what training do these salesmen get? As the hon. minister well knows, in a few hours time we will be coming to consumer affairs and the role of the real estate broker, and the people in mortgage registration. They are going through fairly rigorous examination processes these days to become a real estate salesman. Not everybody makes it. I think the failure rate as a matter of fact is very high.

I am not clear or sure as to what precisely are the requisites to become a security salesman, but I would think on the whole that the involvement—just looking at The Securities Act—is far more demanding, and far more intricate than anything that goes into the real estate business, which I think is fairly easily grasped and handled. Could the minister give me some idea on both those counts?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the first point the hon. member raises, I think the short answer—which I would like to make short—is that we feel we are charging practically all the traffic will bear in the way of fees for the examinations, for the licences issued and so on, and I do not think it is necessary to adopt a policy, or always wise to adopt a policy where you have a department pay for itself, as the hon. member points out.

In Justice we did not begin to meet the expense, but in the registry and land titles branch of that department we did. We have separated those branches out of The Department of Justice. You would find they were paying a great deal in revenue, much more than their expenditures. But I do not think it is a policy to try to make a department carry itself, particularly a department of this kind. And I think our fees—I would be quite glad to review them—have been reviewed quite thoroughly and the fees are reasonable. To raise them any higher might make them onerous.

As to the number of persons employed as brokers, the hon. member perhaps could save me putting this on record if he would look at the report which I tabled last week, the report of the department for the year ending December 31, 1970, page 13. There is set out the numbers of all types of persons who are licensed by the department, both for the year 1969 and 1970, the number of prospectuses, statements of Ontario fact received, offerings to shareholders, hearings, and a good deal of statistical information which I think will answer the question he asked.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one point. I did review that. I knew I had seen it somewhere. Thank you for referring me to it.

You notice that in almost all those registrations—broker dealers, in almost every category—there is a considerable and fairly severe decline. Except, I notice, in the people who want to take in the three functions or roles, broker, investment dealer and security dealer. It went from one in 1969 up to 28 in 1970. What is the reason for this shift?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed that that is largely as a result of a shift of activity. Most of that increase from one to 28 in the broker, investment dealer and security dealer category was a shift from other categories to that field.

Mr. Lawlor: That is obvious. Why the shift?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Probably—and I am only speculating—probably the state of the economy.

Mr. Lawlor: The number of underwriters went down considerably. Would underwriters have slipped into the other categories, because there was not as much underwriting to do?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I think that is not to be concluded. I am told there were amendments to the Act in 1969 creating new categories which appeared in 1970.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, I see, so they shifted?

Mr. Chairman: Item 5 carried? Carried. Item 6, insider trading. The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Sudbury raised the question of insider trading. Really, what we are trying to avoid in insired trading is people making sales or purchase of securities from those who are unaware and do not have the same information or do not have access to the information that those insiders might have.

I have been concerned for many years about the question of the way we ask for reports and I am wondering whether we should not have asked for reports in the case of major moves in stocks, finding out who made the moves, who bought the stock and on what basis, on what information and for what reason did they buy it. Maybe, I should have been asking for this under item 4.

I am most concerned about the element in the securities business that comes up time and time again. When a stock moves up quickly without any information, companies are asked by the Securities Commission to make a statement or explanation, or asked by the stock exchange to make an explanation, but we do not find out who made the purchases and where they got the information on which they based their purchases or their sales. I am most concerned that the public recognize that when a situation arises we investigate it and we punish those who take advantage of inside information in the case of some special deals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Securities Commission exercises a continuing oversight examination of these situations where there is an unexplained rise or fall in the price of shares, or where there appears to be trading on rumour or inadequate or misleading information, or where there is failure to make disclosure by management and where there is trading without filing the prospectus. And by the way, the Securities Commission exercises its control as to issuing cease-trading orders for a period of time to halt the trading until all the facts come to light, which the commission then can ascertain.

In 1970-1971 a total of 20 such orders were made. I have before me the companies affected by that means. And of course the Toronto Stock Exchange exercises a very active control there too, as the hon. member knows. But the Securities Commission has that power and, as I have indicated, does exert it quite frequently and watches those situations and is able to pursue and get the information that is necessary in finding out what is going on.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am aware of those orders and that they are taken and they do perhaps avoid a lot of abuses, but where there is an appearance that some abuse of inside information has taken place, do we then request information to find out who has done the purchasing and where they got the information on which they based the purchase?

For example, last week there was a stock about which I have some familiarity over the years, it made quite a substantial move, one buyer just grabbing any offers that came in that stock, and as it turns out there has been nothing special happen since that time. But if an offer came out subsequently on that stock I would like to know who made the purchases of that stock and on what basis they based their information for purchasing it.

This happens quite frequently. Maybe we get an explanation from the company, but do we ever find out who actually purchased the stock and why they purchased it, and where they got the information? Those are insiders in my view and those are people, regardless if they have any relationship to those that have inside information or not, they may be just friends, but they are ones we should really track down and we should ensure that action is taken against them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am informed by the members of the commission that they do inquire and find out who the purchasers of stock are and ascertain the conditions under which they bought and the reasons why and so on and take action accordingly.

Mr. Deacon: What action has been taken when they have determined that people have purchased stock on the use of inside information, special information?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The only action the commission takes is to see that the reports of insider trading are filed as to the stock they have acquired.

Mr. Deacon: But I am asking, Mr. Chairman, what action is taken if an offer comes out for a stock and for two or three weeks before—or even just a few days before—there has been a lot of purchasing in the market, the commission determines who has purchased the stock and ascertains that some purchases were made by people who had close relation-

ships to those who are privileged and knowledgeable about an offer? Have any prosecutions been taken in such instances? Or could they?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is the hon. member talking about what we call insider trading or someone getting a tip beyond the insider definition?

Mr. Deacon: Well, I am talking, Mr. Chairman, about a similar situation to the Texas Gulf.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A large part of that was insider trading.

Mr. Deacon: Was it insider? An insider in a situation next week might be somebody who is a friend of an executive who has been negotiating a deal. He may say it is a tip but he has got good information on which he has based his purchase. He has got information that is not available to those who are selling the stock to him and, to my mind, this is a serious offence. Are we taking any action? Maybe there is not a law against it, but, to my mind, there should be.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have to tell the hon. member, in the drafting of The Securities Act, we spent a great deal of time on the consideration of insider and insider trading, the definition of insider. We had a lot of time spent on it. We had lawyers, accountants, company people, brokers, dealers, investment people, and so on, all meeting with us in committee here for several days on that. We went a long way, I think, in enlarging and defining the term "insider" and in determining what insider trading it. But we have no law, and I do not know how one would frame a law that would go out so far into the field as to say that it would be illegal or wrong, as the hon. member says—did he say a crime—to get a tip from somebody who knows in the company and to take advantage of that tip to buy stock.

I do not think that one can extend law that far. At least, we have not been able to see how it would be practical to do it. The answer anyway is, we just do not have that kind of a law. You cannot pursue or follow the "tipee", or the person who gets the benefit of the tip. To try to frame laws that far-reaching in an attempt to be definite, I think you would find yourself being most indefinite. How would get to it, I do not know.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to carry on the line of questioning somewhat. We receive periodically from the commission certain information as to trade. Part of the information includes insider trade. I presume, and correct me if I am wrong, that these are insider trades that are brought to the attention of the commission. The commission then makes them public. Perhaps you could designate the fact that you agree with that by nodding your head, or I will sit down and you might say yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Sure, he does.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I agree, of course.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is a statutory obligation, sir, for them to do so and the statute provides, if I recall it correctly—having been involved, I believe, in some consideration—that they can neither directly, or indirectly aggrandize themselves in connection with stock purchases as a result of inside information, unless it is disclosed to the commission. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not to the commission. Not necessarily to the commission, I think.

Mr. Bullbrook: To whom?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The shareholders.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is collateral. They have to make—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If they benefit themselves by inside trading, they are liable to civil procedure.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not talking about that—correct me if I am wrong. They have certain obligations under the statute to make known to the commission the trade in which they were involved if they are constituted an insider as a result of the definition in the statute? They have an obligation so to do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: And they cannot indirectly gain. For example, to make it true and direct, an insider cannot utilize his wife or family to make gains. Getting, therefore, to the point of the question, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, put forward by my colleague from York Centre, I would be most interested in knowing, as a result of fluctuations unusual to the market in connection with a specific share trade, what has been the involvement of the commission during the last fiscal year, so that we might assess the propriety of the expenditures that we vote now. In connection with those fluctuations of stock which create

some concern on the part of both the exchange and the commission—and have led to investigations, as you have advised my colleague—can you tell us how far you go and what the commission does, in effect, to remedy the situation? Could you say have there been any prosecutions concurrent with the statutory obligation to report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There have been no prosecutions by the commission.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am wondering if you could tell us, Mr. Chairman, how many times there have been involvements. You did quote a figure, I think, of 24.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Stop orders. Cease-and-desist orders.

Mr. Bullbrook: Cease-and-desist orders?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: So in cease-and-desist orders there was concern expressed by the commission in connection with the undue fluctuation of a particular stock without what could be called public reason. Now I am wondering what follow-up there is, and perhaps my colleague can correct me in this respect, but it seemed to come through to me that this was the raison d'etre of his question, really. After the commission has made a cease-and-desist order, having regard to its particular responsibility to protect the public, having regard also to the obligations in connection with insider trading, could you advise us in connection with these cease-and-desist orders if concurrent therewith there has been an additional investigation that led the commission to believe that there was undue manipulation of the stock itself by people in a position so to effect it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all the question raised by the hon. member for York Centre was, I think, not quite what the hon. member for Sarnia was pursuing. He was speaking about, I gathered, not just insider but something beyond that, the tippee trades; and he said this was wrong and it should not be allowed.

I did answer that, and said I do not believe we could reach out that far. When someone in the company close to the scene of operations, knowing what is going on, hands a tip to someone outside who is not an insider in that definition, and that person takes advantage of it and makes a gain by it, I do not think our law reaches to them. And I do not at the moment think you could frame a law that would be so all-encompassing as to reach them. I think you would have great difficulty and great impracticalities to face which would make it not feasible at all to pursue.

Now the other part of the question—what does the commission do? It exercises the cease-and-desist order when these items and circumstances come to light which I mentioned, and stops trading for various stages of time by its orders. Then the insider is required to file information; if it is a lack of a prospectus, to file that, to furnish the information, to do all that he should have done in the first place and to make full disclosure to the directors, shareholders of his company who then have rights under the Securities Act to sue him if they wish to do so.

Mr. Bullbrook: I appreciate that very much and confess I am going to invite my colleague to join again in this connection. What I want to say in my naïveté, in my layman's position—because only once have I ever traded in common stocks and that occasion of course is one reason I rise in this House—is that many, many years ago when I made my first fee as a lawyer, I was advised by a stockbroker who was involved, not as my client, that I might be well-served in using part of my fee in purchasing some stock in Sarnia—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Was it good advice?

Mr. Bullbrook: I have named the company, Goodwin Harris and Company. That very night, after having committed myself so to do, I sat in the officers' mess at Sarnia and heard one of my colleagues say: "I see so and so is peddling such and such."

Now the point I make in this connection is that one has to concern themselves with brokers here, and people involved with brokers, as setting up really a schematic enterprise, diffused throughout the province of Ontario, for the purposes of elevating the value of stock, without any substance.

I want to say that I agree to a certain extent with the minister, Mr. Chairman, that it is difficult to concede legislation that would be sufficiently effective from a point of view of evidentiary value—how are you going to prove these things? But I am interested, frankly, in what interest the commission takes in matters of this nature.

Surely to goodness the commission must at times recognize, as I am told it happens, that all of a sudden, without any apparent

reason, there is significant purchase made of a particular stock in North Bay, significant purchase made in Sault Ste. Marie, significant purchase made in Toronto, Chatham, Sarnia? It would seem to me that in many of these instances where there is a cease-and-desist order applied in connection with the trading that the commission might want to involve itself further in ascertaining, by way of example, whether there was any liaison between someone on the directorship of the trading company and a member of the Toronto Stock Exchange whose main purpose is only to promote the sales of the corporation?

You know, after three years here it is amazing that I am on my feet asking these questions, because frankly I have one test question for those three years. I do not want to waste the time of this House in giving a lecture in the fundamentals of high finance, but really I do think that, notwithstanding the fact that you might not feel the same way, I voice the concern expressed by my colleague for York Centre, but I think this is it.

He expresses the concern about artificial elevation of stock value by purposeful enterprise on the part of people who are truly insiders, and certain collusion and connivance on the part of other people to carry that forward.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The commission has carried out approximately 100 investigations in the past year. There are a number going forward now. For things such as fraud and theft, misuse of funds, there are prosecutions carried on by the commission and initiated and sent forward. On insider trading there are no prosecutions. The commission inquires, they catch sight of these circumstances to which the hon. member relates, and they issue a cease-and-desist order in trading. That in itself is quite a severe blow to a company that is registered on an exchange and is trading its stock.

Mr. Bullbrook: Agreed. It is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They stop for 20 days or stop for 30 days, till we investigate, and we want all the facts, and they carry on an investigation and find them out. Then if it is an insider he must make full disclosure, report, reveal that to the commission and to the officers and directors of his company, and so the shareholders of that company are made aware. If they feel he has been misbehaving in that area they have a right to pursue him in civil action under The Securities Act, and make him cough up his ill-gotten gains, if that is what they are.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to pursue this. This is layman's night so let me join in. Many prospectuses will list the promoter among the officers of the company. Perhaps I am using the wrong term. Maybe he is not an officer of the company, but he is associated with the company. I am curious to know what, in the view of the commission, are the limitations in the role of a promoter, because, if I may pick up on the question that the hon. member for Sarnia was raising, anybody who has even a relatively fleeting acquaintance with the stock market will know that there are certain stocks that periodically, once a year, are saved. They are around 20 or 25 cents and go out for their yearly gambol up to $1. Then, when they get to $1 they gradually languish down again.

Again, even on a fleeting acquaintance with the stock market, you will learn from brokers that such-and-such a stock is going at some point, but the promoter is away on holiday or he is sick or his wife has died or something of this nature. This raises, I think, very pertinent questions in the mind of the prospective purchaser—if I may use that rather kind of phrase—that somebody is in the position to manipulate that. Indeed, if you watch some of these stocks, suddenly they will jump 25 per cent. They may be at 40 or 50 cents and bingo, overnight they are at 60 cents.

Mr. Lawlor: Harry is back from holiday.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Harry is back from holiday. Now, let me get back to my original question. What limitations are there on the role of a promoter in the view of the securities commission. More specifically, may I put it to the Minister, what exactly does the promoter do?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, a promoter is a well-recognized title—

Mr. MacDonald: Manipulator.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and the name appears on many a prospectus, as promoter. I think the one we all read yesterday had a promoter. A promoter's role is well recognized and known. It is among his duties, I would

take it, to get information of the circumstance of the company; to publicize that information. He must be, of course—this is the purpose of our corporation tax and the purpose of our security tax, and the purpose of our Stock Exchange Act to see that he is —on the stock exchange. That Act is to see that he complies with the rules of full, fair, complete and honest disclosure.

If he does that—he perhaps gets information for the prospectus; for the Northern Miner; for newspapers; perhaps for other media—I think there is nothing wrong with him advertising the wares he has, which are the stocks, the equity securities of some company which he thinks, or makes out that he believes, have prospects of advancement.

Now, if it was a mining company, I presume his duties would be to find out what is going on on the grounds; what drill holes are being put down, and what the assays reveal. Those things are checked and the disclosure must be correct. I am not apologizing for a promoter, or defending him either, but the promoter is well recognized as a person who advances various kinds of entrepreneur enterprises in the company's field.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is being overly kind.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not being kind—I am trying to be factual.

Mr. MacDonald: I can remember a rather memorable episode in the standing committee of this Legislature, back about 1959-1960 or 1961, when for the first time we began to look rather vigorously. Perhaps I should not say for the first time, but certainly the first of this drive of the last 10 years to clean up the market.

I quoted one Cameron who had been in, I think it was the Securities Commission here and had gone out to Saskatchewan and wrote a rather revealing article in Saturday Night, namely to the effect that he was quoting the then chairman of the Securities Commission that they had cleaned up the market considerably, but if you cleaned it up completely, you would bring it to a dead halt.

I said what are the implications of this? I mean much of this is of questionable activity, but if you clean it up overnight you will bring the whole process to a dead halt. The implications of that are rather serious. It seems to me the minister is talking with tongue in cheek when he says that the promoter is playing this honourable role of finding out what is happening out on the site. If a stock shall I say is at 20 cents and then suddenly bingo, it jumps to 30 or 35 cents and a day or so later it is up to 40 or 45. And it goes up, you know, in steps, to about a dollar, and then it sinks down to the 20s.

Obviously the promoter and others who are in a position to hold stock are deliberately jumping the stock to excite interest and to sucker the public in. After the public have been suckered-in in sufficient numbers, up at a high enough level, they get out and the public are cleaned in the process.

Let us not kid ourselves; this goes on, day-in and day-out, week-in and week-out, on the market. Is this not something that the Securities Commission and/or the minister is disturbed about?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the language the hon. member has used would almost describe the situation which we all are familiar with, known as Windfall—the jumping of stocks, the moving up,—definitely, in that case, being promoted by really what was a lack of information—suggestions, hidden knowledge, and assays which had never been made, and so on.

If that were to happen today—if that stock jumped in the manner the hon. member was describing—a stop order would be issued by the commission. That is what they do. Then they investigate. They stop the trading in that stock and they investigate and find out the reason for the fluctuation and jumping around, and that stock goes off the market. If there is a fraud, or wrongful information, then there is prosecution. If there is nothing more than that, the stock is often kept off the market—

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, well I am not going to pursue it any further. If it is very flagrant, sure, some charges are made, or some investigations are instituted. All I am saying is that this is a pretty regular practice with many stocks, particularly mining stocks, year in and year out.

Stocks are on the market that have had very little, if any, real development potential, or real development reality—they are just on the market and are played periodically, and someone is in a position to benefit from it and it is the "insider." Not an insider, maybe, in the sense that we were referring to earlier in the statute, but somebody who has just enough of this stock so that he can play it, with or without promoters in the game.

The people who get fleeced are the innocent public who think they are going to make a quick buck. They may make a quick buck if they get out just before the boys who are in control of the situation, or who have knowledge of the situation, decide they are going to get out.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to pursue this much either, but I note the hon. member says this goes on to a great extent all the time, every day. I do not think it is quite fair to take a general situation and describe it that way, because to my observation, and I think, to my knowledge, the situations that used to exist in the days of Windfall and others like it, do not exist today.

If there are fluctuations the Securities Commission is doing a watchdog job stopping that sort of thing, unless there is reason for a stock to go up. I do not think you find the wild fluctuations today. If the hon. member is following the market, even in the mining stocks, or any other, I do not think he will find this situation. I do not say he is being unfair at all when he says this goes on continuously, day by day, but I do not think it exists to anything like the extent that his words seem to imply.

Mr. MacDonald: It exists to a greater extent than the minister's words imply.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, if I may just differ with the hon. minister—I think it was the minister who introduced the word "Windfall"—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I introduced it.

Mr. Ben: —and not the hon. member who just sat down. What the hon. minister is trying to do is substitute a very exaggerated example which, quite admittedly, occurs infrequently on the market and substitute that example for the situation—

Mr. MacDonald: For the common practice.

Mr. Ben: Yes, for the common practice which does, as the hon. member describes, happen annually. These inflations in prices, Mr. Minister, are not in the neighbourhood of a $2 or $3 or $4 jump from 25 cents, as was the case in Windfall, but are a jump from 25 cents to 50 cents, or 75 cents—in that range—still leaving a magnificent, if not fantastic, profit for the manipulator.

You are being very kind, as the hon. member has said, to the promoter. In other professions they are referred to as hucksters, and in others as plain hustlers. The truth of the matter is that there is not the control over their activity that there should be.

In the story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves, the magic words were "Open, Sesame." On Bay Street, among the promoters, the magic words are, "An interesting anomaly." If you try to find out why, all of a sudden, this stock went up, "Well, they have discovered an interesting anomaly." You try to pin them down as to what this anomaly is, where it is located, and they do not know. It is "an interesting anomaly." But what they try to do is raise funds so that they can send in a drill and find out what there is in this interesting anomaly. The only interesting thing about these interesting anomalies is that nothing interesting ever comes out of them. But the stock still rises.

It is fine to have stop orders, Mr. Minister, but it seems that these stop orders always come after the promoter, or the manipulator—and I prefer to call him by the second name—or his friends who are not insiders within the meaning of the Act, have already unloaded their stock. And that is the only time you seem to be able to get any information, when they are pushing for the sale.

They go up gently. They do not shoot the stock up. The usually take three or four weeks to get it up by nickels and pennies and sometimes dimes, until they double or triple a 25-cent stock.

Then, all of a sudden, the news gets out that a trip has uncovered an "interesting anomaly." That is the magic word that is supposed to get the sheep rushing to the stockbrokers to buy more stock and get it up that extra nickel or dime, during which time the promoter and his buddies unload their stock. By that time, a stop order, if it does anything, just prevents more sheep from being fleeced.

What has to be done is somehow arrange the affairs of Bay Street so that those sheep which have been fleeced can get a substitute coat and get that coat out of the promoter who fleeced them. It does the poor sheared sheep very little good to find out that a stop order has been issued and, perhaps, even a prosecution laid, although I do not think the former minister, outside of the McMillan, could tell me of a recent prosecution.

Mr. Lawlor: No power.

Mr. Ben: The minister says that all you do is issue stop orders and this is supposed to be the big dam that prevents any further action or flow of stock.

It is no consolation to the little man who is fleeced that some promoter is going to get a $5,000 or $10,000 fine, or maybe six months in jail after he has cleaned the market out for a few million dollars.

There must be ways of controlling this. They will say it was insider trading. The hon. minister, in replying to the hon. member for York Centre, suggested that Texas Gulf was a different situation, that in Texas Gulf, it was a question of the conduct of insiders.

If my memory serves me correctly, what brought the whole issue out into the glare of the public was that some institutions, all of a sudden, started to buy a great deal of Texas Gulf stock. And it was discovered that the information had leaked out from Texas Gulf to A, to B, to C, to D. D then advised his institutional clients to buy stock, and this was the issue at that time.

I think that this government should set up machinery to be able to trace transactions from A to B, from C to D. If there has been an unjustifiable fluctuation in the price of stock, and I suggest that this would have to fluctuate eight, nine, 10, 100 per cent, as is the case with Windfall, but a fluctuation of even 100 per cent of 25-cent stock is considerable. An investigation should be carried out to trace some of these sales to find out why the price did move up so rapidly. It would not take very many of those investigations to make brokers on Bay Street extremely wary of carrying out what is probably a very subtle form of wash-trading. Two or three investigations over a period of two or three years, I think, might put the fear of the government into a lot of these people that would last for another three or four years. At least, to my way of thinking, it is worth a try.

The minister says he was not trying to approbate or reprobate when it came to these promoters. I think he was, as the hon. member from York South said, being extremely kind if not magnanimous toward these—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: All I did was define their role. I did not approbate nor reprobate. I did not use those words at all.

Mr. Ben: No, you did not use those words, neither did the hon. member for York South, but I rather suggest that this is what you were trying to do.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 6 carried? The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I will be very brief. I see no point in spending time on the securities issue. We will shortly be given a chance to review several salient features under The Securities Act in the next day or two, before probably the week is over, extensive emendations to the securities legislation as they presently stand, for instance in sections 31 and 32 of the new Act. We will be discussing the new regimen with respect to insider trading and the effect.

I do want to mention one thing that arose out of this debate and that has to do with the penalties that may affect the insider trading. You do impose a fairly severe penalty under section 106 of the Act on those who do not report their insider dealings within the prescribed periods, with the fine of $1,000 under summary conviction legislation.

I find it passing strange why you leave to the civil jurisdiction the sole enforcement rights with respect to possible losses suffered either by an individual who can prove it or the company itself, rather than utilizing the powers of the summary conviction proceeding for people who operate in this way within a quasi-criminal context.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6. Does the hon. minister want to reply to those?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps I could deal with that in our legislation that is coming forward.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 6 carry? Carried.

Vote 602 agreed to.

On vote 603:

Mr. Chairman: We move to vote 603, which will be the superintendent of insurance and registrar of loan and trust corporations programme. Item 1, vote 603, programme administration. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister if the Atlantic Acceptance investigation is still on?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I think that is concluded. A report was filed by Mr. Justice Hughes about a year ago, it seems.

Mr. Sargent: How much did that investigation cost?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not have that. I think that was in The Department of Prime Minister or the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: In that investigation, that whole mess, some people committed suicide

and some went to jail. How many members of this department lost their jobs?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This department was not formed at the time of the Atlantic débâcle.

Mr. Sargent: The superintendent of insurance and registrar of loan and trust corporations programme. You had The Loan and Trust Corporations Act in effect then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: How many of the officers enforcing that Act were discharged?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not got any such figure, Mr. Chairman. I do not know that there was any finding of misbehaviour or neglect or gross negligence on the part of any official of the department. I would not think they would be fired unless there was some fault.

Mr. Sargent: The very fact is the whole of this department was guilty. The thing would never have happened if they had been doing their jobs.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member wants to be fair; surely he knows that theft, fraud and various crimes can be practised on the public, on citizens in numbers or in single instances, and that we maintain great police forces to prevent and then to catch up with the criminal after the crime has been committed.

It would be impossible, because someone has done a very capable and sophisticated fraud in the field of the Canadian securities or the financing or promoting of some project, to say that everyone who was involved should have been aware and was guilty because he got away with it.

If that were so, in the field of perpetration of crime generally there would be many citizens who could be condemned out of hand. But our police forces are largely engaged in catching up with the criminal after he has committed a crime. Much of their work, of course, is prevention. But because they do not catch him before he commits it, you do not fire the police force.

Mr. Sargent: Well, my point is this: As you know, Victoria and Grey took over the British Mortgage operation by money advanced or pledged by this government. Since then, many fortunes have been made. There have been stock splits and many people have become wealthy. It has been the biggest bonanza in modern times, the coup pulled off by British Mortgage insofar as the takeover of British Mortgage. My concern is that the assets accruing therefrom are in the many millions of dollars, and in the area of the people who lost their shirts through government dereliction of duty—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Nobody lost anything.

Mr. Sargent: From the whole piece in the transcript of the things developed and the wording of Mr. Lawson, the director of British Mortgage and the head of a large insurance company, there was complete dereliction of duty on the part of the staff of the people who administered this Act. We have a great area of responsibility on the part of the government.

The amendments to The Securities Act and The Corporations Act provide for a full disclosure of the financial and trading affairs of companies. My concern is that, to this day, there never has been a full disclosure on the part of the government of the members of the government who made fortunes, who made a lot of money in owning that Victoria and Grey stock. I would like to know why there was not a disclosure of how many members of the government had Victoria and Grey stock. How much stock did Leslie Frost have of Victoria and Grey and how many millions of dollars have been made through this takeover?

Mr. Chairman: I must say that I think the hon. member is straying from this particular vote. Vote 603 has to deal with the examination of the financial standing of insurance loans and trust companies and—

Mr. Sargent: How do you interpret the fact—

Mr. Chairman: —licensing insurance companies now.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think if you are going to halt the hon. member at that point, as I think you should, if I may say so, I should be permitted to say something on the further remarks the member has made about British Mortgage and Victoria and Grey. First of all, let me tell the hon. member that nobody lost any money as a result of the difficulty in which British Mortgage found itself.

Mr. Ben: I thought I heard you say that. I was going to ask you about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Will you allow me to finish? The company was in a very serious

financial position in that its investments, which were at some considerable time—

Mr. Sargent: The stocks dropped to $2 a share.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right, if you would just let me continue. It was in a difficult position in that it could not meet the drain on its deposits to pay out of its certificates, because the investments it had made in mortgages, which were long-term investments, did not afford it cash. For the company to sell those would have meant they would have had to be sold on a market where they would have had to sell them at great discount and they still would not have been in a position to meet the demands that would be made upon them. Confidence had been lost by the depositors in that company. No money was advanced by the government to British Mortgage or to Victoria and Grey.

Mr. Sargent: You gave them the credit to do it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No; no money was advanced by the government to British Mortgage. I was the Attorney General at the time and I was aware of the whole thing. I played a very active part in it. No money was advanced by the government.

Mr. Sargent: You gave them the credit to do it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We did not give them credit.

Mr. Sargent: Where did they get the money then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member will allow me to answer, it is true that Victoria and Grey came to the rescue of British Mortgage and purchased its assets and its—

Mr. Sargent: They did not. You came to the rescue—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and its liabilities. I know what I am saying—

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): The member for Grey-Bruce does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —because I was part of that. I was administering the laws of this province at that time as law officer of the Crown. Victoria and Grey assumed the assets and liabilities of British Mortgage, all its assets and all its liabilities, and is meeting them today and has been meeting them from that day forward. Perhaps Victoria and Grey is making money and will make money. That would be part of what I would accept—

Mr. Sargent: How naive can you get?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Because the company was in the position where it could not meet its current obligations.

Mr. Sargent: Where did they get the money?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The only persons who would have lost money—and I would like the hon. member for Humber to get this, because he was checking my language—the only persons who would have lost money would be those who held stock.

Mr. Ben: All right, that is exactly the point. You said nobody lost money.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They would be those who held stock in the company. The stock went down on the market and if they did not hold on to it, they would have lost it.

Mr. Ben: Well, they are somebody in our estimation, even if they are not anybody in yours.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And in exchange for a Victoria and Grey share—

Mr. Sargent: Six for one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was an arrangement made between the companies by British Mortgage, which was in a difficult situation. That is admitted; but for the hon. member to suggest that government persons were involved because they had a personal financial interest, of that I have no knowledge. I doubt it. Certainly I have no knowledge of it; I doubt it very much. And if they did—

Mr. W. Hodgson: He has not any either.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Tell us where they got the money.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If they were in a situation where they held British Mortgage stock, you had better consult the hon. member for Humber. He says they lost money.

Mr. Sargent: They did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, that is not gaining money. Now on the other matter, the loan and trust—

Mr. Sargent: You said they did not lose money.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: To go back to Atlantic for a moment: the Hughes report, which was a very thorough report going over a long period of time and being extremely probing to the utmost detail, found no fault and no suggestion of fault or dereliction of duty on the part of any official of this department or any other department of the government; particularly the superintendent of insurance was not questioned or castigated or blamed in any way, nor the persons who had to do with loan and trust corporations.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the minister said the government did not give them any money or pledge any money. Where did they get the money for the takeover?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be exact. That happened five years ago?

Mr. Sargent: In 1965.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think Victoria and Grey, if my recollection serves me right—

Mr. Sargent: I suggest you are misleading the House. That is not true. The whole group was part of the deal.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Would the hon. member for Grey-Bruce resume his seat? The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member asked me a question, I think Victoria and Grey had ample assets—

Mr. MacDonald: How can he mislead the House when he has not answered yet?

Mr. Sargent: They would not put up their own money; you put up the money and the credit for them to do it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I am not aware of that.

Mr. Sargent: I know that as fact.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister was not quite correct in the first instance; he did try to correct himself subsequently.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not correct myself.

Mr. Ben: In the first instance the statement of the minister was that nobody lost any money. Perhaps what the minister should have said was that no depositors lost any money.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will accept that.

Mr. Ben: But this is not what he did say. In fact, the government guaranteed the deposit; that is when we rushed through the legislation to enable the government to do so and he introduced deposit—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Do you not think—

Mr. Ben: The deposit insurance came after that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is just saying this to protect depositors in various other institutions.

Mr. Ben: Fine, but the fact remains that the shareholders of British Mortgage in fact did lose millions, just about their life savings. The stock, I think, tumbled from $19 to about $2.

Mr. Sargent: From $30 to $2.

Mr. Ben: Well, that may be—but it took a nasty tumble. Furthermore, when Victoria and Grey did go in and purchase the assets and liabilities at this very low price: lo and behold, to the joy of Victoria and Grey, it subsequently transpired that the assets of British Mortgage had been undervalued by somewhere in the vicinity of $2 million; so Victoria and Grey got a nice little windfall. Assets that had been written off as being such were found to have a value, to be substantial. So a lot of people did lose a lot of money, people who had invested all their life savings in British Mortgage because it had been a reputable company.

I would have to agree with the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that a lot of people did lose their money and it was because of lack of control by this government. After the horses were stolen, they did put a door on the barn, but I still have not seen a good lock on that door.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 603.

Mr. Ben: Well, it deals with loan and trust companies, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The present operations, functions and examination of financial standing of insurance and loan and trust companies. I think we should confine our remarks to this present-day structure of what has been done to take care of the situation.

Mr. Ben: Well—

Mr. Sargent: The only point in bringing the whole matter up was I wanted to get from the minister why the government would not make part of the agreement with Victoria and Grey, when they made the deal, that the profit coming to Victoria and Grey would go to pay off the people who lost their shirts.

Mr. Chairman: Well, that is unrelated to this vote too. That is unrelated to this particular vote. Vote 603. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I only have one comment about the structure of the loan and trust corporations and the insurance corporations and that is to ask from the minister some assurance that he, as the minister, will recommend to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and the government that they reinstate, or continue the work of, the select committee on corporation law. Because, in the last terms of reference to that committee, several of the specialized types of corporations that were referred to the committee included the loan and trust corporations and the insurance companies.

The committee has never arrived at the point in time when they could deal with them, because of their preoccupation with credit unions and co-operatives. It may be that the government is giving some thought to letting the select committee die, rather than to reappointing it, and is using the system of internal committees or minister's committees, of one kind of another, to deal with the problems of updating the structure of these companies. The then chairman, the member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton), is now a minister of the Crown.

I would like the minister to give us some assurance that that select committee on corporations will have his support to have it reinstated to continue its work in the field of insurance companies and loan and trust corporations.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Is it not better for us to have an election than to fool around with a select committee? Let us have an election instead, this fall.

It is a silly suggestion. We are going to have an election this fall.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, it is definitely my view that this committee should continue its work and deal with the area the hon. member mentioned, the loan and trusts and the insurance situation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have got just two or three things on this particular vote. One has to do with the present situation in the department.

Just to bring you up to date, because of my naivety and ignorance in these areas, I notice in the report that you sent me—which is a rather large book which contains very little information, curiously enough—from the superintendent of insurance, your report of the year 1969. At the bottom of small Roman numeral ix:

> A large number of equity link contracts were introduced by life insurance companies in 1969, following the establishment of interim rules by all the provinces in September of 1968, relating to disclosure, marketing and related matters.
>
> I believe these insurance policies involve actuarial accounting and legal problems, which were new to supervisory authorities. The problems have been further complicated by the resemblance of these policies to securities marketed by mutual funds and other agencies, and which has given rise to concern by securities administrators.

And that is where it stands. No comment is made. Nothing is indicated as to what action is taken, how they regard those funds.

A year later, a few months later, or perhaps even at that time, there was an internal problem in your department, and I wonder how it has been resolved. Namely, that somehow the jurisdiction over these matters was split between the superintendent of insurance on one side of the fence, and the Securities Commission, because of the variable fund features connected with these policies, on the other side of the fence.

I am not clear, as I say, which way that was resolved, as to who had final authority under your legislation. I suspect the Securities Commission, but I could be wrong. Just bring me up to date on that, and indicate what is the present position generally with these equity link contracts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. member brought this up. The item he read at the foot of page ix, in Roman numerals, in the report of the superintendent of insurance is quite factual. I think it is quite clear that insurance companies have moved into the sale—the distribution and sale —of equity types of investment of their own companies, or some company that they are associated with; something that is an investment, rather than purely an insurance contract.

Some of them are separated entirely from insurance, and their agents may sell them if their company has something like that Investors Syndicate investment, they may sell it along with, as part of, or separate from a policy of life insurance. So this is a fairly recent development and our insurance companies have moved to that field, and insurance companies, of course, are themselves engaged in investing funds. Their agents and particularly their officials are informed and trained in investment in estate management, in investment of funds to build estates and to build pensions, and to build securities, as well as the insurance feature, which is the risk side in the event of death or some other event.

It became necessary, if we were to see that the persons to whom those security type of things, those equity investments were being delivered and sold, if the insurance companies were to sell them, it was for the Securities Commission to be involved to exercise its responsibility, its powers of regulation, checking, and control as to the nature of those equity investments, those securities. So we have, as a member of the Ontario Securities Commission, the superintendent of insurance, who sits here with my staff tonight.

But the field is not simply insurance, nor is it solely investment, and we therefore had to divide, as it were, and read what I think the insurance companies felt for a time at least was an unnecessary involvement in meeting the standards of really not two different bodies—although they were joined, the superintendent of insurance being with the Securities Commission and a member of it. He had certain requirements which they must meet. The Securities Commission on its side had certain requirements and standards which had to be met.

We have resolved that, but that is not fully resolved yet. I have had conferences very recently—the latest one today, as a matter of fact—with insurance representatives, and with the members of the Securities Commission and with the superintendent of insurance discussing this very matter and examining what is done in other jurisdictions.

In Britain I am told the Board of Trade, through one of its branches, has one body which passes on this very type of thing, where the insurance contract is tied in with the equity invested, and that you can go to one body and get it clear.

Here, at the moment at least, while the two bodies are very closely tied together, actually in membership they still have to meet two requirements which to some extent differ and it is a little awkward but it is very effective. It does put the insurance companies to a little extra trouble because they say, "We met the superintendent of insurance. We have met all his requirements. We still have to now talk to a body of which he is a member—the Ontario Securities Commission." That is the way it is. We may be able to improve it, and we are seeking to do so, but for the moment that is how it is. That is the reason for it.

There are two insurance companies who have now got into the field of investment and we just cannot leave the superintendent of insurance to deal with that side of it. We take the knowledgeable body which has that responsibility and engage it in the matter.

Mr. Lawlor: Very interesting information; thank you very much. I want to make an observation, a suggestion to you, which you can do with as you please, as you will anyway. While the minister has had a review of unfair practices and what not in the insurance industry and brought legislation forward last year under that head, it has been some time, I think, since a review has been made of the disclosure and warranty concepts within the insurance industry as such.

And if the minister would think it wise and feasible, perhaps he would give some thought to referring the fundamental law of insurance to the law reform commission to have a look at it, to see how the material statements in these uberrimae fidei contracts, have developed down through the 19th century, in their demands upon the insured, not only with respect to facts which lay within the purview of his knowledge, but even facts that lay outside.

And we had to move in on it and make the facts material ones, first of all; and make it knowledge which was accessible to an insured. Even then the nature of fraud and the nature of the disclosures that have to be made are extremely onerous, far more onerous than in any other form of contract, certainly than The Sale of Goods Act. These have a very high degree of risk, all loaded, in my opinion, against the insured.

And that, taken together with the indemnity features of contracts which most men in the street are not aware of at all—the cash value of a contract, for instance in the case of fire policies on houses, being the lower value after depreciation is considered, and a host of other matters, so that they wake up shocked to learn that their $18,000 worth of insurance did not amount to anywhere close to that.

With the on-going nature of the commercial enterprise in the insurance industry, it might be time in our history, it struck me when looking over these estimates, to give that a review and a mulling over. I would not think it would be a major task for the law reform commission, but in case, just in case they are running out of work—which I doubt; they have been pouring out a plethora of stuff in the past couple of years—it might very well be an area that might be taken under consideration.

Another area that I would like to bring to the minister's attention to see if I could elicit some response on his part and which I find somehow reprehensible—and I find it very difficult to say why, to put my finger on it—is the business of insurance companies acquiring and forcing upon reluctant mortgagors equity ownership in return for long-term loans.

The movement of the insurance industry out of the stock market to some extent and into the area of real estate investment, particularly the allocations of vast proportions of their funds which were previously used for residential mortgages, and because they find them to be obnoxious mortgages both in terms of administrative costs—they are not going to ask some poor devil who wants an $18,000 mortgage to give them 10 per cent interest on his house. That might raise a bit of a hare's rebellion on the streets of Ontario—but they find it quite feasible to do that very thing in terms for lending their money as an added bonus and as a hedge against inflation I suppose, and because of the profit margins that are involved, in the case of condominium developments; in the case of highrise apartment buildings; in the case of commercial enterprises, and in the case of industrial plants to say, "Boys, I will not give you the $100,000 or the million bucks that you need on a mortgage. Sure you got full security and value for it, in the normal market of five years ago we would have given it to you, but we have some strings attached now, we want a part of the action. We want to get paid back, we want our interest rates."

But in return for this—because money is extremely short and because it is difficult to get it, for instance, from the development banks without tying yourself up in a straitjacket of impossible internal inflexibility—you have to turn to these individuals. And it seems to me they are taking advantage of their position in imposing terms that are not only onerous but really unconscionable.

This is exacting a pound of flesh with a vengeance in return for the gratuity of lending money which is not their money anyhow, which is put into them by hundreds of thousands of small people from month to month and week to week—their vast sums of money. I take umbrage with this obviously, and I wonder whether the minister has got any legislation in view which might curb these unsightly practices?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have noted both the suggestions, the ones to make reference to the Ontario Law Reform Commission in certain matters relating to insurance risks, policies and obligations; on the other matter that he mentioned, about the way that insurance companies lend their money to large enterprises for construction of buildings and apartments, condominiums and so on, by the business world, I have no legislation which enables us to reach it at the moment. If they are reprehensible, as the hon. member suggests, whether we should frame legislation or whether we should also refer that for a study, I do not know; but I have certainly noted his suggestions. I would like to look at it, and I certainly shall.

Mr. Sargent: Another form of usury.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, could I say a word on this particular subject? I attend annually the meetings of insurance companies in my area, and it has been a concern to me—I have mentioned it before—that the percentage of reserves or moneys going into residential mortgages is declining yearly, while their equity position is going into such things as combined efforts and we have Shipp construction and Mutual Life building buildings in partnership. The strange part to me is that this is a relatively new venture which started when residential mortgage rates were back up around 10 per cent.

If the mortgage companies were not satisfied to risk their mortgage money at 10 per cent, now that mortgage rates have softened considerably, I think we will find insurance companies going into more equity deals. This could prove to be very detrimental to our residential building programmes in this province. Your colleague, who was in the Legislature, will probably find that the private sector, through insurance companies, will not be putting the money into residential mortgages that he thought they would in a year like this is.

I too have the concern of the member for Lakeshore on this point—and I have spoken

of it before—because I feel that, as residential mortgage rates have softened considerably, you will find the insurance companies will want a piece of the action in practically every large venture they are going to get. And if insurance companies get out of the residential mortgage field, then I think our economy is going to be in great trouble in the near future as far as our building programme for housing is concerned.

Highrises are great, but there is not anything that is going to take the place of single-family residences for good citizenship in our province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I just have one thought that I might offer, which really amounts to a complaint or a suggestion of concern about the field of investment into which insurance companies are now going. As hon. members know, in our laws relating to loan and trust corporations, I do not think we entirely direct the areas into which they may invest funds, but we actually do direct that certain portions of their funds must be invested in bonds of Canada, the Province of Ontario or municipal bonds guaranteed by the province—

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not make it geographic too?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —not more than a certain amount into other equity types of investment and so on; certain amounts in first mortgages and others into stocks where the companies have had a record of dividend payment over a number of years. So we do have perhaps a more or less negative pattern; it is not positive, saying they shall invest this way. What is suggested here is perhaps a different approach, that the insurance company might be legislated into not investing more than a certain amount of its money in perhaps this type of enterprise which the hon. members seem to feel is not good for the economy.

Mr. Good: Just to the extent it cuts off the residential mortgages.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is something one could think about. I am not suggesting that I see the way clearly to do it immediately. All in all, at the moment I am giving you the benefit of what I think as I consider what you have said.

There is only one redeeming feature that seems to come out of the discussion. This is that apparently while the insurance company has gone out of the individual residential mortgage field, perhaps a great deal of money has gone into the apartment field, so that while that does not help the individual homeowner, it has, at the same time, provided a great deal of residential space for the citizens of the province. So there is something on the credit side of the balance sheets from that angle. It is something that I have noted and I would like to think about it and pursue it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I think the minister is overlooking two very important features, if I may so suggest.

Number one is this. Even if the lending institutions are putting their money into highrise apartments, which is a good thing, by so doing and at the same time, demanding an equity position, they are in effect driving up the cost of these highrises and therefore the rents. Because the person who is constructing the highrises must go to the lending institutions for this money—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I realize that.

Mr. Ben: —he must give up part of his equity and, since he is going to get his profits back, he must increase the value of the whole project.

So in essence, demanding an equity out of highrises and demanding an equity in these highrise buildings by the lenders is driving up the cost and the cost of the leases. That is one point.

But the fact that galls me the most, Mr. Chairman, is that although our lending institutions, in the form of trust companies and insurance companies and loan corporations and banks, will demand an equity position when it comes to the construction of buildings, we do not hear them demanding an equity position when a big American outfit comes over here and says to the banks: "Lend us $50 million or some other figure equally as large, so that we can buy ABC Company Limited, presently a wholly-owned Canadian operation."

They are quite prepared to demand an equity position from Canadians when lending money to Canadians so that they end up owning a piece of what already is Canadian, but they seem to be extremely reluctant—to the best of my knowledge, I have never even heard of it being done—to ask a huge American corporation which wants to come over here and take over a Canadian enterprise or a piece of that Canadian enterprise or the loan

of the money that will make it American. This to me is the most shameful aspect of the whole situation.

What I would like to see—and I know, Mr. Minister, that this comes in the field of banking, and I know that you have no say in it directly—but I should like to see the federal government pass legislation that would perhaps demand of the banks that they, in turn, demand of these American companies an equity position for any moneys lent to take over a Canadian entity by a foreign-controlled group.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I should like to see a complete prohibition on the use of Canadian money by foreign interests who take over control of Canadian enterprises. That would be the best solution. I cannot see it done, much as I regret to say that with a Liberal government in Ottawa. But what the minister can do, since he has control over insurance companies, since he does have control over loan companies and trust companies, is insist that they not lend any money to a foreign individual or corporation for the purpose of acquiring ownership of a Canadian entity. If he does not want to go that far, at least he should demand that they in turn demand an equity position up to the value of the moneys being advanced. That is one way of stopping the takeover of all our industry.

I was just going to sit down since it is 10:30.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be further discussion on this vote?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Are you going to call the vote?

Mr. Chairman: I understand there will be further discussion on the vote.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker, in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before I move that the House adjourn, I think I might indicate to hon. members that on Thursday we will perhaps do order No. 1, the budget debate, for some time in the afternoon, plus—I am not sure of this, possibly if the time allows in the afternoon—I would like to return to the estimates of this department in the evening on Thursday, at which time I hope they might be completed.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Might I ask which bill the hon. Minister has in mind?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There are a number of bills on the order paper. Bill 48, which is order No. 5, I think I might discuss, perhaps on second reading; Bill 49, order No. 6, The Securities Act, and possibly Bill 52, The Business Corporations Act. Then the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has a number of bills there which are important, I think, and hon. members might like to take part in the discussion of those on second reading. I am not sure we will accomplish all that on Thursday afternoon because I do not know how long the budget debate may go that day, but I do want to return to these estimates on Thursday evening.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I assume when the minister says "the bills of the Attorney General," he means bills standing in the name of the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis).

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

An hon. member: Let us get a breather on that, eh?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I introduced that two years ago.

Mr. J. Renwick: And the minister withdrew it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not withdraw it.

Mr. J. Renwick: It died.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It died on the order paper. The member saw it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart, continued 2525

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2552

No. 62

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 10, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1971

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today, in both galleries, are students from the Henry Munroe Public School of Ottawa and, in the east gallery, students from St. Rita's Separate School of Toronto. Also, in the west gallery, students from the St. Madeleine Separate School of Don Mills and St. Thomas School of Sault Ste. Marie.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before my formal statement, may I recognize the award-winning Henry Munroe School Choir and mention for the record one songbird of that group, Miss Andrea Lawrence.

In moving from happy to the other end of the spectrum, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to the subject raised by the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) the day before yesterday with respect to the tragic refugee health problem in India. In response to his question I undertook to have my department immediately assess our capacities in relation to the provision of health services and to raise the question with my colleagues at our cabinet meeting yesterday.

The first step taken by my department was, of course, to communicate with the Canadian government to initiate a chain of inquiries on our behalf by Canada, seeking information through the World Health Organization and ultimately through UNICEF to the government of India. We advised that we have available for immediate delivery from the government of Ontario, four four-wheel-drive ambulances which we, and those with whom we are communicating, feel might be particularly useful in view of the fact that the area in question is entering the monsoon season.

We have also been advised that Connaught Laboratories has already sold its total stock of cholera vaccine to Oxfam. In addition, reports reaching us through the channels I have mentioned indicate that at this moment there would appear to be no particular demand to provide such medical supplies as antibiotics and intravenous fluids.

As information on priorities for the stricken area reaches us, as it did yesterday and this morning, we are finding that the actual needs on the scene appear to relate to other than strictly health support. In any case, the government of Ontario at this time is prepared to provide support in the amount of $100,000.

As soon as a satisfactory inventory of needs is developed, I will report further to the House.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I was asked a series of questions about the builder-proposal techniques and Headway Corporation Limited. As well, there have been a number of newspaper articles on the subject.

I am sorry the hon. member for Sarnia is not here. He was particularly interested in this.

I would first like to deal with the builder-proposal technique and the various steps taken in assessing proposals received.

The builder-proposal system, which has contributed greatly to the success of Ontario Housing Corporation's production of housing, was first used in November, 1964. Under this method the corporation publicly invites proposals from builders and specifies the number of housing units requested by a municipality. Meetings are often arranged locally with interested proponents to clarify any matters relating to these requirements.

Proponents then submit firm-price schemes based on dwellings of their own design and on land which they already own or hold under option. Where possible, Ontario Housing Corporation purchases land and calls for the proposals from merchant builders on a specified site.

When proposals are received, they are formally opened and recorded on the closing day of the call by a committee of the corporation. The various corporation technical officials assess and review the proposals in

light of building type, building design, architectural appearance, proximity to necessary urban amenities—such as schools, shopping, public transportation—the siting of the units, dollar value rating and long-term maintenance consideration.

Based on these assessments, a review committee of the corporation selects the most acceptable proposal. The development committee of the board of directors then examines the staff recommendations in detail. This committee makes a further recommendation to the board of directors as a whole, which makes the final selection of the successful proposal.

All proposals, Mr. Speaker, including the one recommended, are then presented to the municipal council concerned for its approval before applications are made to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for 90 per cent financing and the provincial cabinet for the remaining 10 per cent.

Not only has the builder-proposal technique resulted in more favourable prices being received by OHC over the tender method, but the housing units are available for occupancy at a much earlier date.

The builder-developer who submits the proposal is responsible for preparing all plans and specifications to the corporation's requirements, making application for any rezoning together with securing all the requisite approvals from municipal and other governmental agencies involved.

The introduction of the builder-proposal scheme reduced the price of public housing units by at least $1,000 a unit over the old tender system used in the federal-provincial partnership prior to the formation of Ontario Housing Corporation. Also, in student housing it succeeded in reducing the per bed cost from an average of $8,000 to about $5,000.

I would make these points about the builder-proposal system: It is faster. It makes use of techniques the builder is already familiar with, as the builder knows local conditions, material and trends. It provides sites are not known by the corporation. It reduces costs. It has produced housing of varied design, helping us to eliminate any stereotype look in public housing.

The system pioneered by OHC has been used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the United States of America. Last year it was used by the federal Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in its $200 million innovative programme.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): No!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And CMHC is using the builder-proposal technique again this year.

Mr. Shulman: With outside controls.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This technique is used in other provinces as well for their public housing programmes, including Manitoba.

In acquiring housing, the corporation also makes use of the tender system in specialized buildings such as the YWCA hostel. At the present time OHC has four major proposals being developed by tender, and our experience in this regard also assists us in assessing submissions received by the proposal method.

It does not, Mr. Speaker, appear to be advantageous to dispense with this proposal method. To do so, we could not take advantage of the expertise of the private enterprise builders and we would have to increase our technical staff of architects, engineers and others very substantially. The end result would be a very substantial delay in providing much-needed housing.

Dealing next with Toronto Star story of June 8 which alleged, and I quote, the "Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has ordered the Ontario Housing Corporation to get more for its money" on family and senior citizen developments, I am informed that this is a surprise both to OHC and the federal CMHC.

In fact, Mr H. W. Hignett, president of CMHC, following the appearance of the Star's story telephoned OHC's managing director and denied the basic allegations made in the newspaper story.

The story mentions a CMHC directive which went out to all provincial housing agencies and claims that federal officials said it was aimed specifically at OHC.

The only intergovernmental letter which could be remotely connected with this claim by the newspaper is one that OHC received from CMHC last November in which the federal agency asked OHC to provide a written explanation whenever a proposal other than the lowest was approved. OHC agreed to this request by its federal partner.

If I may turn to the newpaper story's claim that the Headway Corporation Limited received more than 15 per cent of the OHC's business since it began in 1964 and in most cases charged more than its competitors, to the end of May, 1971, OHC had awarded

443 construction contracts for a total of 34,768 family and senior citizens rental units. The Headway organization bid on 259 proposals and was awarded 76 for a total of 1,899 units. This works out to 5.5 per cent of the corporation's total public housing production.

For the first five months of this year, Headway has been awarded two contracts for 52 units.

As for the Star's claim that Headway "in most cases" charges more than its competitors, let us examine the firm's performance in 1970 when it had six proposals accepted for 142 units in five communities: In Espanola Headway was $450 per family unit higher than its competitor, but was awarded the contract as the low bidder did not meet the requirements of the call. In Espanola also, Headway was lower by $860 per senior citizen unit.

In North Bay, Headway was lowest of five firms by $93 per family unit. In Teck township, Headway was lowest by $2,542 per senior citizen unit.

In Sturgeon Falls, Headway was the lowest of three bidders by $1,700 per unit. In Moosonee, of the four firms that submitted proposals, Headway was lowest by $5,500 per family unit.

I believe, sir, these figures speak for themselves.

I will not attempt to answer all the points made in the Star story—that would consume even more time than I am consuming now of the hon. members' time. If the newspaper account can be believed, however, my hon. friend who represents Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) blundered badly when he described a local firm's failure when it competed with Headway for the right to build a Sarnia senior citizen development.

According to the Star, the Sarnia company's bid was lower than Headway's but "it lost out because it had not included balconies in its design." The paper then added that even with balconies its price would have been lower than Headway's.

That may be true, but what appears to have escaped the hon. member for Sarnia's attention is the fact that while the Sarnia firm did not get the job, neither did Headway. Both lost out to a third company which won the contract with a superior design and a superior site.

Before leaving the Star story, sir, I would like to clarify one other point. The story claims that proposals are advertised mainly through a mailing list to contractors who are interested in OHC work and through municipal councils.

I am advised, sir, that every proposal is advertised in the Daily Commercial News and Building Report, and as most members know, this publication might be described as the construction industry's bible.

In addition, proposals presently are advertised in the newspapers published in the community in which the housing will be constructed and quite frequently in any major publications nearby.

A number of builders have asked to receive notices of proposal calls. Some are interested in specific areas; others are interested in all calls. This service is available to any builder who applies but it is really the least important means by which OHC informs the industry of its intentions.

Last Tuesday, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked, "Which OHC proposals built by Headway Corporation were turned back for re-assessment at the request of CMHC?" After checking our records, we called the head office of CMHC in Ottawa and they confirmed our findings that no Headway proposals had been turned back by them.

The hon. member for High Park asked:

> Is the minister aware that a complaint has been lodged against Headway by a citizens' group in Thunder Bay?

I did note in a recent newspaper article a brief from some citizens of Thunder Bay has been forwarded to the hon. Robert Andras in connection with the extent of land holdings by Headway in that city. However, as I said on Tuesday, sir, it appears to me that there is nothing OHC can do, or should do, about that.

The hon. member for Sarnia asked:

> Can the minister explain how Headway Corporation continually is able, in advance—

And I am quoting, sir.

> —of announcements by the corporation, to enter small municipalities and option lands sometimes six months in advance of announcements of proposed projects by the Ontario Housing Corporation—

Sir, that is the end of that quote.

> —and by way of further supplementary—

And I quote:

> —would the minister advise the members of this Legislature where the leak is in

> the Housing Corporation to Headway, or in his department, or in Progressive Conservative Party liaison?

That is the end of his question.

In answer to the first part of the question, sir, I am informed Headway is in the land development, shopping centre, residential construction and apartmental rental business in Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario, and is in the process of acquiring developments in Quebec. They are active in many parts of these provinces and acquire or option land for the above purposes as well as to bid on OHC proposal calls in Ontario.

Ontario Housing Corporation is active in developing family and senior citizen accommodation in some 200 Ontario municipalities and, in municipalities of about 20,000 and over, is operating an almost continuous development programme. In other words, there is not a municipality of size in Ontario where a builder interested in bidding on OHC work would make a mistake in buying a good site near transportation and services.

Anywhere from six months to a year before a proposal call is made by OHC, a resolution is passed by a local council asking OHC to carry out a survey of need and effective demand. At the present time, 92 such surveys have been requested or are under way, and all but a very few will result in proposal calls. These resolutions are reported in local newspapers and the surveys under way are listed in the bi-monthly issues of Ontario Housing magazine which has a circulation of about 6,000, including every member of this Legislature.

If the hon. members will bother to look at that, I would think they will find, maybe, anywhere from 40, 50 or 100 listed as being under survey at the present time. When the survey is completed, it is presented to council at a public meeting and its findings must be endorsed by council before a proposal call is issued. It is only where suitable sites are not available that the corporation asks proponents to include the site in their proposal.

As for the question—and I quote again—"How would Headway know six months before a proposal call in Sarnia?" They could read the request for a survey in the local newspaper. The member for Sarnia, who is kept abreast of our activities by letter, could tell them. They could read the request for a survey in Ontario Housing magazine, which I have just mentioned, or they could be optioning land for other purposes, such as a shopping centre.

Also, it should be borne in mind that even before a resolution requests OHC to carry out a survey, it has been a subject of public discussion in the local councils for weeks or, in some cases, even months.

Therefore to imply that Ontario Housing is leaking information to Headway is really not worthy of the hon. member.

The same member also asked:

> Could the minister therefore, in connection with this request, ascertain how Headway Corporation, in advance of projects in the city of Sarnia and the town of Petrolia are able to enter some six months in advance of the announcement of the project and option land?

And that is the end of the question.

I have already answered the general question, but I would add that, in Petrolia, proposals were called on land owned by OHC and, therefore, if in fact Headway optioned land, it had nothing to do with the call or the OHC.

The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) asked me to ascertain "whether any members of the board of directors of the Ontario Housing Corporation have from time to time done business with Headway Corporation, not necessarily in OHC projects but in other building concerns.

I am informed sir, that a poll of the board indicates that with one exception, no member has had any dealings whatsoever with Headway Corporation. In this one case the member's firm has bid in competition with other firms as a sub-trade on plazas and private apartments being developed by Headway, but never on housing sponsored by OHC.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Which member is that? Which firm?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The chairman of the Ontario Housing Corporation, Mr. Emerson Clow.

Mr. Shulman: Should he not be doing his presidency job full time?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Clow?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park also asked:

> Will the minister ascertain whether any member of the board of directors or former member of the board of directors of the Headway Corporation is now working for the Ontario Housing Corporation?

Sir, as far as we can ascertain, no member or former member of the board of the company is working for Ontario Housing Corporation.

I must add to that, sir, a word of caution; we have some 1,200 employees. If there happens to be — the company has assured our people that there is no such person who has left the board of directors of Headway — but just in case the hon. member may possibly find some office boy or some messenger among our 1,200 employees who may have been, by some chance, a member of the board of that company, I just want—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Office boys?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —knowing how this can be blown up, to tell him as far as we can ascertain of the whole 1,200 employees, no member of the housing corporation or its staff has ever been a member of the board of this company.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

HEADWAY CORPORATION AND OHC

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the hon. minister's statement and as a matter of clarification: In his last few sentences he did indicate that the chairman of Ontario Housing does do business with Headway on construction projects not associated with Ontario Housing, but that he is presently associated with them on a business basis other than that associated with Ontario Housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not said that he is presently associated; that is not quite what I said. I said the member's firm has been in competition with other firms as a sub-trade on plazas and private apartments being developed by Headway, but never on housing sponsored by OHC.

Mr. Nixon: Further to the minister's statement, as a supplementary question: Is he aware that in other jurisdictions which use the proposal method rather than the tender method, which has shown certain advantages, safeguards have been implemented which are not used by Ontario Housing in that the proposals are made anonymously to an external board or a group of individuals which can assess them without knowing the names of the firms which are presenting the proposals, in that way making certain that no criticism might be levelled at the ministry or at the corporation exercising this authority because of a knowledge of the name of the specific company associated with the proposal? Is the minister aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. Even if that were the case, I could say right off the top of my head, in view of the number of technical committees and so on which these proposals have to go through — and I might point out we have some fairly distinguished people on the Ontario Housing Corporation board which has finally to pass on these — which in the final analysis have to be approved by the local council, I do not really see what could be accomplished. I think it would be better to do it the way we are doing it, openly—

Mr. Nixon: It is considered to be a valuable safeguard.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, it seems to me that we would be open to question; I am not ruling this suggestion out at all. I certainly am going to look into it. But now that we are discussing this, it would seem to me that doing a thing which is apparently not in the open leads itself to more suspicion that somebody will leak something to somebody.

Mr. Nixon: It would be completely in the open.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It would not be completely in the open if you did not openly—

Mr. Lewis: It is an independent board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —say who was behind the proposal. Therefore, any member of the board or any member of the committee which had to rule on this is in a position to know whether he should in fact disqualify himself from any decision.

Mr. Nixon: You said that none of them had any business associations.

Mr. Singer: Except one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know, but it is easy to say that. But then I am sure there could be a possibility that someone wishing to criticize it would say, "Well, how do we know that xyz company's principal, knowing somebody on the board, did not pick up the phone and say, "Here, you know that is our proposal. Will you give it some special consideration?" It seems to me that, on the face of it, it would be better to have the thing right open. You know who is bidding. It is going to a great

number of committees and, in the final analysis, it goes back to the municipality, which has to accept it. Then everybody knows who is doing what.

As I say, I am not ruling out the possibility that there may be some merit in what the hon. member said. I will certainly find out how that is done and see whether it is indicated that perhaps we should accept this.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary and clarification, I take it that Mr. Clow's firm has not merely bid but has, in fact, been awarded a contract outside Ontario Housing purview with Headway?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That may be; I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: You do not know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think it is pertinent anyway.

Mr. Lewis: All right. I just wanted to ascertain what the meaning of your statement is.

The other question I have to ask is—perhaps the minister at some future time could clarify—why in several communities in Ontario like Fort Frances, Midland, Peterborough and St. Thomas, the actual cost per unit of family or senior citizen housing, awarded by contract to Headway, has been higher than that awarded by contract to other building firms in the same community? Is it a matter of difference of year and time, is it a matter of difference of land, or difference in construction cost? Could he itemize that for us on a future date?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the moment I cannot, but I would think that the hon. member has answered his own question. Building costs are different in various places.

Mr. Lewis: The same community?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that information might be available. I will get it for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview—a supplementary?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, a supplementary: Does the minister have the breakdown of the percentage of business other than in Toronto that Headway in fact got, and did the minister note in the Star article to which he referred that the percentage they dealt with was in business other than in Toronto?

Mr. Shulman: And large cities.

Mr. Singer: And large cities, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, those figures were not correct. I was going to deal with them in this statement. I have it in the original draft. I took out a lot of this material which I thought had been answered by me either in the House or outside the House.

The implication, if I recall—I do not have it here—I think the implication of the article was that they received 15 per cent of all the business that OHC did.

Mr. Singer: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am speaking from memory. That certainly is not correct. I gave the figures the other day and I think they were something like 5.97 per cent—

Mr. Singer: That is the figure the minister gave today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I think it has turned out to be 5.6 per cent.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary: could the minister answer the specific question? How much business other than in Toronto and the large cities did Headway do of all OHC business? What percentage?

Mr. Shulman: Twenty-seven per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I have given that figure.

Mr. Singer: No, the minister has not.

Mr. Lewis: No, he has not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then I will be very pleased to give that figure if it has not been given. It has been bandied about, back and forth, in the newspapers and from outside—

Mr. Singer: The minister says the newspaper is wrong; give us the right one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think this is important.

Mr. Singer: I think it is very important.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. I will be very glad to give it to the hon. member. As I say I do not think it really proves a great deal. If a company has been more successful—

Mr. Singer: Do not defend them, just answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am answering the question, and I am answering—

Mr. Singer: The minister is not answering it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am giving the member the information.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister is dealing with Toronto as well. It is over 20 per cent outside of Toronto.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There was a better-informed parliament here this morning—the mock parliament.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I did answer that question in my statement did I not?

Mr. Singer: The minister said of all of the business, five-point-something per cent, and of all of the business that must include Toronto. We are asking a very simple question; what is it, excluding Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I answered that. Maybe it was the page I missed. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) refered to something I stated on Tuesday. He said: "When you say Headway had 2.97 per cent you are including any building that was done in the city of Toronto?" And later he amended his question to exclude building done inside Metro Toronto. Did I not read that? It may have been in my original draft.

Before answering the member I would like to amend—I think I said this on my feet a minute or two ago—to amend the 2.97 per cent. The amount of 1970 OHC work received by Headway should read 2.6 per cent. The figure is arrived at in the following manner—if the hon. member would follow this:

In 1970, OHC advertised 68 proposal calls for a total of 5,461 units, and Headway bid on 45 of them. Contract awards were authorized in six of these 45 bids and they totalled 142 units. I mentioned earlier, or I think I did, that in all six cases Headway was the lowest acceptable bid. This resulted in Headway receiving 2.6 per cent of the OHC business in 1970.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is talking about the ones outside. I am informed that Headway has bid on projects in all sizes of communities up to and including large ones like Hamilton and London, but has not bid in Metropolitan Toronto. If we deduct all the units awarded to date in Metropolitan Toronto we get a figure of 20,393 units. Of the total, Headway obtained 1,899 units, or 9.3 per cent of projects advertised outside of Metropolitan Toronto. I hope that that answers the hon. members' questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was trying to shorten my statement.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary question, how can the minister rationalize the remarks he made about the cost of Headway with figures prepared by his own department and dated February 28, 1971, which show that Headway, on both senior citizen and family units, cost an average of $1,000 more than the average of all the other contractors when he has broken it down by contractors, and his own department has done this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has, on another occasion—I think I asked one of my staff to call him to explain the question he had the other day which was very unclear—he referred to figures which he had read from an OHC statement. I do not know which statement he is referring to now. If he would let me have those figures which he says were published—

Mr. MacDonald: Would the minister not like to have it?

Mr. Shulman: I promised it to the minister's executive assistant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he lets me have it, I will look at it. The hon. member has a great tendency to compare oranges with apples. Now, he is referring to senior citizens—

Mr. Lewis: You have been sitting in our anteroom all morning asking for the statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have not.

Mr. Shulman: The minister's executive assistant was down there, and I said he could have it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a reasonable request. If the hon. member would let me have the figures to which he is referring, I will give an explanation.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: The minister in his statement said the costs under the proposal unit had

been approximately $1,000 less than under the previous tender figures. Would he mind giving those figures, because that does not agree with the figures I have—also from his department. What figures does he have specifically under the tender system prior to 1964 compared to now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I will get that information, and in conjunction with the figures the hon. member is going to provide me I will get him the answer.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that Headway was formed specifically to deal with the Ontario Housing Corporation? There is a letter dated 1966 on file in the Provincial Secretary's office. We examined it this morning, and it says just that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not aware of that, but I do not know how that would change the picture at all. If Headway or any other company is smart enough to be able to see what OHC is interested in, if they are interested in building houses, and if they think they can find a way of getting those houses built, that is good business. The only thing we, as a government agency, have to concern ourselves with is whether they are being given any special privileges. If they are smart businessmen, more power to them—so long as it is not costing the taxpayers any more money.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): They are not businessmen. They do not know the meaning of the word, any one of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

INCREASE IN SPENDING FOR MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Health. Immediately following the presentation of this year's budget there was an announcement in the press—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Nixon: —that the budget had included an amount of $20 million extra to expand staff and services for mentally retarded children. Can the minister explain what that budgetary item was and if, in fact, he does intend to expand the staff and facilities for mentally retarded children by an amount of $20 million this year?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, that statement quoted by the Leader of the Opposition is not quite accurate. The $20 million is the difference between our spending in mental health last year and our spending this year. It is not specifically related to the retarded nor to staff.

Mr. Nixon: Was the error in the working up of the budget figures or in the minister's presentation of the departmental plans?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think it was a misinterpretation more than an error, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: For clarification: There will not be an increase of $20 million in the facilities and staff available for mentally retarded children but for the provision of facilities for all of the psychiatric facilities in the province. Is that right?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: All the mental health facilities.

Mr. Nixon: Mental health facilities. Right!

OXFAM REQUEST FOR AID TO HELP INDIA, PAKISTAN

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the Minister of Health. Has he received a request from Oxfam for monetary assistance from the government of Ontario in funding its assistance to the cholera situation in India and Pakistan? If so, will there be some assistance forthcoming?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There has been a request. The details of it are not familiar to me. I think it only came in last night. I will be assessing it but basically, as the tone of my statement may allow, I would sooner see us provide what we have immediately available in this province than simply write cheques. I think this more appropriately might be sorted out and rationed, as you might say, by the federal government with our support rather than us dealing directly with Oxfam.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary: The indications are that the available vaccine has been neither purchased nor acquired by Oxfam to be sent immediately to the site of the need and they obviously need funds

to make this purchase possible. Will the Minister of Health undertake to co-operate with the government of Canada, or request from them, that this assistance be forthcoming since, I believe, there has been an announcement of a federal grant to Oxfam of about $150,000 in this regard?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

PARCOST REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON DRUGS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Minister of Health. Has he now got a report from his special group that was to examine the Parcost programme and, if so, have there been any recommendations which would indicate that the programme should be amended, changed or improved?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker. No formal report; we had a report to the House a month or two ago relating to the past period of operation of Parcost. We review it all the time, of course, but there is no specific project. What the Leader of the Opposition may be concerned with is the report of the committee on drugs in so far as substitution and non-substitution are concerned.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that it right. That is right.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have that report on my desk. I had hoped I could have tabled it today but, as a matter of fact, I wanted more copies, which means I can table it early next week.

POLICY ON SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Treasurer. Regarding the statement made by the Treasurer's director of regional development indicating that the regional development councils essentially have failed in the goals that they have been seeking over the last few years, does this indicate a change in government policy? If so, is the Treasurer prepared to tell the House the basis for this change and essentially what he is going to do about it?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in my reading of what he had to say, I do not think the director said just that. I will be glad to send a copy of the director's remarks to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Then there is no change in the policy of support for the regional development councils? The Treasurer is indicating there is no change?

INCOME PROPOSAL UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services: Can he now report to the House any details of, let us say, the deal that has been offered by the government of Canada to the provinces which may lead provinces into a position where they can finance some form of a guaranteed basic income through the Canada Assistance Plan?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot make any of those details available now. The decision of all the ministers at our conference was that this should be reported to the first ministers' conference next week. The decisions on publication and detail of the arrangements perhaps will come out after that.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: It is to be expected that this matter will be discussed at the Victoria conference, either in open or closed session?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I really cannot say what will be discussed there. The first ministers will be deciding that, but I know that I and many of the ministers of welfare will be attending that conference.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICES TO SPADINA EXPRESSWAY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Given the intense public interest and concern which followed the cabinet decision on Spadina, why is the cabinet still secreting the report that was submitted to it in December, 1970, on alternative transit and commuter facilities in southern Ontario?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): I have no knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of anything that has been secreted and hidden away. If there is a report of that character—and there probably is—I would presume it has not received the full study that the government should give to it before it is presented for public scrutiny.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Given that the minister is in charge of this department—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Given that the minister is, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I assume that. What does he mean that he presumes that this report may exist? It was submitted to cabinet in December. There have been many speculative stories about it. There is another story on the contents of it in the Toronto Daily Star today. Surely the public has a right to the judgements of that document and to have them aired at this point in time, almost six months later.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is a moot question, Mr. Speaker. First of all, as to how the contents of the report became available to the press, I would not know how that happened. But it is a moot question as to whether there is any limitation on the time that a government is entitled to study a report and act or not act upon it and reveal its contents to the public. I think that is quite fair.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: The government has managed to throw the transportation system of Metropolitan Toronto into evident turmoil, for whatever good reason; does the minister not now think that the people in the area—

Mr. Singer: The member applauded the decision!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I approved the decision. I approved the decision then and do now. Does the minister not think—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The turmoil is over there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): I will give the member a subway token.

Mr. Lewis: There are 29 opinions in this House on any subject—the Tory opinion, the NDP opinion and 27 Liberal opinions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Now, may I ask, having done that to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is not true. There are a couple of them who do not have any opinion on anything.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a fair addendum.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister not think that it is just that the people and the officials of the Metropolitan Toronto area now have access to that report so that the alternatives, which the government has promised, can be subject to public review? How long does he intend to keep the report a secret document and why is he sitting on it now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, it could well be that I am sitting on it because it is not as relevant as it was at that time. Times have changed. Decisions have been made which change the ball game, if one wants to put it that way. These matters are being pursued in an altogether different context.

I will go this far with the hon. member and tell him that today, this morning, I had a meeting with Mr. Campbell, the Chairman of Metro Toronto, the chairman of the TTC and certain staff people to consider the extent to which we now move into the new ball game which has been developed. I do not think I need say any more. It is quite possible that a number of reports can become obsolete in changing times and changing circumstances.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not, Mr. Speaker, to give the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party or any member in this House the contents of that report but reports can become obsolescent and some things became obsolescent last Thursday.

Interjections by hon. members.

ORDER-IN-COUNCIL ON SPADINA DECISION

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, or a new question really, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications where is the order-in-council which is required as a result of the Premier's (Mr. Davis) announcement in this House last week?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The order-in-council is being drafted and it will be presented to council in due course and executed promptly upon tabling.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): In the fullness of time.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since an order-in-council can rescind the OMB decision or bury the OMB decision, which will this order-in-council do?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member will just have to wait and see.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think I am going, at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, to disclose the nature of an order-in-council to the House. I do not think that is required. I do not think it is proper.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it has certainly given the minister's decision—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think it is. I do not think it is proper until cabinet has considered the content of the order-in-council. I do not propose to disclose the contents. As a matter of fact, at this point in time, I do not know what the content of the order-in-council may be.

Mr. Lewis: You are meeting with Mr. Campbell not knowing what the order-in-council may be?

Mr. MacDonald: Are you in any doubt about the decision?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would have to tell the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party that because of the decision last week a number of things changed. He is well aware of it. He was happy with the change. I do not think I could document these things in precise terms any more than he could if he had to. I do not think that is possible.

Mr. Lewis: We would have done a little more planning in advance.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And I do not propose to do it at this time. It would be irresponsible.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a case of follow-through after the decision.

Interjections by hon. members.

BYPASSING HOSPITAL PLANNING COUNCIL REPORT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker? Could the Minister of Health explain what has happened to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: There is very considerable irascibility in some parts of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Health explain why the Metropolitan Toronto Hospital Planning Council reports of the last three years on the priority of chronic and long-term care development has now been apparently bypassed in the extension of funds to acute treatment care in the additions to the hospitals which are planned?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is a question of bypassing.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): It is a good decision.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The number of priorities that we have are assessed by the commission as they come forward. I do not think the commission has ever tied itself to any planning council's opinions. To the extent they conflict, I am afraid I would be beyond my depth in discussing this. Perhaps a question that I could consider and answer on the order paper, or by correspondence, would be more definitive.

Mr. Lewis: All right.

PLUM HOLLOW CHEESE FACTORY

Mr. Lewis: I have a last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Agriculture and Food—urgent and public but not as earth-shattering. Can the Minister of Agriculture and Food not devise any plan whereby the Plum Hollow co-operative cheese factory can be saved in this province with all the relevance it has to the county of Leeds and the surrounding communities?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Obviously, my hon. friend must have spent some time in Brockville talking to some people who would like to carry it on.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Last night!

Mr. Lewis: Last night, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just last night?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No wonder the question is fresh in his mind.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the matter is of great concern to us; it is also a matter of concern to the Milk Marketing Board as well as to the Milk Commission of Ontario. Ways and means are being sought to provide assistance to cheese factories to try to resolve their very complex situations. We cannot resolve it to the satisfaction of all concerned, let me say that.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, it was possible to give Kraft Foods a $500,000 EIO loan. This company is now buying up sufficient quota and sufficient small plants to jeopardize the operation of very small co-operatives of this kind. Is there not some counterbalancing government policy for smaller groups?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker; any factory can purchase a good deal of quota. As a matter of fact, I do not have the figures with me at the moment, but I think the member would find that some of the small factories in eastern Ontario were able to acquire considerable quota within the last few months from other sources. This is going on all the time right across the province among various industrial milk plants, acquiring a quota from others that are going out of business.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question previously asked by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence).

USE OF CORN IN ALCOHOLIC SPIRITS

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kent asked how many tons of corn are used in the manufacture of alcoholic spirits in the Province of Ontario. The answer is 236,700 tons.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is corn for you.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): A lot of corn.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am glad he did not ask me how many corn kernels were involved.

He also asked: What has happened to the study undertaken by the department concerning the sale of keg beer—no, some other member asked that. It was the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) He is interested, not in corn liquor, but in beer.

"What has happened to the study undertaken by the department concerning the sale of keg beer for home consumption" he asked. This was a question asked well over one year ago.

The answer is draught beer for home consumption use is available in 12½-gallon kegs. This has been available for some time, but in order to clarify the question, on or before June 25 of this year a brochure will be available to customers in every brewers' retail outlet explaining precisely how they may buy keg beer.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes. May I ask of the minister if he did study the question of the manufacture and distribution of keg beer in the four-gallon containers, not the 12½-gallon containers?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not indicated his preference over the size of the keg. I will now get him details with reference to the four-gallon keg.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for Kent

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): As a supplementary: I want to thank the minister, but could the minister tell me if the many tons of corn that are used to manufacture alcoholic spirits are all grown in the Province of Ontario or in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know the birthplace of the corn, but I would be delighted to find that out for the hon. member.

LOCATION OF TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. Minister of Public Works has answers to previous questions.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works: Mr. Speaker, on May 28 the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) asked the Prime Minister a question regarding the new tourism and information centre at Pigeon River. His question was:

> Did the Prime Minister receive a letter from a resident of Cloud Bay offering land at whatever price the government was willing to pay for a location for the tourist information centre near the Pigeon River border? Is it a fact that the site that was chosen was purchased from an American millionaire and will require up to 65,000

yards of fill? Assuming both of these statements are correct, what is the difference in the cost to the government of the site chosen and the site which was offered at whatever the government was willing to pay?

The site that was chosen was purchased from the government of Canada for the sum of $1. Negotiations, to my knowledge as former Minister of Tourism and Information, have gone on with the government of Canada for some time.

I assume that the letter or proposed letter to the Prime Minister to which the hon. member referred was from the owner of a small tourist establishment at Cloud Bay. In my capacity in those days as Minister of Tourism and Information, I had visited this site which I would say is some five to 10 miles from Pigeon River and from the border crossing site. In fact, I think The Department of Tourism and Information had their temporary trailer here for a few years and we found that the number of inquiries was very low.

We arranged with the government of Canada to put the trailer on the site at the bridge and my recollection is that our inquiries have increased something in the order of four times. It was the decision of The Department of Tourism and Information to obtain a site at Pigeon River. I think the gentleman in question was prepared to offer a site for almost anything to have the department establishment across from him, obviously, I suppose, to attract business to his own store and cabins. But in the judgement of the department, the maximum efficiency for the centre would be at Pigeon River.

I have another answer, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Could I ask a supplementary now?

Mr. Speaker: Not until the answer has been given.

Mr. Stokes: The answer has been given. I think a part of the original question was how much additional money will have to be spent to utilize the site that has been chosen because of landscaping and the amount of fill required in using that the site.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I cannot answer that question specifically, Mr. Speaker. The department advertised for leaseback proposals and accepted that lowest bid, which was an all-in figure, I know there is a considerable amount of fill required for this site because the natural gradient is below road level.

However, one of the considerations in selecting the site was the fact that while there would be fill required, there would be a saving on the very substantial cost of building the septic tank bed because this would not have to be excavated. There is a balancing factor, but there is no question that the site will require substantial fill. We attempted, for something in the order of two years, to negotiate with the government of Canada for a site closer to the bridge where this fill would not be required. We were unsuccessful, because the government of Canada said they required this space closer to the bridge plaza for possible future expansion of housing.

INQUIRY INTO WOMAN'S "DEATH"

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General. Has the Attorney General investigated the case of Joan Harris at 292 Hinton Street in Thunder Bay, who was pronounced dead and taken to a funeral parlour when, in fact, she was very much alive?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What was that name?

Mr. Shulman: Joan Harris of 292 Hinton Street in Thunder Bay.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There are about a dozen of these things on my desk at the moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I have not got one on Harris yet.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the Attorney General through the coroner's office find out exactly how this occurred and take the proper steps to prevent a recurrence?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, if the hon. member will send over to me, in his usual inimitable fashion, the details, I would be glad to cause an investigation to be made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

BATHURST STREET-401 BRIDGE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can the minister now advise whether his 1965 decision to build the 401 bridge over Bathurst Street to a capacity of only four lanes—because of his department's conclusion that the Spadina Expressway would carry the anticipated increased traffic—will now be changed, and if the province will immediately rebuild this bridge to at least six lanes to allow the widening of Bathurst Street, which cannot be undertaken until the province builds a new bridge?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Can the minister answer that one in a hurry?

Mr. Singer: No, it is a very simple one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that one in a hurry. Of course, until the decision is made to widen Bathurst Street there is no necessity to consider any extra interchange lanes at that location.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister advise how any decision can be made to widen Bathurst Street and take care of the fantastic increase in traffic unless the province advises that it is prepared to reconstruct this bridge, which it has already refused to do?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, that has to be the acme of hypothetical questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise if and when he is prepared to make that decision and announce it?

Mr. Nixon: Since he runs the department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, that decision will not be made in isolated terms by the minister. We propose to make that decision in co-operative terms with Metro.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary: When can the minister tell us that such decision will be made in co-operation with anybody? When?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The expressway is stopped. The member will have to make up his mind to that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot give such information to the hon. member or the House at this time because no such decision has been reached and it may take some time. This cannot be decided in isolation because there is a much bigger and broader problem of transportation to be developed in this particular community before decisions can be made in isolation. The hon. member should know that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary: Will the minister advise whether it is now government policy that all future decisions about transportation, whether public or private, will be made in consultation and co-operation with the municipal authorities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, and I can confirm that in very, very positive terms. I will make reference again to a preliminary meeting that took place with myself, the chairman of Metro and the chairman of the TTC this morning, and we will shortly be making a statement on the terms of reference associated with a very, very broad agency that will deal with these things, including these three agencies.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-South.

SPRAYING OF PESTICIDES

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health: Will the minister lay charges, for infractions last year of The Pesticides Act, against the Temco Company Limited of McClure, Ohio, or any other firm that may be responsible for actions that took place last year in aerial pesticide spraying without a licence, and further, without a permit to spray parathion?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot lay charges in view of the passage of the limitation period, which is six months. I am also advised that the firm doing the spraying this year will be using Sevden—I think it is pronounced—

Mr. Paterson: That is right.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —which does not require an application and an approval, and so this year we envisage no trouble.

Mr. Paterson: As a supplementary: In the minister's opinion, is aerial spraying as safe to an area as low ground mechanical spraying of these pesticides?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I cannot really answer that, Mr. Speaker, except in terms of safety from a Department of Health point of view, and there we are concerned with the formulation of particular chemicals used —Sevden, as I mentioned can be used without endangering health.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT AT PEACE RIVER MINING

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development regarding Peace River Mining and Smelting Limited, where 40 of the remaining 50 employees have received notice of termination.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would speak up a little.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development concerning Peace River Mining and Smelting Limited, which has given notice of termination of employment to 40 of the remaining 50 employees for June 18. My question is: Has the government taken any steps to determine whether this company could be kept in operation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am familiar with the fact that my staff has been investigating a company in that general area, but I am not sure it is the same one. I will get the information.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications has the answer to a question.

LAYOFF OF TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEES

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the answer to a question asked of me by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator), but I see he is not in his seat. Shall I give the answer anyway?

Mr. Speaker: Would it be agreeable to the Liberal Party to accept the answer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member asked the following question:

> Due to the recent layoff of 25 male employees working on the Queen Elizabeth Way at the Dorchester circle within the last week, could the minister inform us why this layoff at a time when there is so much unemployment?

My answer is this, Mr. Speaker: The 25 men laid off on the Queen Elizabeth Way-Highway 20 project were contractors' employees. The labour requirements on any particular project are the contractor's responsibility and, as can be understood, I believe, through the course of the work the number of employees could vary according to the contractor's schedule of work.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East.

CHARGE AGAINST OHC TENANT

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the minister of public housing. Is he going to carry out—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which minister is that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question for the hon. minister of public housing. Is the minister going to carry out his threat—

Mr. Nixon: Dr. Grossman.

Mr. T. Reid: Dr. Grossman?

Mr. Speaker: There is no such ministry.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister of Development—

Mr. Speaker: Trade and Development.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister of Trading and Development!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the minister going to carry out his threat to charge OHC tenant Gordon Potts with contributing to juvenile delinquency, as he stated in Hansard on page 1922 and on CBC television?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. professor, I might tell him that I did not threaten to take action. I said, if I recall, that I would ask my officials if there was sufficient evidence to lay an information, and that is what I am going to do. I am waiting for a legal opinion. I do not have my QC yet, just my PhD.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the rather lengthy period of time since the minister stated publicly on television that he was contemplating laying such charges against Gordon Potts, and since the alleged incidents at the OHC headquarters took place, has not the time period elapsed whereby the minister could make such charges?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, Mr. Speaker, if I recall, I did not say I would lay charges.

Mr. Nixon: He just wanted to threaten.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the second place, is the hon. member sorry that the time may have elapsed? Does he want me to put the Liberal candidate in jail if I can? Is that what he is after?

Mr. T. Reid: Do not think you can.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. professor that he might ask those questions which he threatened on television he would ask me and never has.

Mr. T. Reid: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider asking Mr. Robert Bradley, the director of community relations for OHC, whether or not he, an official of OHC, used Gordon Potts as a mediator in that dispute to try to prevent such destruction as took place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When I get the report I will advise the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Make a statement first, then get a report.

Mr. Lewis: The members are the only two who watch each other on television. Believe me, the rest of us are not interested, I can tell them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Nobody watches the member, so why worry?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Your committee would recommend that the time for presenting reports by the committee be extended to Thursday, June 24, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented the annual report of The Department of Social and Family Services for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the first report of the Law Society Council.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the third annual report of the advisory committee on legal aid in Ontario for the year 1970.

Mr. Hamilton from the standing natural and physical resources committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved,

that supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972:

Department of Mines and Northern Affairs

Departmental administration programme	$1,485,000
Provincial geological services programme	2,742,000
Mine safety and public protection programme	1,125,000
General services for mining public programme	6,096,000
Northern Affairs programme	774,000
Ontario Energy Board programme	236,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. members that this is a particularly significant day for approximately 75,000 people in Ontario. For those Canadians who are of Portuguese descent, today is the national day of Portugal.

In the selection of its national day, Portugal is somewhat unique among nations for June 10 commemorates the death of a poet. Luis de Camoes, who died in 1580, is venerated for his moving accounts of the glories of the great Portuguese explorers, Vasco da Gama, Magellan and others, who not only explored most parts of the world, but developed for us our modern navigational methods.

From our very beginning, we in Canada have been blessed by the Portuguese presence. Labrador, for example, is named for the Portuguese explorer, Juan Labrador. There is a statue in Newfoundland to mark the visit of another Portuguese explorer, Corte Real.

We are fortunate that this spirit of adventure and discovery continues to the present, for it has brought to Toronto alone 50,000 people of Portuguese descent, and we welcome those who continue to arrive in our province. The character of the Portuguese people embraces the finest of human qualities. This day, the national day of Portugal, is being observed in a number of Ontario cities with a week-long programme of events, culminating in our capital city this Sunday evening at Nathan Phillips Square with a festival of Portuguese art, folksong and dance.

I am sure that the members of the Legislature would wish to join with me in conveying to the Portuguese consul in Toronto, Dr. Luis Martins, and his kin, congratulations and best wishes from the people of Ontario.

Parabens e os melhores desejos do Povo do Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may we associate ourselves vigorously with those remarks and extend a particular welcome to the 75,000 Portuguese citizens who are resident in the Province of Ontario and wish them a very good week indeed; and hope, perhaps, as part of the celebration of that week, that the Portuguese government might provide amnesty to its political prisoners.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The member would have to put that in.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, knowing the propensity of the hon. minister in sending out his congratulations to a lot of people concerned who are very much honoured indeed that these matters are raised in the House, I think it should be well known to all of us that the Portuguese people who have come into this province have, perhaps to a greater extent than some others, spread themselves over the agricultural areas and have not just maintained their own communities in the urban areas. I know that the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) is looking at me, and perhaps nodding, because there is a large group of them in his area who have established a substantial reputation for the honesty they bring to the kind of work they do for farmers and in establishing their own farms. They are ideal neighbours, and certainly we welcome the comments made by the hon. minister.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Private bills, second reading.

Clerk of the House: Private bills, the 22nd order; second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was advised at 11 o'clock this morning that the order of business immediately following the question period was going to be the budget debate. Even on Tuesday night there is a record of it in the Instant Hansard and yet here, without any notice whatsoever, the House leader indicates that he is going to second readings.

How does Mr. Speaker expect this House to operate with any degree of efficiency if we are going to perpetuate the kind of thing that has been going on for the last three or four weeks?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the point of order is well taken. When I say this, in speaking to the point of order, I did announce yesterday, that the order of business today would be some budget debate, to be followed, if there was time, by second readings of bills whose numbers I mentioned on the order paper; and then this evening the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): But the minister did not mention private bills in that list.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now there are on the order paper for second reading six private bills. They ordinarily would not take more than six minutes. They ordinarily would not have any debate. There is some urgency in one or two of them because of their nature. Perhaps I should have offered a word of explanation first, which I do now. I think, in less than 10 minutes we will be through with those six bills if the House will permit.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister does not have an estimate lineup for us yet? I understand his colleagues nearly had a duel over who would come last?

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Morrow moves second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be referred for third reading?

Agreed.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. Bolton moves second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. Villeneuve, in the absence of Mr. Gilbertson, moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. Kennedy moves second reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the Town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF PELEE

Mr. Ruston, in the absence of Mr. Paterson, moves second reading of Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the Township of Pelee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GUELPH GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. B. Newman, in the absence of Mr. Worton, moves second reading of Bill Pr38, An Act respecting Guelph General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the House will permit third readings to follow, they should take another two or three minutes.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the City of London.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, because I was not aware at the time second reading was given that private bills go automatically to third reading without the opportunity to speak in Committee of the Whole House, I did not raise any objection. I wonder if, on third reading, you would allow me to make a brief comment on Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the City of London?

Mr. Speaker: I might say that it is a relatively new procedure in accordance with our new standing orders. The hon. member missed the point that the bills automatically are standing on the order paper for third reading. I think no harm can be done by permitting him a comment.

Mr. Peacock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Clause 3 of Bill Pr16 establishes a new principle in our housing legislation in the Province of Ontario, in respect to the relationship between landlord and tenant. The city of London is seeking here a principle which I support with considerable enthusiasm. It is a principle to which I gave my support on first coming to this Legislature; that is where a landlord refuses to comply with the order of the housing standards committee to repair or restore his premises to the standards described in the bylaw of the city of London, then a notice of non-compliance served on the landlord under a bylaw of council may direct that the rents otherwise payable to him go directly to the corporation of the city of London. Therefore a landlord who is in the default of the housing bylaw standards does not continue to gain an economic benefit from that defiance where his property does not meet the standards. The council can impose the sanction and by this means force the landlord to comply.

I think that is indeed very welcome. But I think the section of the bill, and I believe of the earlier legislation respecting the city of London which originally set up the housing standards committee and the code of housing standards, is in default of the recommendations of Mr. Justice McRuer, in that a landlord notified of the committee's decision to comply with the standards is not given any

chance to appeal. I raised this with the solicitor and officers of the corporation when they appeared before the private bills committee, and at that point I think it was represented to the private bills committee that owners of property faced with an order to comply with the standards could not appeal from a finding or decision of the housing standards committee to any court or to council or a committee of council.

While I express my full support for the intent of the legislation, I make that reservation; that before any such order as provided in section 3 of the bill is enacted by council, taking the rents from the landlord and paying them over for the benefit of the tenants so that repairs may be made, the landlord should not be subject to a single decision on the part of the housing standards committee but should have the right to appeal from that committee to council or the courts.

I think the reservation I have just expressed is in line with the recommendations of Mr. McRuer. I would trust that the city of London would return to the private bills committee to amend the prior city of London legislation to make that good.

THIRD READINGS
(continued)

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that third reading of Bill Pr33 be deferred at this time and we go to Bill Pr36.

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the Township of Pelee.

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last Friday, I was outlining this party's position in regard to the medical scheme in the province. I would reiterate at this time that we would combine the medical services and hospital services and that we would do away with premiums for medical coverage and finance the medical charges out of the general revenues of the province.

Today I would like to speak about some other topics. I see the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) is in the House and I would like to say a few words to him in regard to conservation problems, for his edification and possible programmes later on. I have written the minister a letter and he has been kind enough to reply, in regard to hiring university students to act as summer game wardens or conservation officers in the Province of Ontario.

Particularly where I live in northwestern Ontario, we have a great many tourists. Fishermen, particularly Americans, come to our area to hunt and fish and we welcome them. There is a problem, however Mr. Speaker, that because of the vast areas to be covered, the fishermen are not checked as regularly and as often as we would like.

We read stories every season of some fishermen being caught with 100 fish over their limit, or 25 fish over their limit, and our lakes cannot stand this kind of pressure. I have suggested by way of letter to the minister, and this was a suggestion passed on to me by a university student, that the department hire summer conservation officers and station them at the border crossings which would allow them to check the catches of the fishermen as they return home. In this way, I think that we would cut down on the practice of those who take more than their limit.

The second thing I would like to bring to the minister's attention and ask for his consideration is in regard to non-resident fishing licences. I throw this out for discussion, but I would think that it would be to the advantage of the Ontario people and to The Department of Lands and Forests to institute a two-week non-resident fishing licence. In other words, if a party comes up fishing on July 1, they are issued a licence until July 14 or July 15. After that, if they return to Ontario to fish later on in the fall, or any other time, they must purchase an additional licence.

As it is now, for the sum of $8.50—which I have pointed out before is one of the lowest fishing licence charges for non-residents in Canada—the fisherman can return time and time again and fish in Canadian waters for the price of the $8.50. And as the minister is well aware, this is often the only benefit,

the only economic benefit, that we get from some of these tourists, so I would suggest for the minister's thought that he take this into consideration—the instituting of such a licence. It would of course add to the general revenues of the Province of Ontario.

In this regard, we also have a problem in the north and the northwest in regard to camper trailers, and we sometimes call these the "Pork and Bean Tourists," who come to our part of the province. He comes in and the only purchase he makes while he is in Ontario is a fishing licence. He parks his camper trailer on a bush road or forestry road or by a lake. He does not pay for any tourist accommodation. He brings his own boat and motor. He brings his own food, his own gasoline, his own alcohol—

An hon. member: Oh shame!

Mr. T. P. Reid: —and spends not a penny in Ontario over and above his fishing licence.

The real problem, as the minister is well aware, is the problem of controlling these people, and of controlling particularly their garbage and litter because this kind of person, I say, the Province can do without. But they come; they do camp in inaccessible areas. There is no restriction on them and the minister I am sure is aware of the ramifications of the problem.

The minister had a committee set up, under the chairmanship, I believe, of the district forester at Sioux Lookout, and that report, I understand, was made to the minister over a year ago or six months ago, and yet—well you have had it for some time in any case—we have yet to hear anything about it. I am hoping that soon the minister will come up with some kind of policy that will enable us to control these kind of people.

Perhaps it will be necessary to come up with a policy that would restrict camper trailers to the main highways—the King's or the Queen's highways in Ontario—and make it a regulation or a prohibition that they cannot park in these areas, because the longer the minister procrastinates in this area the worse the problem gets.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The higher the garbage piles.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The higher the garbage piles, indeed. Well those are just a few things that I would like the minister to think about.

An hon. member: I have a speech I ought to think about too.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, while I have the Minister of Lands and Forests here to pass on my thoughts to the cabinet, I would like to tell the House of my frustration with the Minister of Lands and Forests and the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier).

We have just completed the estimates of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs. It was probably some of the most frustrating hours that I have spent in this Legislature. I think there is a disease over there, on that side of the House, that started with the Premier (Mr. Davis).

A year ago I referred to the then Minister of Education and now Premier as "bland Bill." One could never get an answer out of the Premier on anything one asked him. As a matter of fact—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Things have not changed a bit.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —the comment was made that he was the Paul Martin of the Ontario Conservative Party, and I think Mr. Martin—

An hon. member: Oh now, now!

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think the analogy is an insidious one, but certainly Mr. Martin could take lessons from our friend, the Premier. In any case, this blandness and this refusal to answer questions—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He cannot remember his name.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —has been communicated, in particular to the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs. The Minister of Lands and Forests, of course, has been suffering from this disease for the 3½ years that I have been here.

But we got nothing out of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs either. The Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs did not see fit, Mr. Speaker, even to make an opening statement, even though he was a new cabinet minister, and had taken over a new department in effect—that part dealing with Northern Affairs—and yet we had no statement from the minister of his views, of his policies or of the directives and initiatives that his department was going to take.

And under intensive questioning by the opposition during the estimates we did not get any answers of any kind. We discussed with the minister the situation in regard to our northern mining towns, the problems with the high cost of transportation and so on; and

we got nothing, absolutely nothing out of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Personally, as a member from the north, Mr. Speaker, I was most disappointed. I had hoped that with the minister from Kenora in the cabinet we would have a little more weight—that the voice of the north would carry a little more weight in the decisions of government.

Such, apparently, is not the case. The minister himself is not prepared to undertake any intiative in his own department and I suppose we can expect no initiative therefore in the cabinet on his behalf.

We are worried that anything that is done or said in regard to northwestern or northern Ontario, by this government is so much window dressing. I do not think the Minister of Lands and Forests carries much weight in the cabinet.

I recall to mind about 1½ years ago when the minister had not been told that his deputy minister was going to be seconded to another government study. During the estimates of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs we also learned that the programmes and policies outlined by the then minister (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), the predecessor of the minister from Kenora, were not really being carried over by the present minister.

As a matter of fact, we learned that many of the initiatives that were at least spoken of by the then minister when he held that portfolio were not going to be taken up and pressed by the new minister. There was one very telling charge, Mr. Speaker, that the minister from St. George went around this province, and particularly across the north, preaching great things about northern Ontario and what he was going to do for the development of northern Ontario.

We were all impressed with that, but the minister from Kenora knew better. He knew that was so much window-dressing and so much talk because the minister from Kenora did not support the then Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs in the leadership campaign. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that even at that time the present Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs knew that the proposals outlined or suggested by the then Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, really had little or no substance to them.

Before I go on to pollution, Mr. Speaker, while I have the Minister of Lands and Forests still in the House, I would like him to be prepared, because I am going to ask him about his policy and the government's policy in regard to helping commercial fishermen who are fishing in areas where there is mercury contamination. Now I asked this question of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) and he said, "Oh well, we have a programme of loans for the fishermen." This, to my mind, is the only programme that the minister has at the moment. Am I correct?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting the decision from Ottawa on a programme for commercial fishermen.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The situation, as the minister well knows, is that many fishermen on particular lakes—and I am concerned mostly at this point with northwestern Ontario—are fishing in lakes that have some degree of contamination. Last year when these fish were tested by the federal Department of Fisheries and found to be contaminated, the province and the federal government compensated the fishermen for those fish that were destroyed. Some time ago—a month or two months ago, the minister can refresh my memory on the exact date—the Minister of Lands and Forests wrote Mr. Davis, the federal Minister of Fisheries, telling him that Ontario was going to withdraw its support from this programme. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. What I said to the Minister of Fisheries was that at the present time we have reviewed The Fishermen's Loan Act at 100 per cent cost to this province; that we had also the programme of assistance to fishermen under The Department of Trade and Development and that we were reluctant to embark on a prorgamme of purchasing rejected fish.

However, I have since then written to the minister and indicated that we are prepared to do so I believe that we are, as I said earlier, awaiting word from Ottawa whether they are also prepared to do so.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am very glad to hear that because maybe finally we are going to get somewhere. The fishermen have been fishing for two or three weeks now without any indication of whether the fish that are contaminated are going to be paid for. I understand the minister to say, then, that in fact the Ontario government has said to the federal government "We will pay for the fish that are destroyed because of mercury contamination if you will agree with us on a

shared-cost basis" or something? Fine. I am very glad to hear that.

All right, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on and make a few remarks then about pollution and the pollution problems in this province. My remarks will be brief and, I hope, to the point. They can be summed up really in one sentence.

The present Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Kerr) who is responsible for pollution in this province is really doing nothing. His department is doing nothing. Since he took over that portfolio he has done nothing except bang his desk and make loud noises.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He is what you call a nothing minister!

Mr. T. P. Reid: We have really got very little in the way of any provincial initiative since the present minister took over that portfolio. I am sure that all hon. members know that there is hardly any legislation that has come down in regard to pollution problems since he has been in that portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, today I handed the Clerk of the Legislature a question to go on the order paper and I would like to read it into the record.

Inquiry of the ministry:

> Could the Minister of Energy and Resources Management advise the number of charges laid in the last two years by the Ontario Water Resources Commission or the air management branch or his department in regard to: (1) Water pollution and and (2) Air pollution? Against whom were the charges laid? Was there any conviction? What was the penalty?
>
> 2. How many firms have been served with a ministerial order within the last two years that would require them to discontinue practices which contribute to (1), water, and (2), air pollution?
>
> 3. How many of these have been complied with or how many that did not meet the deadline have been charged and what were the results of these charges?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, when we get the answers to these questions, that we will have a little more information than the minister has so far provided us with.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has taken no initiative in regard to his department. In the time that I have been criticizing his department and the estimates of the other department we are just over, I raised again with the minister the problem of noise pollution. To this, the minister replied that he was not all that interested and that it was more a municipal responsibility.

I asked him at that time, "On what do you base your decision, for instance, on where the new airport is going to be? Do you take into consideration the noise factor?" We are all aware, of course, that noise causes fatigue and nervousness and leads to high blood pressure in certain people and so on. It is a factor in our lives and it should be dealt with and dealt with by this government.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): It is the noise around here that bothers me.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister is certainly a prime example of noise bothering someone, because one can see his blood rise when we, on this side, make remarks to him. But just to prove and underline what I am saying in regard to initiatives, Mr. Speaker, I would refer you to the McRuer commission report, inquiring into civil rights, in which in volume 5 he deals with various departments of government and various commissions of government. There is also a section in volume 5 dealing with the ODA and the Ontario Water Resources Commission in which Mr. Justice McRuer makes many recommendations as to how the present legislation can be made better and more effective.

I would just like to quote from the McRuer commission, chapter 128, page 2113, and there is a heading called, "The Permission to Pollute." Referring to the OWRC, it says:

> The commission has wide powers designed for the protection against pollution of water supplies, but at the same time, it exercises equally wide powers, or wider powers to permit pollution.

Justice McRuer goes on to say:

> The result is that The Department of Health, the commission or the Ontario Municipal Board may give approval which has the effect of exempting the person obtaining it from the penal consequences of the act.

Now he goes on to make certain proposals and recommendations, and I would bring them to the attention of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management if he has not read McRuer.

On page 2124, in particular, he makes recommendations in regard to OWRC, and he says in recommendation number 5:

A full review of all provincial legislation respecting the use of water should be conducted with a view to: (a) Determining a coherent policy on this subject;

Obviously, at the moment, there is no coherent policy on the subject:

and (b) Removing conflicting statutory provisions relating thereto.

Now we have had the report of Mr. McRuer for some time, Mr. Speaker, and yet to my knowledge nothing has been done in this regard. He makes 18 recommendations as to a way in which the OWRC should be made a better department of government.

When I said, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Energy and Resources Management in regard to pollution has done nothing, I refer also to the Environmental Council of Ontario. Now I introduced a bill last year, Mr. Speaker, called the Environmental Council of Ontario, which had two main purposes, one of which was to be an objective board to report on the condition of the environment to the Legislature every year, and to be a continuing advisory and investigatory body in regard to pollution problems in the Province of Ontario.

In the Throne Speech this very thing was alluded to and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, we returned here March 30. This is almost three months later and yet we have not seen any sign of the Environmental Council of Ontario bill, and I wonder just whether we are going to get to that before this Legislature prorogues.

Perhaps it is just part again of the window dressing of this government—a headline and no action. If the whip can tell me that this legislation is going to be introduced within the next two weeks I would be very happy to hear that. Can the whip do that?

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): You are just being cynical. You want to be cynical and nasty.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, I recall to mind—"cynical," the member says—I was not, I was a fresh, young, innocent young man, trustworthy and trusting, when I came to this Legislature 3½ years ago. Since that time those of you on the opposite side have turned me into a rather suspicious and rather cynical person, and made me an old man in the bargain.

Mr. Stokes: You mean you have lost your innocence?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, you people would bring out the worst in anybody, and you do, you do indeed.

The minister says "cynical." I recall a bill in a debate we had here when we were talking about air pollution or garbage disposal; a bill that I believe the Minister of Health introduced with a great deal of fanfare in the last session before the election. It had to do with environmental problems and there was a great deal of fanfare and publicity about that, but that bill was never given Royal Assent, it never became the law of this province. A great amount of publicity, but no concrete evidence that there was really any intention of this government to do anything toward solving the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I offer those few remarks in that regard. I close that particular topic only with the suggestion that the minister have a look at McRuer and the recommendations he makes in regard to his particular responsibilities.

Also, for the information of the Minister of Energy and Resources—and I do not want to get into a great long speech again about the power export from Fort Frances, Ontario, to International Falls, Minnesota—but I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, the Statutes of Canada, 1959. I am looking at the statute, chapter 46, in regard to the National Energy Board, and I just want to put this in the record that section 83 outlines the terms of reference of the National Energy Board, and these are two, really. Section A and section B of section 83 read:

(a) The quantity of gas or power to be exported does not exceed the surplus remaining after due allowance has been made from the reasonable, foreseeable requirements for use in Canada, having regard to the trends in the discovery of gas in Canada.

The first term of reference of the National Energy Board therefore, sir, is to decide whether the export of power, whether it be hydro or gas, is surplus to the needs of Canada.

The second term of reference of the National Energy Board is:

(b) The price to be charged by an applicant for gas or power exported by him is just and reasonable in relation to the public interest.

Their second term of reference, therefore, is that the power to be exported be sold at a reasonable price which will be of general benefit to Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring this up is because the minister and I have had an on-going battle in regard to this power question. I maintain—and justifiably so—that the power question is a matter of provincial concern.

The Ontario government gave their approval to an agreement between Boise Cascade and Ontario Hydro for the export of power. They then threw the responsibility for making the decision on the National Energy Board as to whether this power would be detrimental to the employment opportunities of the people of Ontario, and in particular, the Rainy River district and Fort Frances.

I succeeded, I think, in convincing the Minister of Energy and Resources that he should at least modify and qualify his approval for the export of power, and I think it obvious, Mr. Speaker, that when one looks at section 83 of The National Energy Board Act that it is no part of their power to base their decision on whether the power exports should be or should not be. It is no part of their power to decide whether or not that export will be detrimental to employment opportunities in Ontario.

Therefore, the responsibility for ensuring that it will not be detrimental to the people of Ontario rests with the Ontario government. And yet, instead of protecting the interests of the people of Ontario, the government opposite went ahead and gave their approval for this export of power.

I have mentioned this so many times in this Legislature that I hope this question will never arise again, because the responsibility for objecting and opposing an export of power which would be detrimental to the job opportunities for the people of Ontario surely rests with the Ontario government.

And the Minister of Energy and Resources and the cabinet generally have tried to slough that responsibility off onto the National Energy Board. That will not wash. It is the Ontario government's responsibility. They made a mistake. They tried to rectify it as best they could, I think, but having made a deal with Boise-Cascade they tried hard not to back down on it.

I hope that in the future this will never arise again, and that the province will respect the responsibility they have in this regard. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a Liberal administration will accept the responsibility and protect the jobs and the employment opportunities of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the Liberal Party's policy—

Mr. Stokes: Is the hon. member going to speak about them all?

Mr. T. P. Reid: You know, that is rather interesting—"Do I want to speak about all my policies?" I heard that exchange in the House this afternoon and I looked across at that sea of blank bland faces which constitute the Conservative monolith, and then I turned to my left and I saw blank bland faces of the NDP—another monolith.

There are no individuals in either party, Mr. Speaker. They all hold the party line. They all do what they are told, except for Mr. Shulman of course—pardon me—the hon. member for High Park—and of course, he is not a socialist anyway—he is not an NDP'er —he is just an anti-Tory and really does not fit into that party any more than he would fit in the Tory Party. Not that I am suggesting that he would fit in this party.

But for the rest of them, Mr. Speaker, they all toe and heel the party line and it is a little frightening. Most of us are in this party because we are individuals and we do express our concern and our differing viewpoints and we have that right and privilege to do so on our own behalf and on behalf of our constituents, and I think we are the only party in this Legislature that can admit to that.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Admit to what?

Mr. T. P. Reid: The rest—the NDP, the Conservatives all do what they are told.

I am glad the member brought that up because I was reading a little statement about what the NDP can learn from the Liberals in regard to democracy and decision-making. And there is a rather extensive article by Stephen Clarkson that was written in the Toronto Daily Star on May 3, 1971.

Mr. Gaunt: Very impartial observer.

Mr. Stokes: What did the member learn from him about Spadina?

Mr. T. P. Reid: And Clarkson, and others, Mr. Speaker, have pointed out that probably the least democratic party in Ontario, and certainly in Canada, is the New Democratic Party. I must admit that they have done a wonderful snow-job in convincing people otherwise; they talk about it being the party of the people—

An hon. member: Oh, yes! The member knows what people!

Mr. T. P. Reid: —that the policy comes from the grass roots. Let me tell you who makes the policy in Ontario. The member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), makes the policy—

Mr. Stokes: Nonsense.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —and a little cadre of what they euphemistically call the inner council. That is who makes the policy in Ontario. And who really tells the member for Scarborough West what to say? I will tell you who tells the member for Scarborough West what to say. It is the unions, and particularly the United Auto Workers Union. That is who runs the New Democratic Party. That is who runs the "No Downpayment Party."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: The union bosses can really make them bow and scrape, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: They were campaigning in Brant—American cars, American cars, union men strike. Right.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that our friends on the left who are talking about American domination—

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —of our economy. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what were those—

An hon. member: Americans campaigning in elections in Canada.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —Michigan licence plates doing in Brant during the federal by-election?

Mr. Makarchuk: There was not a single Michigan worker.

Mr. Stokes: They were tourists.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Who did those Michigan licence plates belong to? Who did those cars belong to? Were they members of the United Auto Workers of America? Is that where they came from? Michigan?

Mr. Ruston: That is right. That is where they came from.

Mr. T. P. Reid: To knock on doors, to be part of the NDP?

Mr. Makarchuk: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: And then they believe in Canadian nationalism.

Mr. T. P. Reid: And they are trying to tell us that they are Canadian nationalists, that they believe we should run our own affairs, Mr. Speaker, and yet —

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I think it is customary in the House for the member to speak as he pleases but certainly it is not customary to mislead the members of the House and the member for Rainy River, at the moment, is absolutely misleading in his statement.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Oh, no. We have documentation.

An hon. member: That is no point of order.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What was the point of order? My goodness, I sat here for 3½ years and have been misled by you people. I take it then, really, the result—what the hon. member was getting at really in his interjection was a denial. His interjection was a denial that there was anyone from Michigan—

Mr. Stokes: I guess the member's experience in Brant really must have hurt a lot more than we will ever know.

Mr. Makarchuk: The member is telling us a lie, that is what I am saying. The member is telling a lie.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is the member denying that there was anyone from Michigan—

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There were no United Auto Workers—

An hon. member: We do not deny they were auto workers but they were not from Michigan.

Mr. Makarchuk: Absolutely, there was not a single one.

Mr. T. P. Reid: All right. Let me rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. Was there anyone from Michigan, whether he be a United Auto Worker or otherwise, taking part in the NDP campaign in the by-election in Brant?

Mr. Makarchuk: Absolutely not.

Mr. Ruston: Now who is lying? What about those little cameras the American people—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think that we can have this documented, Mr. Speaker. I think we can have this documented very well. I understand there is photographic evidence these cars actually were there and one—I would not want to accuse the member of bringing in Americans to help the NDP campaign. I would not suggest that but certainly somebody did and I know it was not the Liberals and I know it was not the Conservative Party.

Mr. Stokes: Has the member ever seen a Minnesota licence in Fort Frances?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does the member mean that he is going to bring Minnesotans in to campaign against me too?

Mr. Stokes: They happen to be tourists.

Mr. T. P. Reid: My information, Mr. Speaker, and it is open to question, I suppose—I admit that.

Mr. Makarchuk: Absolutely. As a matter of fact the member has been misleading the House. In fact, he has been lying, outright lying.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —that there were Michigan license plates there. Perhaps I was misled. Perhaps it was not the UAW. Perhaps it was another union, or maybe it was the Teamsters. Perhaps I have been misled on that point. But there is no doubt there were cars bearing Michigan licence plates of people who were campaigning in Brant during the last federal by-election.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, the member is lying. Period.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, is that parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to watch his language. Would the member please continue to speak.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think I should have an apology. That is hardly parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —to accuse another member of lying. I would like that remark withdrawn and stricken from the record, on a point of order, if you like, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member withdraw his remarks—the member for Brantford?

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member made a statement and I said that he was misleading the House, and the member persisted in making the statement and he has the evidence and if he feels he has the evidence he can present it because—

Mr. Paterson: That is right. We have the evidence.

Mr. Makarchuk: Because I was involved in that campaign for most of the period of time and I happen to know there were no people from Michigan or from the States—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I cannot understand how you know people—

Mr. Makarchuk: —involved in any way in that particular campaign, and if the member persists then he is either misleading the House or else making an out-and-out accusation or a lie, any way you want to put it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, that hardly sounds like a withdrawal to me, Mr. Speaker, but—

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): You did put it that way.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well he—

Mr. Speaker: Will you accept that as a partial withdrawal?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Pardon me?

Mr. Ruston: The member for Brantford is admitting then he ran the election and is aware of everybody who worked there then, while he was a member here and he was being paid at the same time here, eh?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have digressed somewhat. I was talking about democracy in the NDP and we have already got to the point where we realize there is not any. You know, it is run by the unions and by one or two unions, notably the Auto Workers'.

I recall how their policy evolved. During this business over Quetico Park, one of the NDP candidates discovered that this was a good issue and that he should jump on the bandwagon. So he jumped on a plane, came down to Toronto, met with whom I am not sure—I imagine it was the leader of the party —and came back to the northwest and announced with a great deal of fanfare that the NDP was now against commercial logging

in Quetico Park. And that was where that policy came from. Which makes it rather interesting when we hear all these long stories about how democratic the NDP is.

However, it brings to mind a few other things; Mr. Speaker, just how democratic and what a nice bunch of people they really are. Now, I sat here and I watched them put the knife into poor old Donald. Do you remember Donald MacDonald, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Ruston: Yes, fine fellow.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He was the leader of the New Democratic Party at one point, but he had to go—

Mr. Makarchuk: Nice guy.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He had to go because young Stephen was getting impatient and had to really live up to the Lewis name. He could not wait. So poor old Donald had to go. But, the leader of the NDP is rather a crafty fellow, you know; he did not stick the knife into poor old Donald directly. No, he stuck the member for Riverdale into the scenario, and he managed with one fell swoop to stick the knife into the member for Riverdale and the leader of the NDP both at the same time. So having disposed of his opposition, and with the powerful backing of the trade unions, the member for Scarborough West grasped that power that he so obviously desires so much and which frightens me a little. But it recalled to mind, you know, as I watched this drama unfold with the cast of characters, of Julius Cæsar in a way; although there are really not too many personal characteristics of Julius Cæsar in Donald MacDonald. But let us cast it as if it were Julius Cæsar; let us use the ex-leader of the NDP as Julius Cæsar. And you can just see Donald MacDonald one day saying to Morton Shulman, for instance, call him Petronius or somebody—on the way into the Legislature Donald, alias Cæsar, says: "Yond' Stephen has a lean and hungry look; . . . such men are dangerous."

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That is Cassius. Brutus said that of Cassius.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, it is Cassius. That is right. But we are casting young Stephen in the role of—well, we would not use Mark Antony, but—

Mr. Stokes: You had better go back and do a little research. You do not even know your characters. It was Brutus.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, I am getting to that. The member for Riverdale is Brutus in this scenario, you know, with the greatest of intentions and the good of the party. But he did not know that young Cassius, alias Stephen, was the one who was putting him up to this. And the same thing happened to the member for Riverdale as happened to Brutus, and young Cassius really came out on top.

Mr. J. Renwick: You must have been in Stratford Monday night for "Much Ado About Nothing."

Mr. T. P. Reid: Unfortunately, I was not. But it was beautifully done—there was the hon. member for Riverdale, the Brutus, stabbing poor old Donald in the back, and there was young Stephen ready to grasp the mantle of power. It was a beautifully done job. And I have not resolved in my own mind, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member for Riverdale was really part and parcel of this plot to get rid of Donald MacDonald, or whether he was a more than willing dupe of his leader. I really have not figured that out.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Monday night's play was "Much To Do About Nothing."

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): We have had it today. We do not need to go to Stratford.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is what I think this speech is.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is an interesting situation, you know.

Mr. J. Renwick: Come and buy me a drink and we will discuss this.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the hon. member tell me? He will tell me, will he?

Mr. J. Renwick: I will go outside with the hon. member and the House can get on with the business.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, it is an interesting proposition.

Mr. Makarchuk: However, as a playwright you are a flop.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, we know in this party what they did to poor old Donald in gratitude for the years he led the NDP.

Mr. Worton: They bought him a farm.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They kicked him out. They pushed him out. Young Stephen's ambition had to be resolved, it had to be fuelled. So they did away with poor old Donald, and away he went. And that young radical Stephen Lewis has now incorporated a new image of sweet reasonableness and moderation.

It was funny to an onlooker in politics or a spectator of politics to see that fiery young man who stands in this House, his eyes blazing and his chin wavering, and shaking a menacing finger across the floor. It was strange to see that same man at the NDP national leadership campaign saying: "For God's sake boys, cool it. Take it easy, We are on TV. Look calm, look moderate, look bland. We do not want any fights here." It was quite a spectacle.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Any time you want to come over just send a message.

Mr. T. P. Reid: No. You know, Mr. Speaker, this party is often accused of being divided on some issues, and perhaps with some justification. But the NDP is probably the worst-split party of any in Canada and certainly in this Legislature.

Mr. Stokes: A split personality.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They are a split personality. There is a certain amount of schizophrenia there. There is no doubt about that. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, if you watched the NDP leadership convention, the strength the Waffle group showed.

Mr. J. Renwick: Let him go on. This is an obituary.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, and this will make great reading.

Mr. T. P. Reid: By the time it was all over—Lewis senior only won by 40 some votes—and it demonstrated I think—I am sorry, more than 40 votes—it went much longer than anyone suspected—the strength of the Waffle group. And here we have those paragons of participatory democracy as symbolized by the leader of the NDP saying: "If they do not toe the line they are going to be kicked out of the party."

Now there they were, Mr. Speaker. They have that ability which they share with the Tories of being able to talk out of both sides of their mouth at the same time. On the one hand they say everyone is welcome in this party. You can put forward your point of view any time you want. We will listen to you. And on the other side David Lewis is saying: "If you do not like what we are doing, you get out or we will kick you out."

As a matter of fact, in a press report after the leadership convention he went into great length and at some pains to tell us how he had really crushed the Wafflers. Well the Wafflers are not dead and gone yet, and really I think they are fulfilling the function the NDP should. They should be a leftwing group that puts forward new ideas, that has—

Mr. J. Renwick: You sound like B. Honderich.

Mr. Makarchuk: Here comes the member for Sudbury, the leader of the Waffle.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —if you like, for want of a better word, the conscience of the people, but what does the NDP as it sits in this Legislature, represent, Mr. Speaker?

It reflects now a very moderate refined, reasonable rational liberalism and we already have a party—this party—that reflects those views. We do not need an NDP that is a poor, pale imitation of the present Liberal Party in Ontario.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear.

Mr. J. Renwick: You were right up to that last word.

Mr. T. P. Reid: But you know, and you realize, and your leader realizes especially, that only by denuding himself and his party of that radical tinge do you have a chance of winning the government of Ontario, and I say to you, gentlemen, that you have sold your principles and the raison d'etre of your party and it is sad to see, particularly when you are not going to win the election in spite of devoiding yourself of all principles that you once had.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is what you said in Brant. That is exactly what you said in Brant and it did not work.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, maybe I am not as hardened and cynical a politician as the hon. member who just spoke. But I do not want to win the next election if I have to give up the principles that I hold, and reject the position that I have put forward in this Legislature.

Mr. Lawlor: The Liberal-Labour Party.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You are not going to change—

Mr. Lawlor: How do you work that labour?

Mr. T. P. Reid: —my personality so that I can win an election. I win it on what I stand for and what I represent, and I will remain that way. And it is unfortunate that the member's party does not see fit to operate in that fashion also.

I would like to go on, Mr. Speaker. Before I was so rudely interrupted by the party on the left, I was going—

Mr. Lawlor: You really make us mad.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —to put this party's platform, which has been stated by the Leader of the official Opposition before. I would just like to reiterate it at this time, because I feel it would be helpful, particularly in view of the conference that is coming up on foreign investments. And I would like to tell you very briefly what our policy is in this regard, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, we could use that as a framework in considering the speeches you will hear in the next two weeks in regard to this.

Firstly, in regard to foreign investment in Ontario; the first point is, a Liberal government will immediately establish a takeover review board to screen takeovers of all Ontario-incorporated firms. Secondly, the Liberal Party would require complete financial disclosure from private companies doing business in Ontario. Thirdly, the Liberal Party will implement legislation preserving Canadian control of the finance industry of Ontario. Fourthly, the Liberal Party will require the Ontario Development Corporation to give clear preference to Canadian firms. The corporation, of course, should also take a substantial equity position in growth industries and to act, if need be, in particular situations as a buyer of last resort.

Fifthly, the Liberal Party will insist that any policy on foreign ownership be related to an overall industrial strategy. For example, the Liberal Party will require rigorous enforcement of the laws presently in the Ontario books, in requiring minerals mined in Ontario to be processed in Canada. Multi-national corporations will be encouraged to do more research and development in Ontario.

And sixthly, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal government will demand the right of first refusal on the sale of privately held land in designated regions of Ontario, to any person who is not a resident in Canada.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with those six planks, I think that is a reasonable approach to the problem of foreign control in Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: You do not get much support federally on those six points.

Mr. Ruston: Those six planks will put us across the bridge to government.

Mr. Nixon: Just climb back into bed with the Waffle. Keep warm there.

Mr. Singer: Figure out how to get back off Spadina.

Mr. Lawlor: Your worst enemies are your friends.

Mr. Makarchuk: The Waffle menance did not work in Brant even though you used it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to another topic and it has to do with architects in the Province of Ontario, and my mind was refreshed in this regard by the editorial in last Saturday's Globe and Mail in regard to architects.

The headline of that editorial was: "Self-serving Architects." I think it was a fairly good editorial but it did not go far enough in my view in pointing out some of the abuses that are presently being perpetrated by architects in the Province of Ontario. The editorial reads, Mr. Speaker:

> As a member of the Ontario Association of Architects, the architect has to charge a minimum fee for all work he does. He cannot do professional competitive work free of charge. For instance, if he wants to design a church, or a synagogue for his religious community, he must charge them a fee. An architect cannot do it at a reduced rate. He cannot even promise to waive his fee if his work proves unsatisfactory.

These are some of the things that are wrong with the architectural society in the Province of Ontario. But there is even something that is worse than that, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to you that they are running a closed shop in Ontario. It is a closed shop, a union shop, and I want to relate to you, Mr. Speaker, some personal problems I have had with this.

About a year ago, a fellow I knew in university came into my office to discuss this situation with me. He was from Manitoba but he could not be certified as an architect in Ontario until he met certain rules and regulations. Presently, a friend of mine is in Toronto taking a week's course at the University of Toronto so that he can qualify as an

architect in Ontario. He studied for six years at the University of Manitoba. He has got eight years' experience as an architect, most of which experience took place in Ontario and yet altogether he has had to take three weeks of courses to qualify. Of course, because he does not have that little slip of paper that admits him to the society of architects, or whatever they call them, he has to work at a reduced salary. Really, it is a form of bondage. These courses that he has to take probably are going to cost him anywhere between $1,000 and $2,000 or more because of the time off he has to take away from his actual job, because he has to travel to Toronto and pay room and board and transportation expenses. Here we have a man who took a six-year course of studies and has eight years' experience. Not only is it an annoyance, but it is an insult. And it is a humiliating thing for a man in that position to have to go through what he and others are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, The Architects Act, which was passed in 1937, gives the architects' society a great deal of discretion and power in section 12(a) of the Act: "The board may make regulations for the admission of members of the association and the annual renewal of membership therein." All self-governing societies have that, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular case the board of governors of the architects' society is running a closed shop and using the powers given to it in this Act to restrict entry into this occupation.

I referred earlier to McRuer, and I do so again. I refer, sir, to the McRuer inquiry into civil rights, volume 3, chapter 79, which deals with the power of self-government under the general heading of "Self-Governing Professions and Occupations." I would like to quote just a few things, if I may, Mr. Speaker, from McRuer in regard to the self-governing bodies such as the architects' society. From page 1162:

> The granting of self-government is a delegation of legislative and judicial functions and can only be justified as a safeguard to the public interest.

It goes on to say:

> The relevant question is not do the practitioners of this occupation desire the power of self-government, but is self-government necessary for the protection of the public?

That is one thing, Mr. Speaker. The article goes on to say:

> It is not easy to see why powers of self-government, with all the possible monopolistic attributes, have been extended to some of the bodies covered by the enumerated statutes. The power of self-government is essentially the power to decide who shall be permitted to earn his living by the pursuit of a particular calling. As pointed out by Professor Gelhorn, "The basic civil right involved in professional self-government is the right to make a living in the calling of one's choice."

I suggest to you, sir, that at the moment, under present conditions and under the Act of 1937 and the way the architects' society is run, this is not possible.

McRuer goes on to say: "These facts give foundation to the argument that the government of professional bodies is a matter for the state." I think that it is time that the Ontario government had a look at the practises and privileges of the society of architects. The Globe and Mail editorial ends by saying:

> The attitude of the architects is the attitude of tradesmen demanding a closed shop. If architects want to continue mandatory fee scales similar to a union wage contract, they should stop calling themselves a professional association, acknowledge that they are tradesmen who need the protection of union procedures and hand back to the province the special self-governing powers they have enjoyed for so long.

I think that pretty well sums it up, but I would just like to quote something else from McRuer, if I may, also in regard to self-governing bodies. Two questions arise in regard to admission into the society. McRuer says:

> (a) May qualified persons be excluded from entering self-governing bodies, and (b) may the licensing power be used for purposes of limiting the number of persons permitted to become members of the self-governing body?

And I think it is worth having this whole thing in the record, Mr. Speaker.

> The historical precedent of a medieval guild, as described by Professor Gelhorn, illustrates the kind of thing that causes concern. The medieval guilds, whether of merchants or of craftsmen, seem originally to have been concerned with the reputations of their members. Artisans and tradesmen knew that observance of commonly-accepted standards would enhance the

> reputation of all. At the outset, the guild readily accepted new members, seeking only to assure that they would measure up to the prescribed form of reliability. Before the middle of the fourteenth century, however, there was thinly disguised evidence of a means to restrict competition by restricting membership and a century later the disguises were frankly discarded. Competition between one guildsman and another all but disappeared. Each guild pursued a monopoly for its members, exercised virtually complete governmental powers of a legislative, judicial and financial character.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this whole field needs review. The problems in regard to the architects are, as I have said, two. One, that they have this ridiculous scale of fees that have to be charged or the member—as happened to Mr. Selewyn Cooke—is kicked out of the architects' society. The second is, admission into the society itself, and I understand—although I have no evidence of this; and no doubt we will be hearing from the society of architects in this regard—that some people from other provinces are automatically or immediately, shall we say, admitted as members of the society while others have to take these ridiculous courses.

Surely the thing to do is to have a complete review of this? It is a closed shop and if a union shop is really what it is, it certainly should have no place in a professional society.

Well, I leave that with you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the government will pay some attention to the remarks of the editorial of the Globe and Mail and these few comments that I have made this afternoon. I hope that this will serve to shed some light on to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I would just like to say something in regard to senior citizens of this province and in particular to the senior citizens of the Rainy River district. The government has announced that Senior Citizens Week is, I believe, June 22 to 29 this year. We all have senior citizens in our ridings, either living at home or in senior citizens' housing or in senior citizens' old folk's homes.

In my riding particularly, Mr. Speaker, we have many people who were pioneers in the Rainy River district, who came to our area when it was complete wilderness and carved out a homestead and raised their families on farms that they created out of the wilderness. I think that today—and I have stated this before in the House—all the emphasis is on youth, to the neglect I think, in many ways, of the senior citizens of this province and the contribution they made to it.

People of senior ciizen age, shall we say over 65 which is generally accepted, these are the people who perhaps took part in World War I, lived through the Depression and fought and worked through World War II. These are the people who now are really almost second-class citizens, because most of the programmes of the government and of the community are orientated to the youth, not to the people who have made sacrifices and contributions to make this province what it is today.

I am hopeful that the government will pay more attention to the needs and requirements of the elderly in our society. I think that there should be some shift of emphasis away from the young people and to the older to provide some balance to the general benefit of the older citizens and for the youth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all these senior citizens across the Province of Ontario will enjoy the week that is dedicated to them and I hope to see some government programme come forth that will help the senior citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks on the budget address.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity this afternoon to join in the budget debate on the eve of the federal-provincial conference which will start next week in Victoria. I have a few remarks which I would like to make with respect to some of the issues and problems that to me are apparent in this confederation of our provinces.

Not long ago I came across an editorial by Claude Lemelin in the April 2 issue of Le Devoir which was circulated by our federal-provincial affairs secretariat. The article was entitled "Leon Dion's Cry of Alarm" and it was a commentary on the professor's presentation to the parliamentary committee on the constitution.

I would suggest that the members opposite obtain a copy of this article and read it. Perhaps then they might be persuaded to put politics aside and support the Ontario government's new policy of resistance to the concentration of further power in the hands of the Ottawa government and to the deliberate attempts of that government to reduce Ontario's role in building our

nation by policies which are designed to weaken Ontario's economic strength.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Grinding Ontario into poverty.

Mr. Kennedy: We are hearing from the Liberals. I had not forgotten that they were there, even though the people of Ontario have.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member will find out in the next election.

Mr. Kennedy: The member also will.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): No doubt about that.

Mr. Kennedy: First of all, Mr. Speaker, Professor Dion feels that the principle of self-determination must be solemnly proclaimed for Quebec or for any other province which might wish to take advantage of it. I do not want to get sidetracked on this, because this is the issue that caused our NDP friends across here so much trouble in Ottawa in April, except I would say this.

To me, this talk of self determination is as inappropriate to our situation today as was the policy of unconditional surrender during World War II. If and when the day comes that the majority of Quebeckers feel they are better off on their own, there must be negotiation and compromise on the terms of separation as there were when Confederation was formed.

While I am on this morbid subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge Rene Levesque's assumption that when he forms his government and begins his negotiations for a separate and independent Quebec, these negotiations will be between himself and the federal government only. I suggest that since it was provinces that put this country together in the first place, it must be the provinces and not the federal government which much negotiate with Quebec regarding any terms of separation.

But by conceding the principle of self-determination, Professor Dion suggests that Quebeckers will then be free to contemplate negotiations with other Canadians of a new modus vivendi as the professor calls it, which means a temporary agreement until there is a final settlement, and do this much more calmly and with the patience that is so necessary.

To be meaningful, he suggests that our institutions must reflect the sociological fact that "no power in the world can prevent French-speaking Quebeckers from seeing themselves as a unique society distinct from the Canadian reality as a whole." We all know this to be their attitude, Mr. Speaker.

I have not any great quarrel with that concept, provided that our French-speaking friends understand and are prepared to pay the cost, and there is a cost, which this special type of nationhood will involve.

It seems to me that such a concept as this ignores the benefits which have accrued to Quebec in the past through Confederation and which will continue as long as they are prepared to accept reasonable and practical compromises with their fellow English-speaking Canadians, both in Quebec and outside Quebec. Perhaps I could take one example. Montreal is a Canadian city that has a relationship to Canada in the same sense that New York has to the United States.

Montreal owes its present composition and status to the fact that it has been, until now, one of Canada's major air and sea terminals. It has industrial and commercial centres, the Canadian head offices of many of our leading firms, corporations, and so on. As a result it plays, perhaps, an even more important role in the economy of Quebec than Toronto does here in this province.

If those in Quebec wish to divest Montreal of its Canadian and international flavour, I suppose we should welcome it, for Toronto, as we are already witnessing, will be the major beneficiary, because, under this concept of a unique and distinctly separate identity, there is little or no incentive or opportunity for English-speaking Canadians to continue to contribute within the Province of Quebec, and their departure will, of course, seriously weaken that city and province.

With the remainder of Canada, Professor Dion proposes the now familiar solution which I should like to read into the record, and I quote:

> However, there is another concrete objective which could make a powerful contribution to the restoration of Canada which Professor Dion desires, and which he has developed with such imagination. This is the bringing about, within the shortest possible time, of equality between the two cultures.

According to the article, this will be achieved by "restricting the spread of federal powers into Quebec while broadening them, if necessary, into the other provinces."

Now, this policy trend is already obvious in the field of bilingualism and to a lesser extent in tax reform, to name only two. In the former area, as we know, Quebec is moving to become unilingually French, while Mr. Trudeau is extending institutional bilingualism throughout the rest of the country.

Equality, as we know it, in this province, is a very popular demand at the moment, but obviously the term is open to very wide interpretation or perhaps misinterpretation.

Well, with these few thoughts, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the chance to participate in the budget debate and to endorse our government's decision to resist further federal encroachment into our affairs, and particularly, those measures deliberately designed to weaken the economy of this province.

In doing so, I know that I have the support of the people of Peel South, and this is whatever their political persuasions are, Mr. Speaker. They are also deeply worried over recent events in Ottawa and the Province of Quebec. These remarks, Mr. Speaker, are in effect, a cry of alarm, as mentioned in the Dion article; a warning that our French-speaking friends have seriously overplayed their hand, and have eroded much of the spirit of goodwill and accommodation which ran so high during our Centennial year in 1967 at Expo, and the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference.

It is no exaggeration to remind these people that erosion of the will to co-exist is no longer confined to Quebec. It seems clear to me that both Ottawa and Quebec City are unaware that here in Ontario we have had a quiet revolution of our own.

It has been a revolution of progress embracing all our people regardless of racial origin or mother tongue. It has been carried forward without help from Ottawa; in fact, one might say, Mr. Speaker despite Ottawa, and it has radically altered the role and responsibilities of Ontario within Confederation.

We have developed here a new pride and consciousness, an awareness, that Ontario is where the action is. Mr. Speaker, you have provided us with a recent example of this sort of thing which is going on in every sphere of activity, both large and small. It is a small matter, but it illustrates my point. I refer to the decision to introduce young ladies into the House here as pages. Well, now we read that this practice is to be followed in Ottawa.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Another Ontario first.

Mr. Kennedy: Another Ontario first, Mr. Speaker, and I only conclude that perhaps Mrs. Trudeau has exerted her influence in Ottawa.

An hon. member: Good old Margaret.

Mr. Kennedy: We see further confirmation of Ontario's attractiveness in the influx of federal civil servants and now politicians. We see it in the immigrants flocking into the province from overseas, the United States and our sister provinces.

All of these people are attracted by the opportunities here and we welcome them. I think I would need to make an exception in the case of Phil Givens, because it seems to me that he would have appeared as something less than a straight opportunist if he had remained in Ottawa to do the job for which we elected him—for which he was elected; I did not help.

In fact, if Messrs. Givens and Hellyer had really and truly been interested in the future of the country, they would have followed Perry Ryan's example and joined the federal Progressive Conservative Party of Bob Stanfield.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Who is he?

Mr. Kennedy: The member will hear.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Heaven forbid.

Mr. Kennedy: Paul Hellyer knows, Mr. Speaker, as each of us in this House knows, that the one thing our country does not need at this particular moment is another federal political party.

We have had others come into this city and into the province like the famous urbanologist, Jane Jacobs. She tells us that Toronto is one of the finest cities in the world. She has moved here to help us preserve it and improve it. We are proud of this and proud, too, that in such provincial fields of jurisdiction as civil rights, education, health care, social services, pollution control, cultural affairs, our standards equal or surpass any other jurisdiction on this continent.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the opposition's sensitivity to this and to the member for Don Mills' (Mr. Randall) recent campaign. They know, because it is

the same evidence that is before every one of us—that there is really no place they would rather be and that is why they are here.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kennedy: I am delighted to see our government actively fostering our provincial esprit de corps with renewed emphasis on our traditional institutions, such as the flag, the crest, the trillium, by the restoration of historical sites throughout the province. The expansion of the Royal Ontario Museum and the construction of important new attractions for our people such as the Ontario Science Centre and now Ontario Place.

While I am on this, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not point out the great debt which we in Ontario, owe the man who founded the system of public education in this province. If one were asked to state what single factor has contributed most to our people's progress in these past hundred years or so, one would have to reply without equivocation the system of public education which was initiated and developed in Ontario by Dr. Egerton Ryerson.

I was rather interested, Mr. Speaker, that the socialists conducted a so-called study with regard to the extension of aid to separate schools.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We worked like dogs on that one.

Mr. Kennedy: I realize that and I was going to touch on that. I was going to touch on how hard you worked.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Withdraw the word "so-called."

Mr. Kennedy: I will mention how hard the member worked. I know the result.

An hon. member: Backbreaking.

Mr. Kennedy: I know the result—the position, if you can call it one—separate schools if necessary but not necessarily separate schools. So this non-policy of the socialists—

Mr. Lawlor: That is a misquotation of Benjamin Franklin, I believe.

Mr. J. Renwick: No, it was "fifty-four forty or fight."

Mr. Kennedy: —is based upon a report, that the hon. members mention, by a subcommittee from their caucus and it was chaired by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman).

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kennedy: It is alleged to have conducted a study in depth. There is one thing about NDP studies. They are always in depth and they are in such depth that they get so deeply mired they never emerge with anything that has any clarity to it.

Mr. Lawlor: We do not study everything to death.

Mr. Kennedy: It was in depth—that type of depth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: Let us say it is beyond the member's depth of comprehension.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Completely submerged.

Mr. Kennedy: It examined the historical, legal, institutional, financial, educational, philosophical, all those implications of the school question. That was the depth. No wonder they got so deep.

Mr. Lawlor: That was my job, to be philosophical.

Mr. Makarchuk: How does the member spell it?

Mr. Kennedy: Some idea of the scope of their effort may be gained from the fact that the name of Dr. Ryerson appears nowhere in the report.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is in the study papers.

Mr. Lawlor: The member has not read the study papers.

Mr. J. Renwick: Background papers.

Mr. Kennedy: I would suggest they stay suppressed down in the deep depths, too.

An hon. member: He has them tucked away under his pillow.

Mr. Kennedy: You have got them in such a depth of study you cannot probably resurrect them—

Mr. J. Renwick: If the member calls for them, we will make them available.

Mr. Kennedy: —to the good fortune of the people of this province. But in that study there is no mention of the public system of education which Dr. Ryerson conceived, established, nurtured and supervised.

Mr. J. Renwick: If he were alive, he would certainly agree with our position 100 per cent.

Mr. W. Hodgson: What makes the member think that?

Mr. Kennedy: For so late in the afternoon the hon. member for Riverdale is really reaching.

There is no mention of Dr. Ryerson. He nurtured and supervised and brought this along as the chief superintendent of education in this province for 31 years, from 1844 to 1875.

Mr. Lawlor: If the member finishes without referring to Jesse Ketchum, I will never forgive him.

Mr. Kennedy: And this, Mr. Speaker, is supposed to be a study in depth. It is about as serious a study or an effort as would be a study in English theatre in which my hon. friend from Lakeshore is so well versed, without reference to the works of Shakespeare. It was simply a political exercise they went through and, I would remind the members, in depth.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Here comes the superintendent.

Mr. J. Renwick: Change the word to "democratic."

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, the most important point which I wish to make about Ontario's quiet revolution is this: We are not now a province like the others.

Mr. J. Renwick: Ontario's what?

Mr. Lawlor: What is your position on separate schools?

Mr. Kennedy: The member knows it quite well.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, no, I think your party is confused.

Mr. Kennedy: Ask me some time. They will never find any clarity from reading your report. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not a province like the others. Federal policies which might have a detrimental effect on the economy of, say, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or even Quebec, would not necessarily weaken the national economy. With humility I would say, Mr. Speaker, this does not apply to Ontario, because we have become the industrial and commercial heartland of Canada. If our economy is weakened, the nation is weakened as well. As the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) stated in his budget address, national policies detrimental to Ontario are also detrimental to the national interests.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, I believe our Treasurer has clearly pointed out in his budget address the size of the contribution which our taxpayers make to Ottawa. Our citizens now know that there is no money tree for them on Parliament Hill. In fact, on page 49 of the 1971 budget we read:

> The federal government continually runs a full-employment surplus in Ontario. Since 1962 the federal surplus has increased rapidly. It has also grown relatively faster than the potential gross provincial product. In 1962 the full-employment surplus was equal to $466 million or 2.6 per cent of potential GPP. By 1969 it had increased to $1.5 billion or 4.5 per cent of the potential GPP.

This year I believe the figure will approach $2 billion; that is, our taxpayers in Ontario will contribute some $2 billion more to Ottawa than they will get back under the present tax-sharing formula.

Mr. Lawlor: Why does the member not become the Rene Levesque of Ontario?

Mr. Kennedy: According to my calculations, this works out to something like $285 for every man, woman and child in the province.

Mr. Lawlor: But what does it all mean?

Mr. Kennedy: That is what we would like to know. That is what we are exploring.

Mr. Lawlor: What does the member draw from that? Is he going to be niggardly about it or just thump his chest?

Mr. Kennedy: Neither.

Mr. Lawlor: Neither?

Mr. Kennedy: Neither.

Mr. Lawlor: What is the member going to do then?

Mr. Kennedy: The member should wait and listen; he will learn something. He should not try to project what I am going to say because I will outwit—

Mr. Lawlor: He is my next-door neighbour. I have to give him a bad time.

Mr. Kennedy: I will outguess him if he tries to project what I am going to say. Okay?

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): You are away ahead of him now. Keep going.

Mr. Lawlor: Keep it up.

Mr. Kennedy: Always was.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: You are way out front.

Mr. Kennedy: In all humility, I always was.

An hon. member: Mr. Lawlor is stopped. We have not heard that for a long time.

Mr. Kennedy: They come dragging along out of the depths.

So this is a substantial sum of money, Mr. Speaker. The average family could do a great deal. If there were four in it, it comes to $1,150. As the footnote on page 49 of the provincial budget statement says:

> The federal surplus in Ontario is important in two major respects. First, along with the smaller federal surpluses in Alberta and British Columbia, it finances federal aid to other provinces in the form of equalization grants, shared-cost programmes, regional development schemes, and direct transfers to individuals . . . Second, the federal surplus in Ontario is important as a measure of the strong deflationary influence exerted on the Ontario economy by the federal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer in this province is not overjoyed to learn that this year Quebec will receive some $760 million in equalization payments alone. This is in addition to the lion's share of other federal programmes, such as regional development, bilingualism and so on. The field of defence expenditures is seldom mentioned. It has been in the papers lately, and it is another favourite channel by which successive federal governments have funnelled hundreds of millions of dollars to the Province of Quebec.

In recent years, for example, the CF-104 programme was $400 million, the CF-5 programme was $215 million—with most of the aircraft mothballed as they came off the production line—and, of course, the famous Bonaventure refit—

Mr. Makarchuk: They got the money; we got the aeroplanes, though.

Mr. Kennedy: —cost $17 million. Four new destroyers cost over $300 million. This incomplete list totals close to another billion dollars and represents a very high percentage of the funds spent by the federal government of Canada for new equipment over the last few years.

The member for Lakeshore mentioned, "Are we going to be niggardly." The people of my riding are proud to call themselves Canadians and they are prepared to support the principle of equalization. They are prepared and willing to help those in areas of Canada less richly blessed than our own, but it is an understatement if I say that the taxpayers of Peel South—and I mean all the taxpayers, Liberals, socialists, Progressive Conservatives—are finding it increasingly difficult to accept the economic policies of the present federal government, and the ways and methods of distribution carried out with their hard-earned dollars.

Mr. Speaker, these taxpayers remember that Confederation was designed in part to end a mutually unsatisfactory equal partnership which had existed between Ontario and Quebec for 26 years prior to Confederation. From 1867 onwards each province had complete jurisdiction over those fields such as education, civil rights, health, social services of which, I mentioned earlier—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Highways.

Mr. Kennedy: Highways—were directly related—

Mr. Singer: Yes. $200 million.

Mr. Kennedy: —to the quality of life, while the federal government looked after matters common to all provinces, such as defence, foreign affairs, external trade, highways and expressways.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Cow paths.

Mr. Kennedy: We know that our sister province was equally blessed with natural resources and in addition it enjoyed direct access to the sea which was denied Ontario until only a few years ago. If Quebec now lags far behind Ontario in the quality of life, my constituents are not prepared to accept the blame. Nor do they feel that it is the fault of the constitution or the federal government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, much of the blame must be placed on the system of education which prevailed in the Province of Quebec until about 10 years ago when the present education ministry was formed. And I recall that time.

In confirmation of this fact, I should like to read into the record what the present Prime Minister of Canada had to say about the situation. This was in an article which was written in 1956, and it was entitled, "On the Eve of the Asbestos Strike in Quebec." He said this:

> In this way, the social doctrine which in other countries had openly welcomed popular democracy, the emancipation of workers and social progress, in French-Canada was called upon to support authoritarianism and xenophobia. And worse still, our doctrine helped make it impossible for us to solve our problems for, on the negative side, it rejected all solutions that could be successful against our enemies, the English, the Protestants, the materalists, etc., and on the punitive side, it remained content with elaborating theoretical systems devoid of any objective link with reality and often totally inapplicable in practice.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau told his French-Canadian brothers in 1956, in effect, "the fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Especially in the Tory government.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. W. Hodgson: You came in late. You did not hear all that. You came in late on the speech. Keep quiet.

Mr. Yakabuski: You did not buy your Globe and Mail this morning.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, the hon. member for Grey—Dry Gulch was it?

An hon. member: Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Dry Gulch: It is your fault, too.

Mr. Kennedy: In typical form, he has not been listening because Mr. Trudeau does not happen to be a Conservative. Now, if he wants to approach us, we may talk to him, but he got a tough fight on his hands to make it, to gain acceptance.

Mr. Sargent: He is sure not a Liberal either.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): What was that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did you say Trudeau was not a Liberal?

Mr. Sargent: All the real Liberals have left the party down there.

Mr. Kennedy: So, when I make some reference to Mr. Trudeau, you say he is a Conservative. But, Mr. Speaker, in the conventional wisdom of today, almost all of Quebec's grievances are being attributed to English-speaking Canadians, the federal government, or the constitution.

Mr. Pitman: What revelations! Unexpected moments.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The truth has started to come out.

Mr. Kennedy: And we are expected to pay a very heavy price, so that these grievances may be rectified immediately. Yet, thus far, there has been no great public outcry from English-speaking Canada against the federal government's obsession with the Quebec problem. Claude Lemelin's article suggests that the reason for this is because, and I quote from his article:

> Canadians in other provinces are colonized by federal nationalism, intimidated by the enormous size of America, convinced of their collective weakness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this nonsense can be published by a reputable journal like Le Devoir illustrates the futility of appeasement as a means of resolving the constitutional problems which face this country. I suggest that one of the major reasons why there has been no outcry from English Canadians thus far is due to the statesmanship of the former Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts).

Mr. Sargent: He cannot help you now.

Mr. Kennedy: His influence will go on and on and on, and we will all benefit by it, I would tell the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Ruston: Do not count on that.

Mr. Deacon: Such as Spadina.

Mr. Sargent: Spadina.

Mr. Kennedy: The former Premier was aware of the most important effect of Ontario's quiet revolution, that today this province is in the position to benefit most from what benefits Canada most. That is why it was John Robarts rather than Lester Pearson

who took the initiative in 1967 to try to establish some common national goals and objectives which would inspire all Canadians to continue the experiment begun 100 years ago.

It was an equally symbolic and practical expression of his dedication to this same reality that Mr. Robarts' last act as Prime Minister of Ontario was to go to Quebec, and there to encourage private enterprise to invest, not in Ontario, but in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, was this an indication of weakness? It certainly was not. Could you imagine the Prime Minister of any other province going into Quebec and doing this? It just could not occur. That is strong leadership.

Mr. Sargent: Is he going to come back?

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, he is on his way. His presence is ever present.

Mr. J. Renwick: Sounds like a call.

Mr. Yakabuski: Back to greater things.

Mr. Ruston: Going to bring Randall back, too?

Mr. Kennedy: The hon. members opposite, who seem to be slightly stirred from their lethargy, remind me of a former Liberal Prime Minister—Mr. Hepburn.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Mr. Sargent: He is dead.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They want to forget him.

Mr. Innes: That is the trouble with you people—living in the past.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Do not embarrass them with that name.

Mr. Kennedy: You cannot forget him. But his policy, you see, was "not one cent in equalization payments."

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): We will not forget that.

Mr. Kennedy: We can grant this was some time ago; Mr. Speaker, but it is nevertheless interesting to observe the difference in philosophy between parties, in commitment to Canada, even acknowledging the passing of time.

Yet even Mr. Robart's great patience must have been sorely strained by the demands he felt compelled to make upon our people to accommodate the escalating and undefined aspirations of Quebec. With each new conference the ante was raised, accompanied by the usual threat of separation. And all the whole millions of dollars from Ottawa—or more precisely from Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia via Ottawa—were being poured into Quebec's economy.

Now we have a new leader (Mr. Davis), an equally good Canadian and an equally good friend of Quebec.

Mr. Sargent: He will go down as the shortest Prime Minister in history.

Mr. Kennedy: However, he faces a very different situation—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member is as bad a dreamer as they are.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): He is not that short.

Mr. Kennedy: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we now know what the leaders of Quebec want.

Mr. Lawlor: Will you accept 50 per cent of the blame?

Mr. Ruston: Wait till 1972.

Mr. Kennedy: We all know what the leaders of Quebec want. For years we have waited in vain for them to define their concept of federalism. Now at long last Mr. Bourassa, the federalist, has revealed that his constitutional goal is "profitable federalism."

Mr. Cournoyer will ask Mr. Bourassa nothing that gives us any comfort. Mr. Cournoyer was even more brutally candid with us. He was quoted as saying that he had no interest outside Quebec; that he is a "ledger-sheet federalist." So after all these years our suspicions are confirmed. The bond of the new Confederation that is being sought, of equal partnership, is to be a ledger sheet.

The second complication is equally serious. This is the revelation or confirmation—perhaps slightly more appropriate—that the federal representatives from Ontario have no influence with the Trudeau government.

Mr. Sargent: These should be a point of order. This is an advance copy of the constitution speech of Davis.

Mr. Kennedy: For the benefit of the members opposite who might be attending, by using this they can perhaps make some meaningful contribution in Victoria.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: He is writing the new constitution for you.

Mr. Kennedy: Messrs. Hellyer and Givens and others have told us quite plainly that all major decisions in Ottawa are being taken by "three, or possibly four" individuals. There is not much doubt in anyone's mind as to who those three or four are. But, Mr. Speaker, what this means, is that—

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Members over there.

Mr. Singer: No, over there only one.

Mr. J. Renwick: Their only complaint is that they are not part of the group of four.

Mr. Kennedy: —the great debate over the future of Canada has deteriorated into a family quarrel between French Canadians in Ottawa, Quebec City and, I think we must include Messrs. Drapeau, Saulnier and Ryan, in Montreal.

An hon. member: The family compact.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come off it. That is sickening. That really is sickening. You should be ashamed.

Mr. Kennedy: And the quarrel is over money from Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta, that is a fact.

Mr. Yakabuski: How does the member for Downsview feel inside about it? Tell the truth. Strip off the mask. Bare your soul.

Mr. Kennedy: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Ottawa and Quebec are in complete accord. If you read Lemelin as I suggested, you will discover what he has referred to as the "concrete objective" of the new confederation, namely "the bringing about within the shortest time of equality between the two cultures." Well, we have seen it working in the field of bilingualism. Tax reform is another area of even greater concern. As the 1971 budget of Ontario points out on page 6, the federal government is—

Mr. Sargent: The 1971 budget said an 0.5 billion dollar deficit.

Mr. Kennedy: The federal government is attempting to extend its authority and involvement into areas of provincial jurisdiction such as consumer protection, securities regulations, notwithstanding the practical difficulties this will create in the significant progress which has already been made in interprovincial uniformity and co-ordination. I quote again from the budget:

> In the thrust to expand federal primacy it is also evident that Ontario is marked out for particular attention. Our regional needs have obviously been neglected by the federal government, particularly in such key fields as manpower and regional economic development. More important, however, federal economic and fiscal policies have been aimed deliberately at the curtailment of economic growth in this province.
>
> The severe deflationary policies of the federal government since 1969 have driven the Ontario economy far below its potential and created unemployment levels that are the highest in a decade. The "temporary" surtaxes on personal and corporate incomes, of which over 50 per cent is collected in Ontario, have been extended rather than removed, while the federal government has initiated selective fiscal measures such as the depreciation penalty on commercial buildings in Toronto and other key urban centres.
>
> From this I can only conclude that the intention seems to be one of reducing regional disparities in Canada by diminishing the economic strength and standard of living in Ontario.

That is the quote from the budget. We have heard a great deal recently about the necessity for a tax cut. Mr. Bourassa is, however, firmly opposed to a general tax cut and we shall soon know how much longer the federal government is going to accept his position on that vital issue. As he explained on the TV not long ago, a tax cut would benefit all Canadians and thereby violate the principle of profitable federalism.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Ontario and the other provinces of Canada are being asked by Ottawa and Quebec to accept a more inequitable partnership than that which existed within the provinces of Canada from 1841 to 1867. Yet even at this late date, our Prime Minister and Treasurer are being accused of a lack of dedication to Canada by speaking out in the interests of the people of this province.

Perhaps no finer examples can be found of those who are "colonized with federal nationalism, intimidated by the enormous size of

America convinced of their collective weakness" as the July editorial stated, than the members of the opposition parties.

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote the speech? Does the member have speech writers, too?

Mr. Kennedy: I write all my own. They have been so busy preaching gloom and doom throughout this province that they, too, are unaware of the quiet revolution which has occurred here and which has brought about a fundamental change in Ontario's role within Confederation.

Mr. Lawlor: The member will be aware of it before too long.

Mr. Kennedy: As the Globe and Mail said on Saturday, May 29:

> We hope that Ontario Trade and Development Minister Allan Grossman, will withdraw his offer to let the federal government take over the running of public housing in Ontario. It is in far better hands where it is.

The editorial concluded by saying:

> As for turning Ontario public housing over to Ottawa, the Ontario Liberals and NDPs might think it a good idea, but the people of Ontario know what would happen. There would be another of those grand equalization programmes in which Ontario would henceforth get nothing.

Mr. Carruthers: That is right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Kennedy: Read the newspaper.

Mr. Sargent: How can the member say that? How about $776 million the government squandered away on health? The goernment did not lower the payments of the money—it wasted it.

Mr. Kennedy: Read the newspaper.

Mr. Worton: What about the money you have sitting up on Spadina?

Mr. Lawlor: I am beginning to think you do write your own speeches.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario know what is happening in public housing, public education, in tax reform and in constitutional reform. They fully support the efforts of the government of the hon. Mr. Davis to serve the best interest of our province and nation and deplore the opposition's irresponsible exploitation of every issue large and small—

Mr. Lawlor: Now you are getting into the record here.

Mr. Sargent: That is a talk-back speech.

Mr. Kennedy: —for political gain by fostering discord, dissension and division within this province and by harassing and hampering negotiations—

Mr. Lawlor: You were dealing with hard facts previously but now here you are.

Mr. Kennedy: —with the federal government on the vital issues of constitutional and tax reform. This is all well documented. You would think you were learning something for the first time. Perhaps you are. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand in my place and assure the Prime Minister of Ontario that his neighbours in Peel South are delighted with the government's measures announced by the Treasurer in his 1971 budget—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Kennedy: —which is to maximize economic growth by expanding the private sector.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Louder!

Mr. Kennedy: Oh, the truth hurts them so much.

Mr. Lawlor: Are you not glad the Prime Minister got you off the hook up there in South Peel?

Mr. Kennedy: —to maximize growth by expanding the private sector.

Mr. Sargent: What page are you on now?

Mr. Lawlor: How are your constituents treating you on the airport problem?

Mr. Kennedy: —to control public spending and to advance provincial and municipal reform. They particularly welcomed this government's recognition that the time has come for Ontario once again to play the same central role in preserving this nation that she did in forming it, Mr. Speaker, in 1867.

Mr. Lawlor: The country was falling apart at that time.

Mr. Kennedy: And Mr. Speaker, whether this new Confederation is called equality of cultures, or profitable federalism, they trust the Prime Minister to ensure that it will be equally profitable for all Canadians, in the

sense that it will recognize the legitimate needs and aspirations of all our people in every province and region from coast to coast.

We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that when our Prime Minister goes to Victoria this weekend, he will have his ledger sheets along, for in the new economic partnership which lies ahead, it is time that those who pay the piper begin to call the tune.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was thinking of Robert Burns and his wish that we be given the ability to see ourselves as others see us. Reflect for a moment on how we must appear to the rest of the world.

Here we are, this nation of Canada, the richest in all the world in natural resources, with the knowledge, the skills and the technical know-how to convert this natural wealth into, not just a better way of life, but into the best way of life for all the people.

We like to extend aid to have-not countries; we like to offer to mediate differences between nations. How amused these nations must be when it is obvious to all that we have not in 104 years of Confederation been able to put our house in order.

How dare we attempt to guide others when our governments are blind to the problems in our own land, and permit inequities to flourish across this nation? And we have stored butter until it became rancid while Canadians are hungry.

Some Canadians are sheltered in dwellings —you cannot call them homes, that would cause us to gasp with pity if were shown them in an underdeveloped country. Many Canadians are unemployed. There are Canadians who are denied health care and far too many aged Canadians have but a pittance to keep body nd soul together. This is the picture of Canada the world sees and all of it in the midst of plenty.

So generous has nature been that we are allowing our resources to drain unchecked across our borders. We go further than allowing it. We expedite the drain. We assist our natural wealth to flow away as we lend and, indeed in many cases, give the money of the Canadian taxpayer to foreign-owned or foreign-conrolled corporate bodies to enable them to siphon off the cream of our resources and then we buy back the finished product, while unemployment mounts in Canada.

As a nation we have long ceased to strive for perfection, half measures have become a habit with us. Our governments offer half measures and our citizens accept them with humility. One definition of perfection is having all the properties naturally belonging to us. Well, we do not have all the properties belonging to us, nor will we until governments accept their responsibility in this regard and until the electorate insists that they do so. Just as long as the electorate is willing to accept the half loaf, that is all we will get. The Province of Ontario is the guiltiest of all, simply because we have the greatest natural potential of all Canada.

In air-polluted Hamilton, happiness is when the air pollution count does not reach the danger mark. What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not concerned with pure air but only with the degree of impurity that we can tolerate.

I have feared for a long time that our tendency to accept half measures in the area of pollution is dangerous. My fears would seem to be shared by at least one person in the medical profession. I refer to Dr. Thomas L. Petty, who tells us we are not safe just as long as the pollution index is below the danger mark. He warns: "Any pollution of the air is dangerous and may cause great damage to your lungs. The danger is because you are breathing it all the time, so even if the pollution level is low, the exposure is long and harmful." Dr. Petty is an associate professor of medicine from the University of Colorado in Denver, and I am glad he is a prominent medical person because perhaps his warning will be heeded when the words of a layman like myself seem to fall on deaf ears.

I do not think this government can be complacent in the field of education as long as there are differences between one area and another in what is available to the student. You may have fended off a financial rebellion with the farmers by announcing a property tax rebate but they realize their children are not receiving the same quality of education as the children in cities. They do not have enriched classes. They do not have the same teaching aids. They do not have the same gymnasiums, home economics and workshop facilities, and in no way do they have opportunity classes for the slow learner or the retarded pupil at either the elementary or the junior vocational levels, insufficient as they may be in the cities.

Differences exist in urban communities also. For instance, the student who fails to get 40

per cent in one subject in his final examinations in Grade 13 in Hamilton may not attend summer school to pick up this one subject in order to enter university. He must repeat his whole year but in the Hamilton school system there is no flaw. The student with the same problem there would have a chance to buckle down and get the marks he needed to enter university.

Until university education is made available to all qualified for entrance, we cannot claim we provide equal educational opportunities for Ontario students.

While we are considering the subject of education, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members the limitations placed on the adult retraining programme. I am thinking of a case of a young man I know who left school to earn his living. It was a matter of necessity not desire. In other words, he was not a dropout as the phrase is used today.

Eventually he became unemployed and applied and was accepted in the adult retraining programme. By this time he realized he needed further education if he was to have continuous employment of a nature to provide properly for his wife and child. For those of you who are interested, he was a good student and achieved good marks but he was not allowed to continue past grade 12. In fact his academic education is still not advanced to the point where he is any better trained for employment.

He wanted to gain his grade 13 credits which would have opened doors of several employment opportunities which may have secured him work in the future, and eventually he could have advanced to other areas of education. This may be a federal matter. I think Ontario has an obligation to extend assistance where the retraining programme leaves off. In the meantime, we will not convince this young man that Ontario has equal educational opportunities for all, nor will we convince many others who have to shorten their education to add to the family income that there is any kind of justice for the families in the low income groups in our society.

This is one reason, Mr. Speaker, that I first introduced a bill to establish minimum wage standards for all workers and why, when the government was finally persuaded to accept the principle, I continued my efforts to have the minimum wage increased to a point where no worker can be paid wages less than he requires to keep himself and his family above the poverty line.

While steadily refusing to establish a realistic minimum wage, this government rails against those on welfare because they will not rush out trying to fine one of those jobs which pays less than welfare. But the government will not maintain his medical and hospital insurance to protect themselves and will not make partial welfare available as an incentive to these people to return to the work force.

It is because I feel so strongly that in a wealthy province no one should be required to live at starvation levels that I am determined to find some means of assisting our aged citizens. These people are condemned by a miserly Liberal federal government to eke out a bare existence. They need our help and we in this Legislature must accept the responsibility of supplementing their income to a degree that will provide ease in their final years, until the federal government does accept the responsibility which is properly theirs.

We must also fully accept our own responsibilities to these citizens. Year after year, I have introduced resolutions to include nursing home fees in our hospital insurance plan. Finally, this is about to happen, but the government has unnecessarily placed the current fee at $3.50 per day. It does not increase the numbers of chronic hospitals sufficiently, so that our pensioners may have available for their use the services which they thought they were pre-paying through their hospital insurance.

Hospital and medical insurance rates remain unnecessarily high because this government chooses to provide private insurance companies with a golden accruement of profit at the expense of Ontario taxpayers. The same is true in the field of car insurance. Rates are too high, and indications are that they will increase steadily, and protection is too easily lost. Somehow insurance companies feel the pockets of Ontario citizens are theirs for the plucking. Why not? This government has helped to enjoy this demand by its refusal to provide a government car insurance plan at cost.

Mr. Speaker, there is a subtle programme now under way calculated to cause ill will and resentment against the working people of this province and, in particular, against those who are members of trade unions. Employers are calling on the consumer to oppose wage increases. This is ridiculous, because the largest numbers of consumers are the very wage earners they are urging not to seek the increases they need to pur-

chase the products from the employers. The employer is aided and abetted by the Liberal federal government and its old-fashioned way of combating inflation. They have failed dismally to control inflation but they have been remarkably successful in creating unemployment.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Hear, hear.

Mr. Davison: They are aided by this government, through the introduction of labour legislation designed first to limit the ability of the trade unions to organize and then to hamstring union efforts to bring justice and fair-sharing of the national productivity to those whose labours created it.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Hear, hear.

Mr. Davison: There can be no doubt that our most serious problem is unemployment. Dr. Smith, chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, predicts that it will be difficult to get back to normal employment levels before 1974. He said, "Moves to ease economic restraints are cautious and inadaquate to pick up slack by the end of this year."

Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, is even less optimistic. He doubts that unemployment can be below four per cent through the 1970s. One finds it difficult to understand federal Finance Minister Benson's insanely determined expressions of optimism in the face of mounting unemployment. He is fond of using seasonally adjusted figures which remove the effects of normal seasonal fluctuations, such as prevail in agriculture, fishing and construction during winter months. But we cannot ignore that these people are unemployed. Surely, Mr. Benson can no longer deny that we have a very grave problem.

In November, 1970, 5.7 per cent of Canadians were unemployed. In April, 1971, 7.8 per cent were unemployed. Although not yet released, I understand the newest figures for May, 1971, will indicate a 0.5 per cent increase over April. But an even stronger indication of the depth of our difficulties is the seasonally adjusted figure on which Mr. Benson pins his hopes. It is expected to be up one per cent at a time when it should be falling.

Last December, 20 per cent of Cornwall's labour force was out of work, that is, one in every five. In Kitchener, welfare costs in 1970 increased 500 per cent over 1969. In Hamilton last month, 16,836 were unemployed. None of these figures include the newcomer to the labour force. But one has only to consider the large numbers of high school and university graduates in our own area to realize the impact they would make if they were included in the unemployment rolls. Then, of course, there is the student seeking summer employment to help pay his way through school.

For some unknown reason, the federal Liberal government feels that if it just ignores the whole mess, it will go away. I do not think this Conservative government of Ontario can just place the blame on Ottawa and take no action to remedy our situation in Ontario. It is time we entered into a massive programme of public works. There is not a member here who is not aware of some needed project in his community.

Hamilton, as I pointed out recently, has a lon-standing need for a new jail; it needs increased chronic hospital facilities; it needs geared-to-income housing; it needs more accommodation for our senior citizens. Our municipal government is unable to enter into needed projects as simple as road repairs and sewer replacements because it lacks the funds. They need some grants to aid them, something like the forgiveable loans this government so happily spews into the treasuries of wealthy, foreign-owned firms. Entering into a programme of this nature would greatly relieve the unemployment situation.

What we really need, of course, is a guaranteed income or a negative income tax. Even the special senate committee on poverty is expected to include some recommendation in its report expected to be brought down this fall. We could get rid of the hodge-podge of welfare programmes we have at all levels of government.

Mr. Pitman: Hear hear, how true.

Mr. Davison: No one would be requided to live in poverty. Dare we hope Ontario's conservative Prime Minister would agree with this concept and put pressure on Ottawa to accept it?

An experiment was begun in New Jersey in 1968, and in Pennsylvania in 1969, by a federal agency and the University of Wisconsin's Institute for Research and Poverty covering about 1,200 families and later enlarged to include some rural sections. These families received annual income guarantees of up to $4,600 for a family of four and were allowed to retain varied portions of their earnings. They filed income tax returns and

low incomes would be brought up to the minimum standard.

The American report indicates that there was no unusual withdrawal from the labour force on the part of these people, they had an incentive to earn what they could. Such a contrast with the welfare schemes we have, where they are penalized if they succeed in finding part-time work.

Then we have the mayors and reeves wanting to remove all able-bodied unemployed off welfare and put them picking berries. I am not sure we have enough berries around Hamilton to employ all of them, because in April this year 9,741 persons received general welfare assistance in Hamilton and it is expected the May figures will exceed 10,000. It is all very well to say they should work for welfare, but just where are they going to find employment unless we create the job opportunities?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one final thought. While the reader is constantly bombarded by the clever Ontario advertisements in Ontario's daily and weekly newspapers, our sight and ears are assailed many times a day by the Ontario commercials that flow from the TV sets of Ontario, asking if there is any place we would rather be. It might well be that an electorate will decide, even though they still prefer to be in Ontario, that they are very tired of this government and its half measures.

Mr. Innes moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 48, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to debate the bill on second reading; it deals with a number of specific items and we would suggest that the bill go immediately to the Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I am agreeable, Mr. Speaker, that the bill should go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in section 171, subsection 13—

Mr. Speaker: This section-by-section debate would be dealt with in committee.

Mr. Innes: Well, generally, I am concerned about representations that have been made to me about the present context of the bill. I want to ascertain whether it will cover certain areas in the agriculture field, specifically in the hail insurance. I have been told the time limit for issuing hail insurance for the year is around June 15, so I have been instructed to ask if these items are going to be included as such because it is quite urgent and to a great number of people in my particular area, specifically, southwestern Ontario, that has the large tobacco area.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member. I think he did speak to me about this outside of the chamber. I have, I can assure him, prepared an amendment to the bill, which I had proposed to move in Committee of the Whole, to enable contracts of hail insurance to be written by these farm mutuals, by mutual insurance companies. I have that amendment and it was my intention to move it. Since it mentions, Mr. Speaker, the date of June 15, I would hope that the members of the House would facilitate the passage of this legislation, which is really sort of clearing away some deadwood in the old Insurance Act, and enlarging the scope and powers of mutual companies. I am anxious to do everything I can to hasten it to third reading, and to receiving royal assent. I assure the hon. member that the amendment he looks for will be moved by myself, and I hope we can get the bill forward.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak to this bill on second reading? Does the hon. minister care to make any other comments at this time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I think not, Mr. Speaker. I spoke at some little length, I think, in introducing the bill and I indicated its purpose. We have sort of reiterated and that is really the content of the bill. We will have an opportunity in committee to consider it clause by clause.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill go to Committee of the Whole House?

Agreed.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, 1970

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 52, An Act to amend The Business Corporations Act, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons, we think that this bill deals with a number of specific amendments and that it is not necessary to speak on second reading. We would ask that the bill go to Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to enter the debate on second reading?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I would rather hear Sparky speak than this.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister wish to comment?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No comment except, Mr. Speaker, to say that I am glad to have the bill go to Committee of the Whole. I will have one amendment to move there but as we will be dealing with the bill clause by clause I do not need to outline that now. Perhaps second reading is not the time for it anyway.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill go to Committee of the Whole House?

Agreed.

CORPORATIONS INFORMATION ACT, 1971

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 57, An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1971.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons, we would ask that the bill go to Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments on second reading? Has the hon. minister a reply?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No comment, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be referred to Committee of the Whole House?

Agreed.

LICENSING OF FUR FARMS

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 59, An Act to license and regulate Fur Farms.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry? The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just want to inquire from the minister why this move is taking place. We in this party certainly have no objection to it, but I am just interested in why it should happen in this way; whether in fact the department intends to regulate to a greater extent the fur farming industry in this province. We have a pretty viable industry in Ontario, as I understand it. The industry here produces some high-quality pelts, and I am just wondering why the move at this point in time? Is there any particular significance to it and, if so, what is it? Has the industry asked for this or has the department taken it upon itself to do it on its own?

These are some of the things that immediately come to mind, because I realize what an important industry it is at the moment and has been for many years—and, I presume, it will continue to be. I wish the minister would make a few comments that would perhaps clarify some of these points.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate on second reading? The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, we in this party are quite satisfied about the content of the bill. We would also be interested to hear the answers about the reason for it.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agricuture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would he happy to reply to these inquiries. The reason for the change from The Department of Lands and Forests to The Department of Agriculture and Food is at the request of the fur farmers' association itself. They have presented quite a lengthy brief requesting that the transfer be made so that they might qualify for some types of assistance that are available to farmers as farmers.

Mr. Gaunt: Capital grants?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, and something to do with sales tax and a few things like that.

The request was made by the farmers themselves, and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and I simply agreed that if this was what they wanted, we would simply transfer it. The gentleman in The Department of Lands and Forests who was looking after it in that department—Mr. Madigan, I believe—has been transferred to ours and is administering the fur farms under this Act.

By this legislation, Mr. Speaker, we are simply taking the sections out of The Game and Fish Act and transposing them into The Fur Farms Act, which is the short title. That is really what it does.

Mr. Innes: Could I just ask one question of the minister, Mr. Speaker? Is it not true that they are eligible for capital grants at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Innes: They are?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They will qualify for capital grants now, provided they have $3,000 gross income in the year previous.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the minister's comments as to whether he thinks it would be useful for the bill to go to committee. Are there any people who want to make representations with respect to the bill?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. It is purely a routine measure for the transfer of existing legislation to another department; I see no reason, and no one has even suggested that there should be any reason to do so.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, with the minister's assurance that there are no members of the public who want to make any representations—

Hon. Mr. Stewart Not that I know of.

Mr. J. Renwick: —with respect to the bill, then we would agree that the bill should go to third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 60, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I notice that the amendments are complementary to the transfer of the administration of the fur farms, and The Minister of Agriculture did mention that it was on the request of the owners and operators of the fur farms that this be done. I am wondering what reservations they had about having the administration of the fur farms kept under the supervision of The Game and Fish Act and The Department of Lands and Forests. Obviously, they must have been dissatisfied with the way it was handled, or what was the reason for it?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, this was made at the request of the industry and it was felt that it would be to their advantage, that they would be eligible for capital grants under the Minister of Agriculture and Food, and there were also advantages as far as taxation was concerned—the taxation under the federal government—and the transfer from our department, Lands and Forests, to Agriculture and Food, and also the personnel; Mr. Madigan, the minister was trying to indicate, would also be transferred. So it is strictly at the request of the industry and for their benefit because some of the industry right now is in rather depressed conditions.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

CROP INSURANCE ACT (ONTARIO) 1966

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 58, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act (Ontario) 1966.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Speaker, this bill, in essence, has to do with the condition of the soil before it is planted. Where a farmer cannot get his crop in and has bought seed and purchased a type of fertilizer he will be able to insure against hazards of weather. Will he also be able to ensure under conditions of harvesting too, at that time—will it include that in the Act, such as whether to harvest certain crops, that currently are planted?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter this debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Briefly, the bill simply brings the Ontario crop insurance legislation in line with the federal Crop Insurance Act. By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the way it will be administered is this; because it goes much further even than what we have now in the present Crop Insurance Act. Supposing a person wants to obtain bare ground coverage for all spring planted crops. He purchases from the crop insurance agent crop insurance on one specific crop, as a minimum, on his farm.

Say he is growing 150 acres of various types of crop. He purchases, say, 25 acres of barley coverage. That entitles him to purchase bare ground coverage for all of his crop that is planted, we will say, in the spring of 1971, at the rate of 30 cents an acre for the entire province. That means he has got his barley planted, it is growing; but we will say he wants to plant 50 acres of corn. The deadline comes for planting of corn and passes, and the weather is so wet he cannot get on the land and he does not get it planted. He has bought his seed and his fertilizer, as my hon. friend suggests. He then collects bare ground coverage on that corn land but he may sow it then to soya beans, or white beans or whatever late crop he may get in. But he has been paid for that bare ground coverage.

Supposing he gets the corn crop in and he has 50 acres of white beans that he wants to get planted. The day comes when the deadline for the planting of white beans under The Crop Insurance Act passes. He does not have to have crop insurance on the white bean crop—do you follow me? He has bought bare ground coverage for his white bean crop but not crop insurance on the white bean crop. He can collect bare ground coverage on the field that he intended to put the white beans in because it was too wet and he could not get them sown.

Mr. Gaunt: Without insuring the white beans?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Without insuring the white beans. What my hon. friend says about harvesting—the member for Oxford asked me about this covering harvesting. No, bare ground coverage does not cover harvesting. It simply covers the fact that you cannot get the crop planted. We would assume that the farmer would purchase crop insurance on the crop that is designated, beyond the barley, for whatever it may be. Then, if he did not get it harvested he would qualify for crop insurance. Do I explain it properly?

Mr. Sargent: It is a kind of blanket?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is a kind of a blanket but you first have to have one crop fully insured. That entitles you to buy the rest.

Mr. Sargent: It is a base.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A base, yes. That will start you off, then you can buy the rest of it. Now if a farmer decided that he was not going to cover any of his crop plan with crop insurance on any specific crop, he would not be able to buy bare ground coverage.

For instance, if he had his fall wheat covered by crop insurance in the fall of 1971, he would not be able to go out in the spring of 1971 and buy bare ground coverage for his whole spring crop. He would have to have one spring planting crop insured. Does that make it clear, Mr. Speaker?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Sargent: Is it going to cost more money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thirty cents an acre.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but is it going to cost the government any more money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is hard to know. This year is pretty good.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion.

Bill 58, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act, Ontario.

Bill 59, An Act to license and regulate Fur Farms.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 10, 1971

Ontario assistance re refugee health problem in India, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 2557

Builder-proposal techniques and Headway Corporation Limited, statement by Mr. Grossman 2557

Chairman of OHC and Headway Corporation, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman 2561

Budget increase of $20 million for staff and services for retarded children, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon 2564

Request from OXFAM for assistance re cholera in India and Pakistan, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon 2564

Parcost report by committee on drugs, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon 2565

Change of policy re regional development councils, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon 2565

Provincial financing of guaranteed basic income through Canada Assistance, questions to Mr. Wells, Mr. Nixon 2565

Report on alternative transit and commuter facilities, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Lewis 2565

Order-in-council re announcement by Mr. Davis, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Lewis 2566

Apparent bypassing of Metro Hospital Planning Council reports, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis 2567

Plum Hollow Co-operative Cheese Factory, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lewis 2567

Tonnage of corn used in manufacture of alcoholic spirits, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Spence 2568

Sale of keg beer, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. B. Newman 2568

New tourism and information centre at Pigeon River, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Stokes 2568

Investigation into "death" of woman at Thunder Bay, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman 2569

Rebuilding Highway 401 bridge over Bathurst Street, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Singer 2570

Laying charges against infractions of Pesticides Act, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Paterson 2570

Employees' termination-of-employment notice at Peace River Mining and Smelting, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Burr 2571

Layoff of employees working on Queen Elizabeth Way at Dorchester Circle, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Bukator 2571

Threat to charge OHC tenant, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. T. Reid 2571

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 2572

Presenting annual report, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Wells 2572

Presenting report, Law Society Council and Advisory Legal Aid Committee, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 2572

Resolution re Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, Mr. Hamilton 2572

Commemorating national day of Portugal, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 2572

City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, second reading 2574

City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Bolton, second reading 2574

City of Sault Ste. Marie, bill respecting, Mr. Gilbertson, second reading 2574

Town of Burlington, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 2574

Township of Pelee, bill respecting, Mr. Paterson, second reading 2574

Guelph General Hospital bill respecting, Mr. Worton, second reading 2574

Third readings 2574

Third readings 2575

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Davison 2575

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Innes, agreed to 2600

Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2600

Business Corporations Act, 1970, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2601

Corporations Information Act, 1971, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2601

Fur farms, bill to license and regulate, Mr. Stewart, second reading 2601

Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2602

Crop Insurance Act (Ontario), 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 2602

Third readings 2604

Recess, 6 o'clock, p.m. 2604

No. 63

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 10, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS
(continued)

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): As I get older I get deafer, and I find it very difficult to hear the bell. But the bell out there was sufficiently loud even unto my needs.

Mr. Chairman, if you go down to the Liberal and New Democratic Party offices downstairs there is a conspiracy afoot on the part of the Conservative government. They are desirous of making us miss the bell, because you cannot hear the thing. It does not work and they are making no attempt whatsoever to repair it.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The bell is out of order, not him.

Mr. Lawlor: The bell does not work. That is perfectly right, and it has been like that for three solid days. It rattles away in dead silence and—it is a very good trick—we could come up and the estimates would be all over for a year and we would all have to stand here and weep. The spectacle of seeing these estimates finish would be such an appalling one to me at least that I would urge you to do something about it.

Mr. Sargent: Another Tory plot.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, speaking on a point of privilege, I want to support the hon. member. I have a bare workshop up on the fourth floor which was given to me to carry on some of the duties of House leader, and I was up there at 7:45 working and I heard no bell, no bell at all, and I finally looked at my watch and thought it must be time for the House to be sitting so I came down and saw that I was late on account of the fact that there was no bell. So I support the point of privilege raised by the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Chairman will bring it to the attention of The Department of Public Works immediately, so it will not recur we hope.

We are studying the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs and we are on vote 603, item 1. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I am almost finished with this as far as I am concerned—the insurance part of these estimates—but there is one area I would like to explore for a few moments with the minister. I was somewhat taken aback a year or so ago to learn that there are three sections of The Insurance Act—namely 337, 338 and 339—having to do with the powers and range of responsibility of the superintendent of insurance, for instance in the area of the fixing or making of rates or schedules or changes therein.

These sections have been on the books for a considerable period of time, from at least 1960, and more than a decade has gone by—each one of them calls for a proclamation. Could the good minister explain to me why these sections have never been proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My understanding, Mr. Chairman—and I am glad the hon. member raised the point—is that the superintendent of insurance, by his conferences and interviews with the insurance companies, has been able to satisfy himself that the rates are realistic and reasonable and proper. That is the reason, as far as I know where the sections have not been proclaimed and therefore not used.

I think perhaps it would be fair for me to say in studying The Insurance Act, as I have been doing, with the contemplation in mind I am hopeful for this session, we may need to strengthen the hand of the superintendent of insurance with respect to that area. And I am now giving consideration to what strength he may need to have added to his arm, and what new legislation is advisable with respect to the fixing and determination of rates.

But I, of course, have only had this department in its present form for some three months and that is all the answer I am able to give at the moment. I think perhaps this may be the time, if not for the proclamation of those sections, certainly for the consideration of seeing why they should not be proclaimed or if there is any reason for them to remain there without being proclaimed.

Mr. Lawlor: Now I know, while you were the Attorney General of the province, there must have been a period of time when these sections fell within your purview. I know that you must have been an enormously busy man back in those days—having virtually nothing to do—nevertheless for the many, many years they were in your purview. The plea of three months hardly rings very true.

And when on earth did you ever use such a palliative saying that, in reviewing the rates and watching them, you find that they are on the whole satisfactory?

When did a responsible minister of the Crown ever say that legislation ought not to be available to him at an instant's notice and his fingertips, in the event simply as a something in the background, a means whereby the full benefits and sanction would be present at all times, rather than let the thing float around in some legal limbo where it had no efficacy at all?

It is the weirdest piece of jurisprudence that I have seen since I came into the House, to see these dormant sections sitting there for 11 years at least—and I have not traced it right back but perhaps for longer periods of time than that, without being brought into being.

Whether they had to be utilized or not, if that was the basis for not proclaiming them, then I would dare say that a good 50 per cent of the rest of your legislation on the books of the province ought never to have been proclaimed either. They are there in order to provide for eventualities and to foreclose or prevent them from arising by precisely being there. Never to have utilized them seems to me some kind of negligence on the part of the government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the point is well taken. I think it is well raised. I do point out that the companies are aware that the power is there, on a day's notice or less, or without any notice as far as the companies are concerned. The sections which put that great power in the hands of the superintendent of insurance to fix rates are there, really in a sense to give him some power that he uses to talk with the companies.

And let me say this is done not just with our superintendent of insurance, but with companies across the land in all the other provinces and with the other superintendents of insurance, to review and check and ascertain that the rates are proper and adequate because rates do sometimes have to be increased so that the companies may be able to meet their obligations. But the fact that the power is there and that within a day or within an hour, could be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, is almost as effective as if proclaimed.

But I think the point is well taken and I still go back to the fact that perhaps I had some knowledge of this while I was Attorney General and if the hon. member is able to make the same remarks to me next year, I will be able to give him an even stronger answer.

Mr. Lawlor: Very good. You may ask me that question if you wish next year, and I will give you an even stronger answer. I will force the odds. They talk about us radicals being a little utopian—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I believe the hon. member has his head in the clouds and is dreaming, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one other minute—now that you raise the issue of rates, you know—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Could I comment on that? Mr. Chairman, at the consent of my colleague, I would like to make a couple of points. Regardless of what the minister may presently think about those sections of the Act which have not yet been proclaimed, I would simply point out to the minister that it is an industry where, for practical purposes, the industry fixes the rates and they are uniform throughout the province. It then seems to me that you have to provide, if you are giving any consideration to making any changes whatsoever, a public forum at which the question of the level of rates and the reasons why rates are fixed at those levels can be attended by the public, where they can make their own representations and where a hearing can be held to determine what the level should be.

I think it is an outmoded system to provide the superintendent with some kind of threatening power. We all know that when the question came up in the courts, many years ago now, as to whether or not The Combines

Investigation Act extended so far as to deal with fixed rates by the insurance industry, it was held that The Combines Investigation Act did not apply, because it was a service industry.

It seems to me that there should be, as in many other areas of semi-monopoly operations, a public board at which representations would have to be made, where hearings would be held and the levels of rates would have to be justified. Now, they could be justified. It is not just simply a question of establishing a rate and claiming that it can be no higher. There would be legitimate business reasons why rates might very well be increased, or legitimate reasons why they should be decreased.

But if this government persists in allowing, for example, the automobile insurance industry to remain in private hands—which I am sure the government insist that it do—it seems to me that you have got to have a public body before which hearings can take place and decisions can be made openly and publicly about the level of the rates.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: To some degree, Mr. Chairman, I think I go along with the remarks the hon. member has made. He has noted, I am sure, that I mentioned in these estimates before that, in our discussions in Ottawa and in our correspondence with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), we discussed the matter of a competitive approach to the marketplace in all its aspects. I think it has been noted in news reports of yesterday—which I was not at liberty to say—that he is planning the establishment of a very expert committee to deal with these matters, and I note that he says the committee will be empowered to deal with services and with the professions as well as with industry and that he intends to establish it by legislation very soon.

I agree that study of insurance rates generally should be held in public and that the public should have an open view of the proceedings, the right to make presentations and to examine the evidence presented.

On the other hand, I think it is fair to say that a great deal of disclosure is required of the insurance companies in their annual statements, in the whole gamut of their business —the losses, the claims which they receive and pay, and the profits which they make. I think the superintendent of insurance—and again I say not just the superintendent of insurance in this province, but in conjunction with the superintendents in other provinces who are interested in this field—they examine, discuss and, I think, to a large degree, assist in the regulation and control of insurance rates.

As I say, I go a long way in agreement with what the hon. member has said. I do not admit that at the moment there is a case to be made out that insurance rates are extravagant or exorbitant or unreasonable. This goes along with the remark of the member for Riverdale: "Why are not the sections which give the superintendent the power proclaimed?"

I think even if he had that power he certainly could not exerciseit in an arbitrary way. It would have to be exercised on reason, on understanding, on information, on knowledge of the business, the losses, the claims, and what the insurance companies are obligated to do. It is not just a case of having an arbitrary stick to say "reduce your rates" or, "on your application you may raise it." There is a lot of knowledge and study that has to go into such a widespread and varied industry as insurance.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make two brief comments. I think there is a legitimate area in which the criminal law power of the federal government has to be used. But I think that so far as the province is concerned, it should be in a sense jealous of the requirement that rather than the criminal law power in areas which are monopolistic or semi-monopolistic—or where it is a co-ordinated industry which really fixes the rates and provides only an area of competition in terms of the services which are provided—the best way to deal with it is through an effective rate-making body which hears the evidence where the public can come.

I think, as usual, the minister and I tend to agree on this particular aspect of the problem. I was not saying that either the rates were exorbitant or otherwise. Under the present system they are set by the demands and losses of the marketplace, even though they are relatively uniform throughout the whole of the industry.

I think what is wrong about the present system—so long as the government persists in leaving large areas of it within the private field—what is wrong with it is that there is no public forum in which people can express their views as to what the level of the rates should be. My only comment, interjecting after what the minister said, is that I do not really believe—and I am not talking in a

constitutional sense—that the encroachment by the federal government, by the use of the criminal law powers, is really the way to cope with the problem. The problem is within our own jurisdiction by way of a rate-fixing public body. I am sure the minister is in agreement on that part of my comment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I want to make one comment on that. As I understand the discussions which we had in Ottawa and the correspondence which, as I say to you, has been carried on over a period of some months with respect to the combines investigation field—not just with respect to insurance, but with respect to other industries such as oil and industries generally—it was our view and I think the federal government is now of the opinion—I think this from Mr. Basford's news release of yesterday and the speech he made which was carried by the news, that he will move away from the criminal approach of The Criminal Code in the federal power—that the way, which we think is the better way really, or at least a supplemental or an additional way, to approach these matters is the power to regulate, the power to control perhaps through the civil authorities by licence or by direction, by regulation rather than by prosecution, which is awfully difficult sometimes to bring home, where intent or evidence has to be produced beyond reasonable doubt, and so on.

The criminal power has not been really as effective as would be an approach from the civil side. I think we are coming to that. I think the federal people are. It is something we can do in other fields. I do not want to stray from this subject to other fields, but we feel that we can get into the contract, in the terms of a contract, its reasonableness, its fairness and so on. We do not have the combines investigation procedure which is a wide-ranging national federal power. But I think we are coming to this with an understanding with the federal people and they are coming to our view of things.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the Attorney General, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs; I continue to think of him in his former role—what, then, is the constitutional authority under which the hon. Ronald Basford would assert this authority? I would assume that the federal government does not have jurisdiction when we come into the field of insurance in terms of traditional constitutional law about questions of private contracts? Under what head of authority does he assert that kind of power?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I had not really thought of that in specific terms. Trade and commerce—the national good; those are not the words, the general good of the country—I think that if the federal government were to come into this field, and I notice Mr. Basford said he was going to look into referral selling, pyramid selling, the things that we have done studies on and have reports on and are thinking of proceeding with. I notice he suggests he is going to go into those.

I do not think we would quarrel with his jurisdiction because trade and commerce of this nature and other natures flow across our borders. I think he could make a pretty strong case that for the good of the nation—my hon. friend can probably help me with the language which the courts have used—

Mr. Lawlor: You do not mean emergency power?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, not emergency; it is peace, order and good government. It probably could be argued that it might fall within that; something that is wider than the jurisdiction of a province.

I suppose in those chicken and egg and broiler cases one of the strong arguments that would be used by those provincial Acts which might be disallowed, would be that the federal power reaching across provincial borders and interference with good government perhaps in a sense. I do not know, but I had not thought of Mr. Basford being restrained at the moment and that he might be considered to be going beyond his jurisdiction.

Mr. J. Renwick: I think that my point, without ranging too far afield on it, is that you know this is a federal system of government and we have in Ottawa, as a political matter at the present time, a very aggressive government and, in this particular minister, a very aggressive minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am very aware.

Mr. J. Renwick: Without saying that the solutions cannot be done on a national basis, I think that this government has got to be very jealous of any endeavour by the federal government to substitute some other kind of authority for what was formerly the criminal law court. In other words, I think that this is primarily—so far from the time of the Parsons case and other cases—a matter within the jurisdiction of this province. No matter how one thinks of the developing federalism of this country, one still has to recognize that

this province has a prime role to play as a pathfinder in the methods by which rate-fixing bodies are established by which the public can come in front of it.

If the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa is relying either on the peace, order and good government clause, or on the trade and commerce clause, then I think we are in for a constitutional hassle. Because, at the present time, the trade and commerce clause and the peace, order and good government clause would certainly not operate to allow the federal government to move in on the question of what the rates for insurance in the Province of Ontario should be

It may be that at some point in the future it will be a matter of national concern, but at this point in time I think that this minister primarily is responsible for introducing a system by which the public can be informed, in open forum, of the reasons why insurance rates are at certain levels, including other areas of insurance coverage. Such as, for example, in the fire insurance field, why certain areas may well be blanketed out as not being eligible for insurance. Why there are so many diverse classifications of rate fixing. All of these matters are matters which can only be thrashed out before a public forum.

I think that is a much better way, at this time, in the state of this particular country and this particular province—that is a much better way for it to be handled at this level, at a provincial level, rather than at a federal level.

I would object very strenuously, if I were a minister of this government, about any encroachment upon that particular field without a thorough thrashing out of the problems involved and without a very clear recognition of what the constitutional ramifications of it are. Because, whether we like it or not, I think we in this party are totally committed to a federal system of government and not to a centralized unitary system of government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am very gratified to hear the hon. member's remarks. Again, I agree with him; I certainly may have made it plain that in my comments, in my contributions to federal-provincial conferences, we believe in the federal system and are very definitely opposed to a centralist type of government which sometimes is urged upon us at federal levels.

I am aware, very aware, of the aggressive approach of the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and I think he is aware of our knowledge of his attitude. And I agree that public forum is the best way to deal with these things.

One must not forget that the public, without a great deal of expert assistance from accountants, persons versed in the law—particularly in accountancy, and actuarial knowledge—would be required to arrive at a decision in fixing insurance rates, and what insurance premiums or charges should be.

On the other hand, I certainly am jealous of the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario, which is the same as that of the other provinces.

As we discuss securities, we are dealing again with the same minister regarding the regulation of trading in securities. And here is the added Canada-wide appeal which flows across the borders of the provinces. I would like to use the word "Dominion" but I understand that has gone out of style. It is across the Dominion, if I may use it once. Perhaps for the good of the nation, for good government, one could make a very strong argument against having 10 jurisdictions controlling and trying to regulate in different ways and with different rules, that the requirements of the placing of a security on the market for the public to buy. A company, say a company incorporated in a province, or a company incorporated by Canada, which sold its securities in Manitoba and in British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia, would then have to meet different rules and regulations. Perhaps there is an argument for the federal government moving into that field, at least to some extent, that perhaps it would improve the system.

Now I will leave that. We have dealt with securities; we have talked about that. But we come to insurance. Our insurance companies generally operate on the national board on the whole level. Is it not arguable at least that, if Ontario were to fix a rate —just to touch that facet alone—if Ontario were to fix the rate which a company could charge in Ontario for a certain risk on a certain policy, would that company then be free to charge a different rate in Alberta, Saskatchewan or New Brunswick, or should it be that a company that is doing business nationally should be controlled on some national basis?

We try to achieve that today, as I say, by the superintendents of insurance in convocation together, discussing these matters

and then dealing with executives and the governing bodies of insurance companies, reaching uniformity—and they have reached a very large measure of uniformity. And that is the way, at the moment, in which we try to achieve something that is level across the board.

But I think one could argue—I am not sure successfully at all—that, not necessarily entirely on a legal justification, but for trade and commerce, for a fair practice in Canada of this industry, it should be governed or controlled, in some areas at least, on a national basis. I do not know that I can add much more to the discussion.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I cannot leave this part of the estimates without saying just a word—you wish I could leave it—without saying just a word about no-fault insurance. I hope that it does not spark a debate. In any event, whether it does or not, it deservedly would.

Is it to be left, as usual, to the vanguard and enlightened, to those who carry the torch, who are willing to take the electoral risks and everything else—namely, the New Democratic Party—to be the forerunners in this particular field and carve out the future for you? Do we have to do it in every new social measure under the sun? Do we always have to be five, 10 years ahead of the government and have it come in and take all the accolades and all the benefits in the meantime? Is this the way the system is run?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: And this is the newest thing, is it not? No-fault insurance, which is vindicated by every responsible person in the field. Everyone from Linden the liberal, clean through to the professors at Harvard University, in various modes and schemes.

I say I do not want to spend a great deal of time on it. It is in the wind, it is on its way. From generation to generation, no matter what type of social improvement one seeks to make, it seems always that there are entrenched interests out there who will fight you tooth and nail and 10 days after it is brought into law will bow their heads and say: "It is the finest thing under the sun."

Let us see you boys take away health insurance at this time of the day, and you heard what your former Prime Minister had to say about it in this House, about Machiavellian schemes and such nonsense. While his left hand was moving the legislation forward, pushing the draftsman, his right hand was waving in the air abominating the scheme. Talking out of both sides of your mouth—double hypocrisy, double hypocrisies keep you straight.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): What the leader says is right at the time and you will go along with him no matter what he says.

Mr. Lawlor: You have, somewhere within your insurance legislation, the possibilities—the simulacra, and incunabula, the very beginnings, the almost microscopic particle of a no-fault policy, have you not?

Mr. J. Renwick: They have the Saskatchewan scheme here, but they will not admit it.

Mr. Lawlor: Going from there, then you go to Ottawa. And by the way, next time you talk to Ron Basford, just ask him who he think he is, where does he get his power from under that emasculative Trade and Commerce head? You can tell him that he was scuttled half a century ago by the Privy Council, and unless we can put flesh back on to the bones of that section of 91, then surely he is in deep trouble with respect to his adventurings.

But to get back to Ottawa: you discuss it with the people up there, and the lame duck excuse I had to listen to from the former minister, the member for York West (Mr. Rowntree) make mention of, all the time: "Well, we really cannot bring it into being because there are constitutional problems."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hyphenate that, will you?

Mr. Lawlor: I am trying to pour scorn on the pacific waters, you know, and the government does not get the message. Always you have some stalking horse riding in front of you in order to act as a pretension to reason why you are dilatory and will not act. Why you forfend in favour of vested interests in this particular way and then you go up there and just—well, I suppose I may turn it into a question although I really do not wish to do so, but more in the nature of a jeremiad, if you will accept the term. What do you talk about up there? In that get-together, where you are trying to set up a uniform scheme across the country, where you do give verbal assent to no-fault insurance, where you know

that the operations of the courts have not been effective in handling the vast bulk of claims at least ought to be taken out of that particular dimension, where—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Even the lawyers are getting them now.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, just to use an obverse argument, when McRuer, which the minister supported for a while until the full weight of public opinion fell on his shoulders—it is the only time I saw him bow, you know, at least visibly, I am sure that he squirms very often in the secrecy of his chamber—it was on the issue of civil juries. The argument at that particular time was basically that civil juries in automobile-accident cases find it virtually impossible—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have to ask the hon. member—I must correct him here. I never reversed my stand or changed my views. Not I. I kept my stand and that is the stand I have today.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, you sent out your sparrows and your doves. Your little rumours and harbingers that the Attorney General of the day—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was never retracted.

Mr. Lawlor: —was very anxious to bring in this particular legislation. Well, let us stay to the nub point, the nub point being that the business of trying to assess, three, four or five years after the event, the very intimacies involved in a motor vehicle collision, would bypass the powers and the omniscience of any single human being.

Why, 10 minutes after an accident happens in 90 per cent of the cases, you cannot reconstruct it. So a great weight falls, and it is on the major cases, as you know. You know the studies made by Professor Linden in this regard; how those were the most deserving. Those who suffer the greatest loss are the ones who are treated the worst by our courts, and by the adjusters and by the insurance companies all across the board.

Another thing, throughout North America, read articles in the Financial Post, in the Wall Street Journal, about the insurance industry and the automobile-claims segment. The thing is a shambles at the present time—all kinds of inworked inequities. And so it is high time that, in terms of sheer equity, we redressed the balance, moved into the area and then seized the bull by the horns, which you fellows negligently refuse to do. So, to get back, Mr. Minister, what is the reason that you do not feel you can bring it in here at the present time?

Secondly, with respect to your conversations in Ottawa, how are they getting along? Where do you stand with respect to no-fault insurance across this country?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is extremely clever in a provocative way—and I do not mean being provoked in a way that makes you angry, but in provoking response. And he probably knows that, as the minister responsible for the field of insurance upon which he is talking, it would be not—

Mr. Lawlor: Now, do not shuffle off the responsibility.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I think he knows where you itch and he is scratching a little.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He would know if he were standing here he could not alone frame and state government policy.

Mr. Lawlor: Listen, I get absolutely nowhere with the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton), I can tell you that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I like these provocations and I am not at liberty to tell him all the ammunition I have in my belt, or the arrows I have in my quiver, but let me tell him I shall be shooting them at him soon.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, good, I would like to be slung with that sling.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They will not silence him from those provocative remarks, but they will have him standing up and cheering.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this part of the pre-election unveiling?

Mr. Stokes: Is this post-election delivery again?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am talking about no-fault insurance. That is all I can tell him at the moment, but I hope he will live in expectation of that great day when I tell him more.

I just want to take him over now—having said that, I just want to tell him that when I proposed no jury in a civil matter that is still my attitude. And it was the Advocates' Society—is the hon. member a member of the Advocates' Soviety?

Mr. Lawlor: No, they do not have any—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am glad to hear that. It was the Advocates' Society which was the chief opponent, because it wanted to get in court with juries, on this type of thing. But one day we will achieve that, too.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a couple of isolated individual points that I want to explore with the minister to see what reaction he has.

In his study Professor Linden contended that some 40 per cent of the time of the courts was taken up in car insurance cases. In contrast, when one takes a look at a jurisdiction such as Saskatchewan, the last time I had a report there were only four cases in the courts.

I wonder if the minister could give us a ball park estimate as to an added figure that should be made in the calculation of the cost of car insurance—namely, 40 per cent of the operation of the administration of justice in this province—which is in effect going down the drain without any real achievement other than delay in rendering claims judgement?

Is the figure 40 per cent and if so, what does that represent in millions of dollars?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot really give a ball park figure. I do know that a large part of the time of lawyers of course is taken up in automobile cases.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. minister accept the 40 per cent that Linden came to?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say 40 to 50 per cent might not be out of the way. Let me say this, speaking of Professor Linden—the member for Lakeshore mentioned him—I have him on my committee studying insurance, studying the type of legislation that I might find it possible to bring forward with respect to no-fault insurance.

Professor Linden is a member of that committee—a very active member. I have sat with him, along with the other people who comprise that very knowledgeable and expert and dedicated committee which assists government, and it is on their findings that I will move. Professor Linden is one of those and he is by no means inarticulate.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the minister realize that he could not get his own party to go along with him the time he brought up the resolution at the last convention—they split up on it?

Mr. J. Renwick: He was briefed by the All-Canada Federation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is my man anyway. I have him working for me and he is very useful.

When the member for York South speaks of the time in the court, I think perhaps the percentage that he speaks of is right at this time, but let me point out that it is not just that simple. You cannot make it quite that simplistic.

The courts will sit, in any event, through the weeks and months that they now sit, if not longer. The salaries of the judges will be paid. The salaries of the officials are paid. So that, in cost terms, the courts' costs will not be reduced at those levels of the administration of justice.

The time of lawyers—the money that comes out of the individual's pocket—is wasted or is spent in perhaps what could be unnecessary and outmoded methods of settlement of claims, particularly if we cannot find a method of no-fault insurance which will make those unnecessary. That is perhaps where the waste and the clutteration of the courts which delays other types of cases takes place.

The actual cost of the administration of justice insofar as government is concerned is probably not much affected.

Mr. Young: But you would not need as many judges, would you?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think you would, but the citizen—I think the hon. member has a point, if you do not have the workload, you do not need the judges, perhaps. But I do not think you could deplete that, or lower that level of court officials or judges very much, but you would save the citizen—and this I think is the important thing—the public from the delay, the individual cost of engaging counsel and going through all the frustration and delay and time and uncertainty of pursuing a case through the courts.

And there again, you save not only the citizen but the insurer, the company, that cost which it is putting into the settlement of the claim. That is why there is such a strong argument—which I accept—for saying to the companies, "Look, pay without trying to determine fault and you can probably do it without increasing your premium, especially in the field of bodily injury or death claims. I am not certain that holds with respect to collision and property damage, although we have a large measure of no-fault insurance

there, really, when you take out collision insurance and pay.

But certainly that is the argument for no-fault insurance, and I am aware of it. I am using it, and the committee that works with me is fortifying me with their figures and facts. As I said to the hon. member for Lakeshore, I hope to have that in shape to give some of this back to him before long.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister speaks with a degree of conviction on the point which almost persuades me that perhaps he has come to the conclusion that no-fault insurance is the appropriate kind and that it will be, in the fullness of time, unveiled.

I have just one small point on the argument he has been advancing. I am told that one of the great problems in the courts is sometimes the length of time one has to wait to get a case before the courts. There is an old adage, you know, that justice delayed is justice denied. Therefore, if the courts were not congested, with 40 per cent of their time being wasted on automobile accident cases, then presumably they might be able to render fuller justice at a more appropriate speed on all the other cases that come before them.

However, I leave that and I go to—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Before the hon. member leaves that, if he would allow me to just deal with it. There is a fair measure of truth in what the hon. member says, that court cases are a long time in getting to be heard. Part of that is due to congestion, but a large part of the congestion is due to the lawyers, and perhaps their clients, who, for one reason or another—

Mr. MacDonald: How would you suggest coping with that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —who, for one reason or another, do not want to get on for hearing. On this I speak from personal knowledge. I speak from knowledge as Attorney General and Minister of Justice over the past seven years; I speak from knowledge of the courts, and I am sure the members for Riverdale and Lakeshore have some knowledge of this too.

There are lawyers who—and I am not saying this to castigate lawyers—there are lawyers who do not want their cases to get on too quickly for various reasons. Perhaps there is sometimes reason that they have not got the evidence together, that witnesses are difficult to find and to examine and to get to analyse and to sift that evidence, to make the case. But the great reason, I think, is that delay may force a settlement, that after there has been a waiting period and a period of time a settlement is more likely to be arrived at.

When you arrive at the door of the court and you are ready to go on, that is when most of the settlements are made. And as a little time goes by and bills pile up and there is the worry about going to court and facing the cross-examination, then there comes a time when there is a more amenable attitude toward settlement on the part of both parties. Then, if there is fault, it is like any other type of case: the memory, the agony of the thing depletes, falls down and when it comes to court, it is not such a vicious or difficult case for one side or the other.

So lawyers take their time, and it is not all because there are too many cases.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs leaves out, of course, and it is that until the injured person is at a point where the lawyer can be satisfied that he is fully recovered and that no deleterious effect is going to follow on—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Often justified.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes. Simply because the insurance companies will not settle on a partial or instalment basis but insist on a final and full complete release. There are many other reasons, but that also is a very significant factor in the delay.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I am glad the hon. member adds that. I did say I was not altogether damning the lawyers, but that is one of the reasons.

Mr. MacDonald: I had not noticed that insurance companies became more amenable as the second, third and fourth years rolled by, but I do agree that many an individual became desperate because he had to get money and he had to get some sort of a settlement.

However, let me move to the second point —I just want the minister's comment or confirmation of this.

Am I correct in assuming that the insurance companies are now moving onto a somewhat different basis in calculating their loss ratios—that the rather oft-quoted 67-33 basis, which you will hear mentioned frequently is now going to turn into a 72-28

or a 73-27 basis? And the different calculation arises from the fact that all the costs of adjustment and so on in coming to a settlement are now being added to what presumably is paid out in the claim, rather than as a cost of operations, an overhead cost?

I was told only yesterday, and I have not had time to check this out, that this has been formally announced by the insurance companies.

If this is the case I think this is the kind of thing on which the minister should speak up. Because, quite frankly, to say the claimant is now going to get 72 rather than 67 on an average, when the difference of four or five per cent is a cost in getting that money to him, is falsifying the situation altogether; he is not getting that money, which he legitimately should be. And the insurance companies have indulged in a lot of manipulation of the books.

The classic one down through the years, of course, was that they insisted that they had the right not to include in their calculations their investment income from the money they took in as premiums. And, interestingly enough, in some of the states of the United States, where normally they are not on other issues particularly progressive, they have taken a pretty firm stand.

I think it is one of the southern states which took a firm stand—I have forgotten exactly which one—in the past year, stating that the companies must calculate in their public statement of their accounts their investment income. And when the insurance companies refused and said if they were forced to do this they would not sell car insurance in the area, the state dug in its heels and said, "Okay, if you do not sell car insurance you will sell no insurance." So they capitulated.

Now let me go back to my point. Am I correct that the insurance companies are now going to engage in this further falsification of their accounts? And if so, why does the minister tolerate it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I must confess I am not familiar with the point raised by the hon. member. I have made a note of it. It must be something fairly new, because I am not aware of it. I shall certainly pursue it and make myself knowledgeable about it, and I will be glad to answer if not before the end of these estimates—which I have had some hope might conclude this evening—at the first moment in the House. I just do not know the answer to that.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, in that respect the fact is that in 1969 Ontario companies began including indirect adjustment expenses, that is office overhead, as well as direct expenses, in their figures for claims paid. In 1969 these indirect expenses amount to 3.7 per cent of premiums collected. Now direct expenses such as claims, adjusting and legal fees have always been included in Ontario's claims figures, but never in the public schemes such as Saskatchewan's.

That means that instead of the 67 per cent payout which the private companies have been giving, they will now say, "well, we are paying out 71 per cent." Yet they are not paying out a cent more! They are just juggling the books. So that this thing looks far better when they compare it with public insurance such as Saskatchewan's and Manitoba's, where the payout is 85 per cent to 87 per cent, and then they can say, "We have closed the gap."

Then if we get no-fault insurance, still under a private scheme, we do not know how the figures may be juggled there. But this is the fact, that last year or two years ago—1969—they began to juggle the figures this way and shift the 3.7 per cent from one side to the other side.

I think this is something the minister ought to look into and look into very carefully.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I begin to understand the point that was made—"juggling the books," as the hon. member has said. I do want to pursue it. I do want to look into it. What I gather from the discussion is that the costs of the insurance company are the same, or thereabouts the same—they have not changed—but that in the way they have set them up in their accounting they have indicated, by carrying over to their cost side some additional percentage, that they are trying to make a better appearing case for themselves.

Mr. MacDonald: They indicate it as a payout, which it is not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I want to pursue that and I will have something further to say on it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the House may do, but I have a call from the Prime Minister, who I believe is at Churchill Falls, on a matter which is urgent and he has asked to speak to me. I think it would

take me but a moment and I wonder if the House would be good enough—

Mr. MacDonald: I will take your place for 10 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I thought you could finish the estimates!

Mr. J. Renwick: Tell us what he says.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would you recess for five minutes?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Minister, I have indicated that we will recess for five minutes. I am sorry the hon. minister did not hear it; I did say it and I thought everybody must have heard it. We could ring for the last two minutes.

The House took recess and resumed at 9.15 p.m., o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: We are still on item 1, vote 603. The next speaker is the member for Humber when the minister gets back.

Mr. Gaunt: He is gone again.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the dialogue that has taken place between the minister and the hon. members to the left because the majority of the dialogue seems to evolve around insurance from the point of view of its cost, of litigation, no-fault, and so forth.

If I may be permitted, I should like to digress from the general tenor of the conversation to bring up what to me is also a very important aspect of insurance and, that is, the fact that in this province, at least, regardless of what the cost may be—too high, or not high enough, or low—it is pretty well uniform throughout the whole province in certain age brackets.

This seems to hold pretty true, even though the party seeking insurance has had a number of accidents. I think it is an established fact, when one reads the Canada Year Book and the statistics in the book, that automobiles kill more children per year in the province and in Canada than all childhood diseases combined. Yet we have not reached the stage in our thinking that causes us to take a sociological point of view of the automobile.

We seem to consider it to be the right of a person to drive an automobile, providing he has passed his original test and is insured. If he breaks some laws, we take the right to drive away from him, but immediately that the penalty imposed has run its course, he is entitled again to reinstatement.

To me, by acting this way, we are doing no more than letting irresponsible people on the road and putting a very deadly weapon into their hands. I think one way of controlling these irresponsible idiots is through insurance. I do not believe that we ought to supply insurance almost at the same rate to people, regardless of their ability or inability to operate an automobile.

Mr. Lawlor: The assigned risk is quite a bit higher.

Mr. Ben: I did not hear that remark.

Mr. Lawlor: The assigned risk plan.

Mr. Ben: The assigned risk is a little bit higher, but the assigned risk, as I understand it, is no longer in operation.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): But the facility is still in operation.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member for High Park says the facility is the same thing. Fine. If it is the same thing, they are still letting people drive who are completely irresponsible and have shown themselves incapable of driving when they have an automobile put at their disposal. Now, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Stokes: Borowski changed that in Manitoba.

Mr. Ben: If I may interject, in Manitoba they do charge a higher premium for people who have had driving records.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, they do.

Mr. Ben: Indeed, they do. But, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, you can blame the roads; you can blame the bad automobiles; you can blame people whose ability to drive is impaired; you can blame dirty windshields; you can blame bad mufflers, and you can blame unbalanced wheels all you like, but the fact is that a car in itself, unless it is pointing downhill with no brakes on, will not hurt a soul until somebody gets behind that wheel and puts it into motion.

What we have to do, as I said before and as the hon. member for Grey-Bruce has just said, Mr. Chairman, is find some means of controlling the mut behind the wheel. That is the weakest part of an automobile, and it must be done either through

more stringent testing laws, through sociological testing, or through insurance rates.

This particular minister is not charged with the responsibility of testing drivers, so I cannot tell him that he ought to give more frequent tests or retest drivers, say, every six months or every year, or give them a sociological test or a psychiatric test or a psychological test, because that does not fall within the scope of his department. I cannot suggest to him that, if a person accumulates so many demerit points, his licence be suspended for a greater length of time and perhaps for life, because that again does not fall within his department.

What I can suggest to this minister is that any person who has a bad driving record be denied insurance and therefore the right to drive, unless he takes a series of tests determined by this government.

In this regard, the minister would have to have the co-operation of The Department of Transportation and Communications, because the person without insurance can apply to the fund, and pay $25 or whatever it is now. I am not sure what the amount is—whether it is still $25.

Surely the people, the ordinary, average citizens, have the right to drive an automobile on the street and feel that the majority of irresponsible, immature imbeciles have been taken off the road by one regulation, Act, proceeding, or other, of either this government or the law.

I believe it has been said that a person has the right to expect that others using the streets will obey the law. This is what the courts tell us we can expect. If that is so, this government must take action to ensure that all these other people are taken off the road. I would suggest that the minister review the whole field of the issuance of licences. He can bring in no-fault insurance; he can bring in compulsory insurance; he can do anything he likes, but we are primarily concerned with the damages caused by irresponsible drivers.

Money may compensate for property damage, but it is very difficult to use money to compensate a person for a lost limb and the ability to enjoy life to the fullest. I hope the minister will give that some consideration.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might say a word briefly in response. I think again I have to go along to some extent, at least, with the hon. member, but there are some points which I think he does not keep in mind. Rates are increased quite substantially in many cases for a bad record, or for an accident where fault is established. That is one thing.

Mr. Ben: Within three years?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes. The other thing that one has to remember is that we have a point system through the former Department of Transport, now Transportation and Communications, where a record of accidents results eventually in removing the driver from the road for varying periods of time, depending on his record. He is called in and he is tested after certain accumulation of demerit points. If they reach a certain point, he is off for a very considerable time. So these two things which—

Mr. Ben: Will the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes; I draw these two things to the member's attention. But the point I think that is difficult is this. He mentioned death of children and death of people by cars on the road, but it would not be justice and it would not be fair to say that in every case, where persons are killed or injured by an automobile, that the driver was irresponsible or at fault. In many cases, he is in no way at fault, so one cannot put a blanket condemnation on a person because he happens to be involved in that type of accident, that type of injury or death.

It is well established that in many cases a child will run out and leave the driver no opportunity to avoid causing injury or death. I am sure that the hon. member is aware that the police after the most thorough investigation, realize that no charge should be laid, even to test the driver's responsibility, whether he was negligent, grossly negligent, or criminally negligent.

In property damage in civil cases, the courts find very often that one driver or another is not at fault. So simply because a person has been involved in an accident, whether it is property damage, personal injury, or death, one cannot say just because you were in an accident you are an irresponsible driver. So this becomes a difficult place to weigh what the insurance company should do; what the public should do; what government should do and what the law should try to do.

As I say, we have the demerit point system which calls for the interview, the test, the removal from the road, and so on. The increased rates are quite frequently used and,

I trust, are somewhat effective as the hon. member hopes they would be or thinks they should be.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, may I through you draw a few points to the attention of the hon. minister?

First, the demerit point system. A person may lose the right to drive an automobile through the cancellation of his licence if he accumulates a certain number of demerit points. He also is required, after the loss of a certain number of points—a number less than the amount required to cancel his licence—to present himself for retesting. But this testing is on his ability to operate a motor vehicle, not his psychological outlook toward the operation of a motor vehicle.

Furthermore, Mr. Minister, through the passage of time the demerit points are cancelled, so that it is quite conceivable that while the person's licence may be cancelled, three or four months later it may be reinstated because the first points which he accumulated were accumulated prior to the prescribed period, and now he has less than the amount of demerit points which will cancel his licence, and he can drive again. That is one aspect of it.

The other mention that the minister made was the increase in rates brought about by accidents. Usually the increased rate applies for a period of three years in most instances from the last accident; in some instances, two. But, Mr. Chairman, it is quite conceivable that the person whose rates were increased as the result of the accident was not driving for two years because the presiding magistrate, in his wisdom, saw fit to increase, or rather add to, the statutory suspension and cancelled the person's driving privileges for two years. So it stands to reason if a person was obeying the edict of the court he was not driving for two years and did not have a chance to get into automobile accidents for two years, and therefore had a clean driving record for two years and even three years. So there is the weakness in the system.

The third point the minister touched upon had to do with the fact that all accidents are not caused by the presence of the type of drivers I have been describing, and, Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to concede that is so. But I also point out to the minister that in many instances charges are not laid because of society's general attitude toward the automobile. It is the same attitude that today is pressing that youngsters not be jailed for the use of marijuana, or not even fined for the first offence for the use or possession of marijuana. The thinking behind such a suggestion being that so many are doing it they will eventually fill our jails if we were to impose very strict penalties, or they argue that if you impose stricter penalties you are not going to change the situation, you are just giving them a record.

Society also acts in a certain way towards the automobile and people who get into trouble through its use. If you take a life through what is called murder the penalty can be a long stretch in prison, but if you take a life through what is called motor manslaughter the penalty is, relatively speaking, light; two years, a year, and in many cases a suspended sentence, saying the man or the woman has suffered too much already, quite apart from the fact that two or three youngsters were killed because of the collision.

This is society's attitude. Society's attitude, or a jury's attitude, is generally speaking, "Well, we have to punish murder because we are not apt to commit murder. Only a certain type of person is apt to commit murder." But when it comes to judging people who are responsible for the taking of a life as a result of a motor vehicle accident, they exercise a completely different thought process.

They say to themselves, "There but for the grace of God go I. I could have been driving that car. I could have been the one who was distracted by a girl in a miniskirt, or a micro-mini going along the sidewalk"—or something else like that—"and have gone over the central line." Therefore, society has a tendency to deal more lightly with people who get into trouble under such circumstances. So we have to do something to try to counterbalance that.

And it is one thing, Mr. Minister, to have repeaters take drivers' tests. Most of them are quite capable of handling, very efficiently, a high-powered automobile. As a matter of fact, they probably got into trouble because they were demonstrating their ability to handle an automobile and then an unforeseen circumstance arose to cause them to lose their cool and good judgement, and an accident resulted. What we want to take off the road are people who have a propensity to place too much faith in their ability to master that motor vehicle which in the last 50 years has made us its slave. That is what we have to do; we have to break those bonds.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not want to prolong this. I think the hon. member's contribution has been very complete. Again, I just say to him, when he distinguishes the penalties for murder and motor manslaughter, almost invariably there has to be, in the criminal sense of murder, intent: some definite intention to kill, to take life.

Mr. Ben: I am aware of that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Motor manslaughter may be so grossly negligent that it amounts almost to intent, but intent is not really an element. Even a murderer is let out, after a time, in many cases, back into society. That is one point I make.

The other point that he deals with, he says, "This is society's attitude" and he mentions a jury. Many of these cases are tried generally before a jury, and this is society. These are our fellow citizens; this is our system of justice. Is he saying to me that if this is society's attitude—and I think this is what he is really saying—we must go beyond what society's attitude is and "counterbalance," is the word he used—make up for their failure?

I do not know. I think perhaps government has a responsibility from time to time, perhaps, to lead society. But we cannot get too far ahead. Generally, government's responsibility is to interpret the wish of the people which sends its representatives to make the laws to govern. If the men and women who make up the jury say, "This is the law as we want it interpreted. This is the way want it," I do not think government could very long maintain a position which made the law more severe than society would sustain or support.

Mr. Ben: Is not the reverse true, if I may interrupt the minister? That it is our job to pass the laws and then society to temper them through interpretation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I still do not think that a government can for very long step out ahead of society's attitudes to pass laws which society does not support. If it does, it will not be successful in maintaining the law.

There are occasions when an enlightened government may pass a law which it feels is good and educates society to its merit and to its virtue. But these occasions are not too frequent and the government may not last so long that it can educate society to its virtue. I think perhaps there was a situation not so very long ago in Quebec, a quite enlightened Liberal government, I thought—

Mr. Ben: All Liberal governments are enlightened.

Hon. Mr. Wishart —wanted to pass very enlightened laws but was thrown out by the electorate before it could establish the merit of those laws. I just make that point.

Mr. Ben: I trust that the minister is not not passing enlightened laws for fear of being thrown out?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I am not afraid.

Mr. Ben: Maybe that is why the government has not passed any enlightened laws?

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 603 carry? Anything further on 603? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister the reason he does not extend to insurance companies the requirements with respect to the degree of Canadian ownership which the government extended to loan and trust corporations in the legislation a year ago?

It would seem to me that there is little if any reason why there should not be a degree of Canadian ownership in life insurance companies, equivalent to that which the government instituted a year ago for loan and trust corporations.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is a matter into which, Mr. Chairman, I am looking. I do not think I am in a position to say what my present attitude is, because I would want to consult my colleagues. It is something I am studying in the whole matter.

We have, as I am aware, in the loan and trust companies some requirements, but whether we should go as far as we have gone in The Loan and Trust Corporations Act with respect to all types of insurance companies I am not sure, but I know this is a subject which is of public interest and concern today. It is a matter at which I am looking and as I continue I will certainly, I think, reach conclusions and, then, clear them with my colleagues.

Mr. J. Renwick: Of the insurance companies that are Ontario incorporated, how many of those companies are, in fact, life insurance companies? I think in the minister's report it shows some 35 life insurance companies as being companies incorporated in the Province of Ontario. On page 15 of the minister's report, the number of insurance companies registered in Ontario include 35

which are incorporated in Ontario. I wondered how many of those are in fact life insurance companies.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will have the answer in just a moment. The number is 15.

Mr. J. Renwick: Fifteen?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: It would seem to me, regardless of what studies may be going on about other types of insurance companies, that it may very well make sense to introduce into the requirements of a life insurance company the same requirements for the degree of Canadian ownership as are presently enforced and have been for some years in the federally incorporated life insurance companies.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603 carried?

Vote 603 agreed to.

On vote 604:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman: On vote 604.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 604.

Mr. Young: On 604, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Consumer protection. I wonder if we could take this in separate items?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want—

Mr. Chairman: I think probably we cannot. We had better take them in total. I am sorry I did not see which hon. member was up first.

Mr. Ben: I was up first.

Mr. J. Renwick: I was up first.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity—

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member for Humber was up first.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this opportunity to enlarge upon the general remarks of my colleague from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) which he made on Monday on the subject of consumer affairs legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that my remarks may range from topic to topic, but the underlying continuity is concern for the consumer and for the taxpayers' interest. In fact, when one looks at the estimates,—at this vote in particular—the phrase used is "total for consumer protection," so that, in essence, the whole vote deals with consumer protection, or the protection of the taxpayers' interest.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, in no area is this concern more evident today than in the manner in which some supermarkets seem to be pushing the housewives around. As the Star pointed out on April 2, first, it was trading stamps; then we had a cut-throat price war, which cynical observers suggested would only last until corner-store competition was defeated, whereupon supermarket prices would rise again as they now seem to be doing. Now we have unit pricing from Food City, with the other chains looking on and wondering whether to follow suit. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that at least one supermarket has followed.

Unit pricing and standardized packaging seems to be just around the corner and they will probably take away some of the glamour from the shopping for necessities, but also, I believe, a good deal of the waste that has been associated with packaging of extravagant sorts. We now have nowhere to throw our garbage, so recycling of essential packaging is coming into fashion. While we hear the government may do nothing about the litter report until after the election, nevertheless, the banning of non-returnable bottles is clearly on the horizon, probably, no doubt, thanks to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce more than any other member of this Legislature.

A recent comment I came across in a local newspaper is the concern that federal support for the Consumers' Association of Canada is stifling necessary independence on that body's part. I wonder if the minister has any comments to make on the objectivity of such associations now that such a large portion of their budgets are coming from government? Can they, in fact, still be critical; or are their criticisms muted by the dollar bill?

Eighteen years ago I had occasion to act on behalf of a person being sued by a finance company on a promissory note of which, it claimed, it was a holder in due course. The note had been given as part of the purchase price of some shoddy goods being sold from door to door by a fly-by-night company. At the time the conditional sales contract which gave rise to the note was signed the note formed part and parcel of the contract.

My submission on behalf of the defendant was that the finance company was not a holder in due course, as the note not only

had formed part of the conditional sale agreement at the time of its execution, but on the back of the note it stated in bold type that the note would be assigned to that particular finance company. The finance company, in fact, used the salesman seller as its agent, I claimed, and cited an obscure case which had been decided by the Nova Scotia Supreme Court in support of my contention.

It was to no avail. The law continued to treat finance companies, many of which were openly financing these slimy schemes, as holders in due course.

Mr. Lawlor: It has all been changed.

Mr. Ben: The expression, "holder in due course," for the benefit of those who are neither lawyers nor merchants, means in law a person who holds the note in the due course of business for valuable consideration and without any knowledge of any defects or corollary obligations.

I have had many similar cases during the past 17 years, and for—

Mr. Lawlor: It has all been changed.

Mr. Ben: —that reasons I have been fighting for legislation which would make any—

Mr. Lawlor: It is passed.

Mr. Ben: —conditions or warranties in a conditional sales contract run with the note or security.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a waste of time in this place. The member does not even know what legislation has come through the House in the last week.

Mr. Ben: I would like to know, therefore, if the minister has any evidence to hand already that finance companies are being more choosy in selecting merchants, following the recent amendments to The Consumer Protection Act whereby they are responsible for the quality of merchandise which is the subject of debts they have taken over.

Would the minister care also—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would interject right here and now to that question. The legislation, which was introduced in this House some three weeks ago and was just carried to third reading and royal assent, has not yet been proclaimed. It will be shortly, I anticipate.

So of course there is no experience of its effect, but I think I can say with confidence that I do not believe it is going to increase the cost of credit, the cost to the consumer. I think it is going to improve the standard of business performance by the vendor in the goods he sells. I think the shoddy businessman, the fly-by-night type, probably will have difficulty getting credit because the holder in due course, the finance company, the bank, the person who finances him, is going to be careful not to take his paper if he is not ready to live up to his warranty or if he does not sell goods that will stand up.

But in a sense, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's comments—and I like to hear him —really have been out of order, because this business he talked about for five minutes is not the state of affairs any longer as a result of this new legislation.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, it was not necessary for the minister to get up and apologize. I agree with every word he said. As a matter of fact, what I am leading up to is the fact that I applaud the minister's position. I agree with what he said, that this would not adversely affect legitimate businessmen. I am quite aware that the amendment has not passed as yet, but I still believe that will have an effect. I was prepared to give the minister an opening to show that even before the amendment has been passed by this House, it may already have had a salutary effect.

I am sorry that the minister did not recognize the opening and the fact that I was trying to give him credit for introducing this legislation and felt that perhaps I was adversely inclined towards what he has to know. My experience from that time on has taught me that this was much-needed legislation. As a matter of fact, I have here Hansard for 1969, where I discussed the matter with his predecessor and suggested at that time that there be an amendment to The Conditional Sales Act that would prohibit a person detaching a promissory note which at any time formed part of a price in a conditional sale agreement.

Now the minister has found another way of doing this, and I compliment him. I am interested in the end results, not the path by which they are achieved, providing the path is proper. In this case, it was proper; so I trust the minister understands, and now maybe the hon. member for Lakeshore will also be relieved and feel at peace.

I would ask the minister if he would care also to enlarge on his recent comments, and his further mention on Monday, on implied

warranties. The publicity which his earlier remarks received was not in keeping, at least in my opinion, with the importance of the statement to every consumer in Ontario. Perhaps therefore, he could amplify the function of the recent amendment to The Sale of Goods Act in the hope that on this occasion the press will accord it the significance which I believe is its due.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will speak to that now too, Mr. Chairman. The legislation, as hon. members are aware, went in its second portion to the point of providing that no vendor in selling goods could require a purchaser to forego or deny himself the right to warranty. The guarantee of the quality or the performance of the goods is in The Sale of Goods Act. The Sale of Goods Act is a somewhat ancient bill which said that anyone selling a piece of goods warrants it to be of certain quality, to be capable of doing the things for which it is intended or appears to be intended, and that it will serve that purpose well, and that that is a natural warranty which the common law recognizes. The Sale of Goods Act picked up the common law doctrine of those warranties and wrote it into a statute which said these are the warranties which go with the sale of goods and everybody is entitled that those warranties will be performed by the seller.

Now what merchants were doing, and have been doing quietly but persistently and more frequently, was in the fine print, or at least in the print on the condition of sale agreement, writing a clause to say that the buyer would forego, would not enforce, would not require, the maintenance of the warranty. What the recent legislation did in the bill I brought in was to say to the merchant: "You cannot any longer do that. You cannot write out the warranty. You cannot take it away from the purchaser, and if you do it will have no effect. The purchaser can still enforce it, as in The Sale of Goods Act those warranties shall stand and you cannot get rid of them. You cannot deny the purchaser".

Let me say one more word. That at least will maintain those warranties, and the buyer will be able to go to the vendor, the seller, and say the washing machine does not work, the equipment does not perform; it is shoddy; it does not live up to the requirements as to warranty which are set forth in The Sale of Goods Act and even though he had signed off, which is now illegal or forbidden, he can enforce those warranties.

Now this is what I want to say further. In our discussions in our own department, and particularly in the conference we had at Ottawa to which I referred, the conference on May 25 and May 26 called by the hon. Ron Basford, and at which all the ministers from all the provinces having to do with consumer protection were present, we discussed a new look by all of us at the The Sale of Goods Act, at this whole business of what warranties, now, in the modern day and age, should be written into a statute, perhaps a new Sale of Goods Act or some consumer protection Act.

This will be one of our activities in which we will be engaging because it is generally recognized I think that perhaps those ancient warranties are not good enough for the present day.

Mr. Ben: Well Mr. Minister, I thank you very much but I think the essence of good business is still a relationship of buyer or seller or borrower or lender, and it must be based on mutual understanding.

The ultimate decision as to whether or not to make a purchase must rest with the individual. However, it is still our duty to protect him to the best of our ability and notwithstanding this amendment to The Sale of Goods Act, I still think there is one major enactment, I should have liked to have seen during my tenure in this chamber, and that is an Act which would make it compulsory to use a standard contract form for most simple contracts involving the sale of goods, other than those made to a customer's own specifications.

We have The Short Forms of Conveyancing Act. We have The Short Forms of Mortgages Act and we have The Short Forms of Leases Act. I should like to see a standard of forms Act which would apply to most simple contracts and perhaps prevent lawyers finding some way out, getting around the existing law and throwing in their clauses which in some way would still end up—

Mr. Sargent: Get rid of all the lawyers and we would not have any trouble at all. There are too many lawyers.

Mr. Ben: —with the results that we have been trying to avoid.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I am working on it, and I have not convinced them yet.

Mr. Ben: So Mr. Minister, you might give some thought to that.

Mr. Chairman, the minister spoke with pride on Monday about the Consumer Caravan. I, myself, was not impressed. As a brochure for a government travelling display put it:

> The Ontario Consumer Caravan looks at the consumers' world and sees therein a mixed bag of opportunity and potential misfortune. This message is founded on experience—glad and sad—by thousands of Ontario consumers.

This is the quote. Consumer credit, the caravan told its viewers, is a tricky beast if mishandled. It is able to swallow people and their families in a single gulp.

True, that is too true, but has the government done anything to make it less true? Are there less such people and their families being swallowed up today than yesterday? Are people better off for being swallowed in a number of gulps rather than in a single gulp? In previous estimates, for the years 1969 and 1970 for example, there were grants of $2,436.12 to the consumers' debt counselling service of Lincoln; $65,035.16 to the credit counselling service of Metropolitan Toronto; and $4,236.36 to the family service bureau of Brantford and Brant County. I cannot see any similar grants in these estimates, although they may be hidden in some amount.

Perhaps the minister will tell me later, because if I let him get in a word he gets in a book. I am quite willing to wait until the end, if I may be permitted to continue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Well I want to point out to the hon. member, with great respect to him, that he should not monopolize the entire debate on this particular vote. There is another member who, in my opinion, was on his feet at the same time. I think he should give him an opportunity.

Mr. Ben: Well, with all due respect—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister can them reply to both at the same time. I think the hon. member for Yorkview should have a few words now.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you will pardon—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: All right; point of order!

Mr. Ben: I do not yield the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will get my word in one way perhaps, and quite legitimately. We discussed the credit counselling service in a previous vote, Mr. Chairman, it is not to be discussed here. But to answer the hon. member, the credit counselling grants were transferred to The Department of Social and Family Services so that we could get equivalant federal grants and, therefore get more money for this very important service. That is the answer.

Mr. Ben: Fine!

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member not going to yield the floor at the suggestion of the Chairman?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I rose on my feet and I stayed on my feet while you were still carrying the previous vote, because I had been sitting here all evening while the party to the left monopolized the discussion on the previous vote.

Mr. Singer: Shame!

Mr. Ben: Only one member of the party to your left rose during that whole discussion, and it was this speaker.

Now Mr. Minister, if we were tolerant enough to wait our turn on these particular items, I should think that the party to our left would be equally tolerant to wait until we finish on this particular matter.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, on the point of order raised by the minister—

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Mr. Deans: I just wanted to say it is a simple matter of dealing with the estimates item by item.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. Order!

Mr. Singer: Order, order!

Mr. Chairman: I simply suggested to the hon. member for Humber that perhaps in view of the fact it was a tie when the two members rose and I recognized him, then perhaps he had taken enough time—but I leave it entirely up to him. If he does not wish to yield the floor I am not going to order him to do so.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The hon. member is not as easy to get along with tonight as he was during the Health estimates.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, let us submit that at least in this debate, on this particular vote, I have been courteous enough to grant the minister more than equal time.

Mr. Gaunt: That is right. Carry on!

Mr. Singer: Carry on.

Mr. Sargent: That is mighty neighbourly of you.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, it is an offence to sell an article without revealing that it is liened. I believe it should be made an offence for a person to obtain credit without revealing the true state of his finances.

Many people will interpret this to be a means of protecting the lender and prosecuting the borrower, but that is not my intention. The true intent and purpose is to prevent people from getting too deep into debt and then either going bankrupt or forever remaining a slave to interest.

This, to me, is something that I should also like to see, a way of preventing people from getting too deep into debt.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I spoke to this House on the United States Federal Trade Commission, and a short while ago I was looking at recent guidelines, rules and regulations of that trade commission and I must say that I was more impressed than ever with what I saw. Let me therefore, Mr. Chairman, stay with the FTC for a while.

Here are a few of the good ideas on rules and procedures which may have originated there and which I think may be used here to some very good end result.

For example, in recent years a vast array of new fabrics in clothes have come on the market. These fabrics often need special laundering or drycleaning to preserve their best appearance or to ensure a reasonable life for the garments which they comprise. All too often instructions on their proper care are not available from the manufacturers. Many garments, often high priced, are ruined through improper cleaning or laundering.

There ought to be, therefore, a regulation making it mandatory for manufacturers to attach a permanent label—not just a tag but a permanent label—detailing the cleaning instructions on every garment sold to the public. Even the fabric experts today can be fooled without such guidance. The housewife, I believe, is absolutely lost without them. We should, therefore, have such a statute as provincial legislation or federal legislation, or even both.

Another reform urgently needed, particularly in low income areas, is an assurance that advertised specials will be reasonably available during the effective life of the advertisement. Dominion Stores, according to its premier promoter Gordon Sinclair, is already doing this voluntarily. Dominion advertises that if a special is sold out during a sale, a shopper during that period of sale may, on request, obtain a voucher which would enable her to buy the merchandise at the special price as soon as it comes back into stock. But this remains, to the present, an offer unique to Dominion.

Perhaps what we must do is to make it mandatory to state in the advertisement the duration of the sale at which specials are being offered.

A typical example which comes to mind at this time of the year is that of Coleman tourist stoves and tourist lamps. The stoves have a suggested list price of $26.75, which nobody ever pays, and they list normally at retail at just around $19. However, they are advertised as being available, "on special", at as low as $14.77—"while they last."

In a test run, a Torontonian has picked up the two-star edition of the Toronto Daily Star on King Street as it came off the press, dashed to an outdoor store for a special of this kind, only to discover that "our limited supply is already exhausted." Nevertheless, he was told, a "new supply" will be available at the $19 price.

This, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the minister, represents an unfair marketing practice, and I shall be interested to hear what the minister has to say about this by way of comment.

Moving on to a larger-scale transaction, what is Ontario doing about automobile pricing practices and their associated advertising, which makes comparisons, expressed or implied, with prices of previous corresponding models of a different year, when such comparisons are not entirely based upon actual differences in price but instead—at least in part—upon an undisclosed redesignation of items of standard equipment to option, or of optional equipment to standard, at extra cost to the consumer?

What too can Ontario do about price changes in new automobiles which conceal the increase actually occasioned by the concurrent reduction in warranty coverage, say from five years or 50,000 miles, to something much less?

Turning to the home scene, can we do something about standardizing light bulb designation so that the housewife knows just what she is getting in light output versus lifetime. What does "standard" mean? And "long-life"? The expected life of a bulb ought to be expressed in hours on the package, plus or minus five per cent. Housewives should be given the information on the package that as a bulb's designed life for any given wattage is increased, the bulb's light output is decreased. Conversely, if the bulb is designed to burn hotter and thus more brightly, its life will be decreased. Far too many housewives do not see the light, if you will pardon the expression, until it is too late.

In general, in all this what I am saying is that the buyer has the right to be afforded the opportunity of making for himself or herself an intelligent choice among products and services. A buyer has the right, in other words, not to be bamboozled. The buyer, therefore, has the right to accurate information on which to make a free choice; the right to expect that his health and safety is taken into account by those who seek his patronage; the right to register dissatisfaction and to have complaints heard and weighed, when his or her interests are badly served. These rights, Mr. Chairman, should be incorporated into a bill of consumer rights.

This brings me to the important question of misleading advertising. I want, particularly, to speak of the kind of advertising known as "bait-and-switch" advertising, which is still far, far too prevalent..

I have already mentioned the problem of nil or insufficient supply of goods at the "special price," but there is also this other pernicious practice, honed to perfection in Toronto many years ago by an outfit which advertised vacuum cleaners for $19.95, and still being carried on on an increasing scale.

Bait advertising has been defined by the federal trade commission in the USA as an alluring but insincere offer to sell a product or service which the advertiser does not in truth intend or want to sell. The purpose of all such advertising is to switch consumers from buying advertised merchandise in order to sell something else, usually at a higher price or on a basis more advantageous to the advertiser. The primary aim of a bait advertisement is to obtain leads as to a person interested in buying merchandise of the type so advertised.

I think it behoves newspaper publishers not to accept advertisements containing offers to sell products when the offer is not a bona fide effort to sell the product advertised. The point is even if the would-be purchaser, attracted by advertisements, subsequently sees the product itself in the store, he recognizes immediately that it is not of the quality that the advertisement purported it to be; yet that person has been lured to the store by false pretences and may still be in a mood to buy material, to be worked on by salesmen on the spot. The first and all-important contact has been secured by deception.

Ron Haggart, while a columnist for the Toronto Daily Star, frequently wrote on this nefarious practice and often sent Mary Mars, his beautiful assistant, as he put it, to follow up any of the obviously varied advertisements and attempt to buy some of the products advertised. Efficient as she must have been to be employed by Haggart, I do not recall her having had much success in buying the products advertised.

Perhaps the minister should employ a few well-trained and intelligent students—not his regular inspection staff—to pose as respondents to advertisements of this type and to file reports which then might be subject of further regular investigations.

Here is the kind of thing that may happen: A salesman will refuse to show, demonstrate or sell a product offered in an advertisement in accordance with the terms of the offer; or by actual words he will disparage the advertised product or the validity of its guarantee. He will claim that credit terms cannot be extended in respect of that item. He will say that the service is lousy, that repairs are difficult or expensive to make, that spare parts are hard to come by, or that you are such a nice person that he just could not sell you that "junk" even if it resulted in his being fired.

I am pleased to see that reputable firms advertising in Toronto papers, and probably with guidance from the government and advertising managers of the papers concerned, have greatly improved their qualifying statements lately, although these are often in too small print to be easily read, especially by the elderly. What I am thinking of here is the kind of statement which says: "This special is available only at a downtown store"; or "The supply of this item is limited."

Nevertheless, there is still a tendency for chains to have available at all outlets listed in the advertisement, an insufficient quantity of the advertised product to meet reasonably anticipated demands. Because of the franchise system under which some operate, a chain is particularly susceptible to running out of

stock on items carried in its flyers. Some smaller town stores which are covered by the flyer may also have inadequate quantities and shortfalls.

In fairness, however, some such stores may not be named in the flyer though the area in which the store is located may be covered by its distribution.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Who wrote that junk?

Mr. Ben: One solution would be to require such fringe-area stores to take orders for the advertised merchandise at the special price for delivery within a specified period of time.

Mr. Deans: He hired the minister's speech writers.

Mr. Young: Here comes a gem, Charlie.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry to hear the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications refer to this as junk, but that is his desire.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well it is nothing but junk and jazz; that is all it is!

Mr. Ben: And if he says it is junk, then we know the government's attitude.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are not even the author of it.

Mr. Deans: Do you know the author?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not. I would like to know.

Mr. Sargent: You are the last guy in the world to talk about junk.

Mr. Ben: Now our understanding from Mr. Walker, the registrar of the consumer protection bureau, is that like ourselves, he has had his staff investigate certain complaints in regard to inadequate stock holding by franchisees.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have not heard an original thought tonight.

Mr. Ben: In one instance he discovered that the franchisee had failed to order any of an advertised item. However, he did not seem unduly concerned about it. Because of the divided jurisdiction there is a tendency to shrug off as many of these matters as possible with the remark that the federal government ought to have a go at the situation first, particularly in regard to pricing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who wrote that? Ron Basford? Is that Basford?

Mr. Ben: There is no reason the minister should not have some answers to some of the questions I am raising now. This government surely cannot continue to lay everything at Mr. Basford's door as the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications who just entered this chamber at five minutes after 10, is inclined to do.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wish I had not come in. As a matter of fact, I wish I had stayed away.

Mr. Young: The hon. minister made a mistake at five minutes after 10 tonight.

Mr. Ben: This government ought not to wait as long as an unscrupulous minority of retailers—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I made a mistake in coming back.

Mr. Ben: —and I emphasize the word minority—whose aim is to walk as close as possible to the line between legal and illegal conduct, lure consumers into the mistaken belief that they are getting more for their money than is the fact.

We have to have provincial definitions, for example, of a "regular" price, a "manfacturer's suggested list" price—cynically known as the price nobody pays—and "reduced from" price. Now I am prepared to admit, Mr. Chairman, that a former price is not necessarily fictitious just because no sales were made at that price. But in such cases the merchant should be able to show that at that former price, the item was openly and actively offered for sale for a reasonable period of time.

Turning to the question of guarantees. Any guarantee in advertising matters ought to clearly and conspicuously disclose the nature of the guarantee that is afforded.

This would include what product or what part of the product is guaranteed: What properties of that product are covered or excluded—for example, road worthiness in tires—what is the duration of the cover; and what anybody claiming the guarantee must do first in order to realize the guarantee—for example, return the tires to the factory, pay a service charge or a labour component, and so on.

All too often the manner in which the guarantor will perform is left vague. Will he replace the product; repair it; or refund the

purchaser's outlay? All too often it is not clear as to whether the manufacturer or retailer is offering the guarantee. This should always be spelled out clearly in the advertisements. When guarantees are to be adjusted on a pro rata basis and again—

Mr. Stokes: Turn it over to Hansard and take it as read.

Mr. Ben: —road wear on tires comes to mind, I suggest it is sharp practice to base such adjustment on a fictitious or list price which the buyer has not himself paid. For example, a tire has a fictitious list price of $50 but the tire is sold for $25. In six months it proves defective although it is guaranteed for 12 with pro-rated adjustments based on a life of 12 months.

Now one would think that by paying the $25 paid for the new tire, the purchaser would be able to get a replacement under the guarantee, but in fact he is shown the manufacturer's suggested list price of $50 and told he must pay half this price for replacement after six months of wear. Since he only paid $25 for the tire when new, no wonder the consumer is confused at having to pay $25 for the replacement. Such pro rating must therefore be based on the price actually paid.

The use of the words "lifetime guarantee" ought to be banned in Ontario unless it is made obviously clear that the words refer not to the lifetime of the purchaser but to that of the product in fair usage or to some other standard.

Similarly, saving guarantees ought to be made specific. "Lowest price in town"; or a famous one: "We will not willingly be undersold"—which always brings to mind those three monkeys, Mr. Chairman, hearing, speaking and seeing no evil—ought to be banned. Then, too, I would like a definition of what: "Satisfaction or your money back", actually means in Ontario law.

With the holiday season upon us, what do we mean by "free" photographic film? Film processors ought to be forbidden from representing the new film they send back with completed orders to be "free", when their quoted price for processing under this trading pattern is not their regular price for such service; or when the processing price they charge is clearly more than that in the run of the seasonal trade, as carried out by processors who do not supply film with return orders. When the processor means that the cost of the processing includes the price of a new roll of film with the returned order, he should say so and not use the phrase "free film." The same, Mr. Chairman, should apply to "free" drapemaking.

If a dealer uses the word "free," then a customer ought to be able to believe that the film, or the service, is a gift in return for continued custom. In any other circumstances the "free" film or the "free" service offer, are deceptive and customers are misled. It is no excuse to plead that no one is naive enough to believe that anything is free any more. An assertion has been made in advertising for the purpose of securing custom, and it is clearly an unfair trade practice, as things stand.

The situation is complicated in Ontario by the fact that such offers are often made in enclosures to Weekend Magazine, which is a newspaper stuffer printed in Montreal and imported into Ontario. However, I recall that not too long ago when John Bassett took exception to an article in Weekend, he had his staff work overtime tearing that item out. One wonders if he would do the same thing when it comes to an advertisement, and whether in fact he would have a leg to stand on in court if he did that as the law now stands.

Of course we should not leave it to Bassett; and I apologize for using his name if it leaves the impression that he is in any way unique in this regard—he is not. We should be taking the initiative right here in this Legislature.

The Senate committee on poverty was told just how deceptive advertising limits the real choice of the poor and keeps them in continued poverty. They pay more for whatever they buy. They pay the high overhead of the fast-talking-door-to-door salesman. The list of instances is as endless as the seamy side of human nature is prevalent in a minority of characters who engage in trade. The honest merchant has nothing to fear from anything we do in this area. In fact he will welcome action.

But for the minister to leave anything to Mr. Basford and his staff, and their execution of the key sections—33c, that is misleading prices; and 33d, that is deceptive advertising —of The Combines Investigations Act is surely not good enough. As the federal Minister of Justice the hon. John Turner said in setting up the department that is now Mr. Basford's:

> The relationship between vendors and buyers has become increasingly impersonal. We are faced with a discouraging display

of goods and services and many complex products of a quality which is often difficult to assess.

Mr. Chairman, it is to help the consumer in this dilemma that these remarks are addressed. I hope the minister will have some positive answers to some of the issues I have raised. I am very sorry that the other members of this House, in the other two parties, found these remarks so offensive to them, but I usually publish these speeches and I will let people decide about the interjections and even how they are to be interpreted.

I have many more questions of the minister and I do not intend to permit this vote to lapse, but I welcome answers to the points I have raised so far.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, following up the remarks by the hon. member for Humber and in somewhat the same vein as part of his presentation, I want to bring to the minister's attention a case which occurred a while ago, a specific case which highlights this very problem.

The whole business of selling rugs is a very vexed one, as the minister knows. In a metropolitan area such as this a great deal of racketeering goes on in this area. Now some time ago the newspapers did agree they would set up a code of ethics about advertising in this field. How that has worked out or how effective it has been I do not know, but certainly there are other ways by which people like this could advertise.

Back in May of last year, TV Guide advertised for Consumers' Carpet Craft in North York and a gentleman by the name of Leonard Playter, who lives in a senior citizens' apartment in North York, answered the ad. A salesman from Consumers' Carpet Craft came to see him. He was satisfied with the sample that was given; unfortunately he did not keep the sample because these people just do not allow samples to stay with the customer.

Consumers' Carpet Craft is a subsidiary of Sandra Associates, a division of Sandra Associates. Two gentlemen by the names of Weinberg and Mandel were running it for the summer of 1970.

On May 23, 1970, the carpet was laid; it was not what the gentlemen thought he had ordered. He was paying $12 a square yard which should get him a pretty high-quality carpet. He was unsatisfied and told them that was not the material that he had asked for.

He called me in July—if I can find the date here, July 17. Now that is just two months, not two months, and at that time the carpet had already started to disintegrate and go to pieces. One could take one's heel and tear the carpet where it was laid on the floor.

Now, Mr. Playter, dissatisfied, talked to the gentlemen in Consumers' Carpet. They would do little or nothing for him, except finally they said they would replace the carpet. I talked with them and they told me the same thing; that is replace the carpet with exactly the same material, which of course Mr. Playter did not want. He finally secured legal aid and went through the courts.

I have a letter from The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Consumers' Protection Bureau, whom Mr. Playter contacted at my suggestion; we worked together on this. The letter says:

"You are aware that Mr. Playter originally filed his complaint with this bureau on June 3, 1970." That was less than a month after he had received the carpet; "and every attempt was made to mediate his problem to attain redress for him. But our efforts were not successful. He declined to accept the settlement offer made by the company, to replace the carpet with the same quality."

He insisted, of course, that that quality was no good, and I think all of us who saw the carpet understood that, but he could not get any satisfaction.

And so finally, through legal aid, as I said, he retained a lawyer and went to court. judgement was obtained under the court action, and the court ordered the company to refund the $157.50 which Mr. Playter had paid. Unfortunately, the company had disappeared by this time; gone out of business. The parent company, Sandra Associates, was still doing business, and as far as I know still is. But the subsidiary, Consumers' Carpet Craft, had disappeared into limbo. Fortunately they did leave behind them a bond and so the judgement is that, I suppose, the bond will eventually pay the $157, but Mr. Playter has had to wait two years until he can get redress.

Now, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman to you, I would suggest that this kind of a loophole ought to be plugged and people who are taken for a ride in this way ought to have some way by which the department can reimburse them without having to wait all this time. Mr. Playter is a pensioner, as I have said.

The carpet is in very bad condition. I would hope the minister would have some advice as to how some legislation might be introduced and some fund set up which could

reimburse people in this particular situation. Then, perhaps, the fund could be reimbursed from the bond at the time it becomes due. I wonder if the minister would comment on this situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The only comment I have to make is that the bond is a two-year proposition. I mean, that period has to be waited out to see what the obligations are; so that that waiting period is necessary.

I was interested in what the hon. member recounted of that situation. I supposed those are not entirely infrequent occurences. We do have, as he knows, regulations regarding fraudulent and misleading advertising in the provincial field. We can deal with those and have done a good deal in the field of watching, correcting and regulating advertising.

Eventually the bonding arrangements will come to the benefit of the situation, and we will have to wait the time out.

Mr. Young: We cannot hear the hon. minister.

An hon. member: It is the operator up there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have been looking at the whole business of bonding to see how we may improve it and make it more effective and more speedy.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder in a case like this—I do not know how a legal mandate could work out—but it seems to me there is so much of it going on in this area. I have run up against it on many occasions in my area, particularly with older people. Some seem to be taken in this way.

Now surely when the salesman comes, shows a sample of a carpet or a rug, is there no way that he should be instructed to leave a sample with the consumer so that that can be compared with the actual material when it does arrive? This would help I think in this situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it can be accomplished. It is something that could be done, could be put in the Act—in one of our consumer protection Acts—that where goods are sold away from the principal place of business by door-to-door salesmen or by a salesman—in language similar to that about the cooling off period in that type of situation—that where such goods are sold that a sample be left. It would be simple enough to enact. The question, of course, arises—how far can and should government go to protect the consumers?

Mr. Deans: As far as is necessary!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, but how far is necessary? It is the same question. Do you hold their hand down the street and take them shopping?

Mr. Deans: If that is what is required.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Really!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know. You see, the old principle, which I do not defend now in this modern day, was caveat emptor—

Mr. Deans: Consumer beware?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —let the buyer beware! One could almost say if one wanted to be abrupt and give the short answer: for goodness sake, if they get a sample, have they not got enough sense to keep it, so that they can compare? Why should government have to say in legislation that the salesman must leave a sample with the buyer? Maybe we should go that far.

I would have to look at the Act and see. It would be simple enough to do it and I suppose it would be simple enough to enforce it. If the person did not have the sample they would not have to take the rug that was there on the floor.

Probably what we would find is that after the sample is left and the contract is made, the elderly couple or someone has lost the sample; it is not available. The rug is laid and we have got a lawsuit on our hands again.

However, it is something I would certainly consider and it would be feasible to enact. There are some problems I can see arising in administration.

Mr. Sargent: It being 10.30 of the clock!

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, in this regard I think that kind of adjustment can well be made. If the person who bought the rug had the sample at one point and then lost it, that is his problem. But it is so easy for the slick salesman to come in and say: "Here is a sample. It is a good quality rug. It is $12 per square yard and in anybody's business that is a good buy."

He naturally takes that sample away and the person is generally trusting. Most of us trust people until we have cause not to. The people come to lay that rug and it is not the goods; but there is no proof that it is

not, just no proof. So they put in a rug that is worth, perhaps $4 a square yard instead of the $12, and the consumer is again rooked.

Now surely there is some way by which that kind of protection can be offered? I think a simple adjustment of the legislation might well do this, and I urge upon the minister that something like that be seriously considered.

Mr. Deans: Well, on the same point.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): It is 10.30!

Mr. Deans: I want to ask—

Mr. Chairman: Will there be much more? Will you be finished in 30 seconds?

Mr. Deans: Well, there will be more than the next 30 seconds will permit.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, before moving that the House adjourn, I would suggest to the House that we will continue with the estimates of this department in the morning in the hope that we may finish them, and leave suitable time for returning to the budget debate.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): No bills tomorrow then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 10, 1971

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart, continued 2609

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 2633

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 64

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, June 11, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1971

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are honoured to have as guests with us this morning, in the east gallery, students from the Adelaide Hoodless School of Hamilton and, in the west gallery, students from the Dolphin Senior Public School of Streetsville, who are hosting students from the Diamond Jubilee Public School of Kapuskasing. Also with us are students from the Merrickville Public School of Merrickville.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a special meeting of provincial health ministers that will take place here in Toronto from June 15 through to June 18. I have invited my colleagues in the other provinces to this conference because it is apparent that many legislative changes in the health field are taking place in provincial capitals across Canada.

As you know, two major health reports have been submitted in the last year. I am speaking, specifically, about the report of the Committee on the Healing Arts and the report produced by the Ontario Council of Health. A review took place in March of this year and the consequence of this review has been the drafting of legislation on the education and regulation of health disciplines.

The basic idea behind the meeting is to provide a forum where proposed legislation at the conceptual level on many provincial health matters can be discussed. I think there may be advantages in searching for a degree of uniformity on a nation-wide basis during the conceptual stages of this legislation. With regard to the healing arts review, many revealing facts are present in this intensive study. Not only would sections of our proposed changes in present laws interest the other ministers, but their approach to the same problems will be invaluable to us in Ontario.

In addition, there are many other areas of mutual concern in our respective Medicare programmes. We are presently working on proposals and legislation to initiate further administrative control. From the press, I gather, the other provinces are undergoing similar reviews. For example, all provinces are discussing proposals and legislation for control of misuse and abuse of Medicare plans. Also, at the present time, there is little portability of health plans. We hope more efficient interchanging of benefits can be derived.

Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing that the actual legislation be identical; it is merely our wish to determine and discuss common concepts in this time of enormous changes in the health field. Other subjects we will discuss next week are venereal disease control programmes, legislation regarding gifts of human tissue and shared-cost arrangements for Medicare.

The agenda will be more fully developed as provinces indicate particular subjects they wish to have placed before the meeting. Because many of these subjects require background material and interaction of provincial officials, agenda subjects will be reviewed by provincial deputy ministers and their technical staffs on June 15 and 16. The ministers will meet Thursday, June 17 and, if necessary, the conference will extend into Friday, June 18.

Manitoba will be the only province not represented at the conference. Due to the upcoming election in Saskatchewan, the Minister of Health will be represented by one of his deputies. A member of the federal Department of Health and Welfare will attend the conference as an observer.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What does the minister mean, the Manitoba election?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Does the minister mean Saskatchewan or Manitoba?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

MEETING OF HEALTH MINISTERS

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, just on a point of clarification with respect to the minister's statement, am I to understand, in addition to the number of items the minister outlined in the statement, that one of the things that is going to be given serious consideration is the uniformity of standards with respect to those people practising in the health field and the health disciplines?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am sure that will come up, Mr. Speaker. By this, do you mean the paramedical and other groups?

Mr. Gaunt: Right.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is not, specifically, a matter on the agenda at this moment, but I would think that it would certainly be pertinent.

COMMITTAL OF MAN TO LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Health, which is not related to his statement. Why was Merrick Neuhoffer involuntarily committed to Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital on what appears to be unreasonable grounds? I would appreciate if the minister would investigate this matter and report back to the House. Would he give the House an undertaking to do that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gaunt: A further supplementary to that: Would the minister, when he is investigating this matter, also satisfy himself that Mr. Neuhoffer was not admitted to the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital on ideology grounds—I cannot say that word this morning—

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Ideological.

Mr. Gaunt: —Ideological grounds, rather than on his mental state?

An hon. member: It is Friday morning.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, Friday morning.

Mr. Lewis: How can you be admitted on ideological grounds? That is a new concept.

Mr. MacDonald: That fascinates me. The place would be filled with Tories if that were the case.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He is probably a Liberal. He has a split personality. That is where they would be.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMMES

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Health, in view of the fact that the minister has lifted his ban in regard to the construction of hospitals, specifically in Metro, I am wondering has the minister given any guidelines to the various hospitals in their construction programmes, which they will undoubtedly be undertaking insofar as the emphasis is concerned, specifically the proportion of convalescent beds to active treatment beds, these types of guidelines?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, it is not quite right to refer to what has happened as a lifting of a ban, or an unfreezing. As I mentioned yesterday, it is more a question of priorities having been reached insofar as local hospitals in this city are concerned, three of them in particular. With regard to the second part of the question, the acceptance of a proposal and the go-ahead for any building requires from the commission itself complete detailing of the whole programme, its breakup and breakdown, if you put it that way, into the types of beds.

Perhaps I could give more information to the hon. member later on this point, but the Hospital Services Commission does not simply write a general cheque; any proposal that goes ahead is based on complete detail of bed use.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Speaker: It is a supplementary?

Mr. Pitman: Yes, a supplementary: I wonder if the minister could indicate the reasons for a change of mind since the estimates, when he indicated that really there were enough intensive care beds available in Ontario and that the whole emphasis should be toward the restructuring of hospital care across this province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is an immediate matter, Mr. Speaker, with regard to these three hospitals. Taken on the provincial-wide basis their impact is not that great. I do not think there is any problem here in assessing and underlining, as I would, my

concern and the concern of all of us insofar as more and more aftercare facilities are concerned. Of course, even our nursing home programme will not be totally effective even on April 1; and to develop the backup of aftercare services and chronic care and rehabilitation generally is a matter of a programme that will take a number of years. And indeed, many of these hospitals that have been given the go-ahead will not be capable of providing beds for three, four and five years.

I do not see it as a change in policy. One thing I will have to find out myself—and it goes back to the earlier question—I am not able today to give you the breakdown as to what extent these hospital plans individually include convalescent wards, chronic care facilities. I am sure that they do but I cannot at the moment tell you what the balance is.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: A further supplementary: Could the minister indicate whether there is any provincial plan in which Toronto Metro area is included and which indicates the number of intensive beds that will be necessary; and in terms of that kind of a plan, can the minister assure the House that there will not actually be an overabundance of these at some future date when there are, indeed, sufficient pyramids of health care services across the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can assure the hon. member as far as policy is concerned, that is clear. The Ontario Hospital Services Commission has assured me that its planning is province-wide. They have assured me that they are conscious of the necessity of balancing continued or aftercare facilities with active treatment. The chairman himself is not in town today and will not be for another week, so I am left a little in the dark when it comes to the actual balance of bed uses in particular hospitals, whether it be St. Mike's or Toronto Western or whatever.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has a supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Is the minister aware that there is no overabundance of hospital beds in Scarborough; and when he mentioned three hospitals, was he referring only to the city of Toronto or was he referring to Metropolitan Toronto; and thirdly, did his statement specify that Centenary Hospital in Scarborough and West Hill in Scarborough will have the three uncompleted floors finished, thereby providing additional beds within four months?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker, it did not, nor did I make any statement. These were simply questions of priorities being reached with the overall provincial planning of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.

Mr. T. Reid: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Was the press report in the Globe and Mail of several days ago incorrect when it stated that Scarborough Centenary Hospital would receive funds to complete the three floors that are already there? Was that an incorrect statement?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I never made such a statement, Mr. Speaker. I cannot tell the member yes or no as to that particular hospital and its particular project.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister come to the House with some explanatory statement about what is involved here? Frankly, we do not understand why Toronto Western, Toronto General and St. Michael's, downtown hospitals, are given this special priority when the suburbs are obviously the place where the bed pressure is greatest?

Mr. MacDonald: Northwestern.

Mr. Lewis: Secondly—Northwestern and East General—we do not understand how it gibes with the Metro Toronto hospital planning council's 1969-1970 annual report which says:

> When funds are limited, priorities should be given to the development of additional chronic care facilities in those areas of Metropolitan Toronto where they are presently in short supply.

Finally, we have a very real sense that the chaos of hospital bed planning in Metro, partly due to the Hospital Services Commission, partly due to the inability of the Metropolitan Toronto hospital council to function, is being perpetuated in some irrational way. We would appreciate from the minister a full explanatory statement.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to do that today, but as I say, the chairman is in Dublin, Ireland, at an international hospital conference and I will not be able to get hold of him—

Mr I. Deans (Wentworth): Check and see if a lottery was being drawn or he had a ticket in the stakes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —until next week some time.

Mr Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary, as far as I am concerned on this subject: Has any thought been given to the possibility of the hospitals in Metro and the University of Toronto co-operating to the extent that they specialize in certain areas—for instance, one in one area and the other one in some other type of service?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge, and I would acknowledge to the member for Scarborough West, the problems that are involved in the teaching and general hospitals in Toronto. It may be some weeks before I will be able to tackle that but obviously it is a very complex problem indeed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have further questions? One more supplementary.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the minister not aware from his colleague, the Minister of Social and Family Services, that the two Scarborough hospitals are having to turn patients away and send them down to downtown hospitals? There are tremendous pressures on the administration and the medical doctors at Scarborough and Centenary Hospitals to get patients out so quickly that some people feel it is not in the best interests of some of the patients. Is the minister not aware of these things? The crisis is in the suburbs and not in the city.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

CANADA-U.S. AGREEMENT ON POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. Gaunt: I have a number of questions of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management as a result of the conference in Washington yesterday.

First, I would like to get some clarification from the Minister insofar as the cost-sharing arrangements are concerned. Has the minister or the Ontario Water Resources Commission determined what the cost would be, insofar as Ontario's part of the agreement is concerned, related to the improving of sewerage facilities along the rivers flowing into the Great Lakes? I understand Ottawa has agreed to look after the shoreline of the Great Lakes as far as improved sewage facilities are concerned. That cost is about $500 million, according to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Gaunt: What is Ontario's cost in that regard?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I think possibly the article in this morning's paper may have misled the hon. member. The $500 million figure is the total cost of treating waste in the whole drainage basin, including the Great Lakes basin.

Mr. Gaunt: Including the Great Lakes basin?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. This includes the cost of local sewers and pumping stations, the construction of plants and trunk sewers and things like that. Now of this we estimate that about $300 million is the figure for the Great Lakes basin—in other words, the figure in which the federal government would be participating.

We are negotiating as I have indicated—there are negotiations going on between OWRC and my department and the federal government on the $300 million figure. But this is strictly as far as loans are concerned. There is no indication that the federal government will be making any grants or any subsidies.

They will be lending under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation money in relation to the $300 million expenditure. We hope that the loans will amount to about two-thirds of that figure, but the actual cost, as the hon. member will appreciate, will be borne by the municipalities and the provincial government. Of course, the CMHC loan has the 25 per cent forgivable feature which will assist and which could be considered at least partly as grant. On the actual $500 million figure, taking that as a whole total figure, if we can get about $200 million in loans we can meet these deadlines.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary. Could the minister indicate to the House what other programmes or initiatives Ontario is going to put forward to this

meeting? Are you going to suggest, for instance, that the IJC be given special powers particularly in the cleanup of the Great Lakes basin?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the communique and, I think, the reports indicated, the idea is to give the International Joint Commission certain increased powers of surveillance, monitoring. Even in the communique they include the words "including spot checks of water quality in the boundary waters."

They would make recommendations to the various governments to pass legislation and to start programmes which will meet the objectives and the recommendations of the IJC report. We have gone into this, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions.

It is my impression, and the impression of the Ontario delegation, that there would not be consensus or unanimous agreement about giving further powers to the International Joint Commission. In other words, representatives there could not recommend to their respective governments that, for example, their state would give up any sovereignty.

I think really the recommendations in yesterday's communique as far as IJC is concerned are sufficient, I think, to carry out the objectives of this communique and that is to clean up the Great Lakes basin and particularly to get commitments from governments to make the necessary expenditures.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Another supplementary if I may: In view of all the minister has said, I do not share his optimism. Is there going to be any discussion of punitive measures that might be undertaken under the aegis of the IJC if what is agreed to by all is not in fact carried out, or is it going to be sweet co-operation, which really has not proved much so far?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, the representatives at that meeting yesterday did not go so far as to recommend IJC having the power to take any punitive measures against any state or jurisdiction.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is it not necessary?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I do not know. I think if the International Joint Commission does what it is asked to do and that is the monitoring, the surveillance, making recommendations for legislation—

Mr. T. Reid: Same for 15 years.

Mr. T. P Reid: How is that different from what they are doing now?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They are not making spot checks now, for example. They are not carrying out any type of analysis. They have no supporting facilities whatsoever. We are recommending that they be able to do that. I think the idea is to focus public opinion on any state that is not living up to its obligations.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is being done!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You have the normal machinery now, in this province or in any of the states, for taking action against sources of pollution within these various states. The U.S. federal government, for example, has Cleveland and Detroit under a schedule now with severe penalties if they do not meet those timetables.

The crux and you might say the guts of this whole thing, in making this international agreement and signing it by next October, is to get commitments from Congress and the House of Commons to spend the money they say they will spend in caring out these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister so far has mentioned only the effect on water pollution. Could he elaborate on what the decisions were concerning air pollution?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The communique referred to air pollution, Mr. Speaker. I must admit that the emphasis yesterday certainly was on water because this was in relation to a study that has been going on for a year by the working groups in respect to water. But there is a reference to air in the communique and it is my understanding that the agreement which will be signed in October will be structured so as to be able to deal with trans-boundary air pollution.

The IJC has not as yet, as the hon. member knows, submitted a complete report on air pollution in the Detroit-Windsor or Sarnia-St. Clair area. That report I am hoping will be out sometime between now and October so that there can be specific reference to air pollution in the treaty.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce with a supplementary.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister agree with the statement of an authority that in the Great Lakes basin pollution area 85 per cent of the pollution is US-involved and 15 per cent Canadian? Would the minister say the cost apportionment should be on that basis?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the percentage is a guess. The amount of money, I think, is an accurate estimate. The figure of about $2 billion for the US and approximately $300 million for us I think is more accurate that the 85 per cent to 15 per cent ratio.

If we meet the same standards and use the same criteria and do the same things, the percentage really is irrelevant, but I think the hon. member knows that the reason they have so much more pollution than we do is because of more people and industry and municipalities.

Mr. Gaunt: I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if there is any provision whereby the Province of Ontario, Canada and the United States can have representation on the International Joint Commission by way of an additional board to give direction to the commission in its new work?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, it is a recommendation of the working group, Mr. Speaker, that the IJC in fact establish a board which would have a permanent office either in the United States or Canada, or possibly an office in each country, whereby they would have proper staff, some research facilities and professional people generally to carry out these recommendations in conjunction with the two governments.

This is being recommended, and it recommends in the communiqué that the IJC really make these appointments based on recommendations of the various governments involved.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have now been a reasonable number of supplementaries on this topic. Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have further questions?

Mr. Gaunt: May I include one more supplementary in this?

Mr. Speaker: I think so.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, in the event that the U.S. Congress fails to vote the necessary funding for this new operation, will the agreement have to be completely renegotiated again?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, certainly before this agreement can be signed in October, if that is the date—and I think it is the target date now—Congress has to appropriate about $2 billion for this programme and we have to have an agreement with the federal government, as I have indicated before, regarding the figure of approximately $300 million.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if there are any—

Mr. Speaker: Is this another supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A short one?

Mr. B. Newman: A very short one.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I do not wish to be too restrictive.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, do you not think that this subject has been sufficiently pursued?

Mr. Speaker: I suggested a few moments ago that I thought it had, although I do not want to be too restrictive on any member.

Mr. Lewis: You have not been restrictive, Mr. Speaker, we assure you. Why do you not assert your authority?

Mr. Speaker: I will permit this last supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask of the minister if there were any cost estimates for the elimination of the air pollution problem? We received cost estimates for water pollution but not for the air.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, this awaits the final report of the International Joint Commission. We did not get into that yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have further questions on behalf of his party?

Mr. Gaunt: I have questions, but at the moment I will pass to my friend from Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I am going to defer, Mr. Speaker.

ROLE OF DENTURISTS

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Has the minister come to any conclusion in his reassessment of the role of denturists in relation to the dental profession?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not a conclusion, Mr. Speaker. I had a very useful and constructive meeting with them the day before yesterday and, as I believe I mentioned in this House, we are reassessing the definition of responsibilities of all the healing arts. I undertook with them to establish terms of reference during the summer for the practice of dental technology. I also discussed with them the possibilities of reorganizing the structure of their profession, which is a very peculiar structure at the moment, as the member knows, with the licensing relating to the laboratories as distinct from the licensing related to the person and his accomplishments. All I can say is, it is peculiar and deserves a good look, and I undertook this with them and they seemed to be pleased.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask a number of supplementary questions then? Would the minister establish a moratorium on the laying of charges until he comes to some final conclusion in this connection?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not know whether I can properly give such an undertaking, Mr. Speaker. If they are in breach of the law, I do not think as minister I could be an accomplice in any way to this.

Mr. MacDonald: The law is an ass in this instance.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, the law is still the law of this province until this House changes it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary: The minister said he had a very useful meeting with them two days ago; is there any connection between the fact that he had a very useful meeting with them two days ago and that two further charges were laid yesterday?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker. I had no further part in the laying of charges as such. I had not heard until this moment that there were charges laid yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of further supplementary, would the minister explain how they pick and choose among the denturists for this harassment? How, for example, were two of my constituents picked upon yesterday when there are dozens of denturists' clinics in operation in the Province of Ontario? How do they pick and choose?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. It is not a function of mine as to what the police or those informed may be doing. Perhaps the question should be referred to the Attorney General.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to refer that last supplementary to the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General explain how those who are enforcing the law pick and choose upon this denturist rather than that denturist when there are scores of them in the Province of Ontario who are now in violation of the law?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, that is a matter that is strictly up to the individuals concerned, who obviously are very concerned about having the law enforced at the moment.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. minister is not answering my question.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: How they do it, I do not know. Again, this is not a function of the Ontario Provincial Police, the Attorney General, or the Attorney General's officials. This is a matter that we leave to those people within the profession themselves who are concerned about bringing alleged offenders before the courts. How they decide to do this, I do not know; it is completely up to them. But I am sure the hon. member would agree that it does not matter where these people are carrying on their business in this province; if they are doing it against the law, then they should be brought before the courts.

Mr. Lewis: This is harassment, not a charge.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The people who are convinced that they are doing something against the law are therefore taking the steps. It does not matter a darn whether it is in the hon. member's constituency, my constituency or up in Winisk. Wherever they are, if there are people concerned who want to produce this type of a test case on it, then they are doing it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, since the charges have to be laid through the Crown attorney or through the use of the police, is it not the responsibility of the Attorney General to see that there is an even application of the law? Otherwise, it is harassment.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. First of all, they do not have to be laid through the Crown attorney—

Mr. MacDonald: How about the police then?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —or through the police. The police in this case were asked to accompany those from the dental technicians' association simply for the purpose of watching them gather the evidence and assisting them in gathering the evidence. If the hon. member is alleging discrimination simply because—

Mr. MacDonald: I am.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —these people carry on their business in his riding, I think it a pretty far-fetched allegation.

Mr. MacDonald: My constituents protest and so do I.

Mr. Lewis: How can they negotiate one day and charge the next and expect to solve it?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: They do not even talk to each other.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is the association; do not blame the minister for that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the two of them should get the word out that they are in the process of sorting it out.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. member for Windsor West have a supplementary?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): A new question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for York South finished with questions on behalf of his party?

Mr. MacDonald: I was just asking—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has a reply to a question previously asked.

CUSTODY OF CHILDREN

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), earlier in the week or late last week, I have forgotten which, asked me a question, and I quote:

> Is it a fact that a father may not apply for custody in the family court and must go to the surrogate or Supreme Court and cannot obtain custody in the family court as a mother can, and is this some form of prejudice?

I indicated in my immediate answer that I thought there was no discriminatory aspect available to one spouse as against another, and that has been borne out by the answer that has now been prepared for me.

The answer is that, broadly speaking, the procedure for an application for custody depends upon the reason custody is being sought. That is, whether it is because of a problem between the parents leading to separation or divorce or whether it is primarily because of the concern of one parent about the mistreatment of the child by the other parent. If the parents are splitting up and custody is sought upon that basis, then either—and I stress the word "either"—either the father or the mother may apply to the surrogate or the Supreme Court pursuant to the provisions of The Infants Act.

If the father has deserted his child and refuses to provide for its support, in these circumstances, the mother may obtain an order for support of the child and for its custody pursuant to The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act. If it is the wife who is mistreating or refusing to care for the child, there are provisions in The Child Welfare Act, 1965, whereby the father can also avail himself of the family court to have the child transferred from the mother's care to his own care.

Under these circumstances, I cannot see that there is any prejudice to either parent with regard to custody application. So, basically speaking, The Child Welfare Act, an application of which can be brought in the family court, deals with wardship only, not with custody in the true sense which really is under The Infants Act, and under The Infants Act that application has to be brought in either the surrogate or the Supreme Court. So there is no discrimination between the spouses in the respect at all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

FUNDING OF HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Peacock: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Why was the minister unable to commit the Toronto-Dominion Bank and the Bank of Montreal each for a full $20

million mortgage financing as indicated in his statement in the House of April 1 rather than the $24 million announced yesterday?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, this announcement yesterday was only an announcement of those applications which they have already processed. More will be being processed as time proceeds. As a matter of fact, there are other banks that are now processing some applications.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How much of the total of $24 million committed was contributed by each of the banks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the press release not give that figure?

Mr. Peacock: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it did. I think it not only gave the figures but it gave the contracts that they had agreed to and the amount involved in each one.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the minister not know himself?

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister does not know anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do I not know myself? I do not go into all of those details.

Mr. Sargent: It is only a small figure, $24 million.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peacock: It is a long way from $100 million.

An hon. member: Just give me a figure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member did not really think that $100 million was going to be processed in a month?

Mr. Lewis: Well, the minister told us it was well under way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What I said—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —was that arrangement had been made with the banks to commit themselves—

Mr. T. Reid: Over the next 20 years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for $100 million, and this takes time for processing and I think the banks—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —have done remarkably well in this period of time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do they not keep quiet?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. members know anything at all about the processing of applications, about the elementary rules of business or anything elementary about business at all, they would know—

Mr. T. P. Reid: If the minister knew anything about his department, we would get some answers.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —there is a tremendous amount of paperwork involved in that. Now, I could have waited perhaps—

Mr. T. Reid: The minister doth protest too much.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for a further length of time and given a larger figure, waited until they processed them all. In the meantime, I thought the Legislature was entitled to know as these contracts were being let just how they were proceeding. I think the banks have done remarkably well under the circumstances.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. Sargent: Want to bet?

Mr. T. P. Reid: It will be another first.

SALE OF KEG BEER FOR HOME CONSUMPTION

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) asked the following question: "Did the minister study the question of the manufacture and distribution of keg beer in four-gallon containers?" I am advised that keg beer has never been available in four-gallon kegs in Ontario. They were available in the nineteen thirties and nineteen forties, but the demand fell off and they were discontinued. It would

appear that, other than from the hon. member, I have not heard of any interest in the four-gallon keg at all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

EXPORT OF ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management dealing with the power export situation. Has the minister received a letter from Mr. Howland, the chairman of the National Energy Board, in reply to the letter sent by the minister to Mr. Howland shortly before the resumption of the export of power hearings in Fort Frances, Ontario? If so, what was the content of his letter and would he table it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The answer is yes. Really, the letter from Mr. Howland was nothing more than an acknowledgement indicating that the submissions I made in that letter would be considered by the National Energy Board and generally that there would be a decision in due course. I would be happy to table the letter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There was no reply on the minister's part?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

ONTARIO HYDRO ADVERTISING FOR ENGINEERS IN BRITAIN

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: In view of the very large number of unemployed graduate engineers, I wonder if the minister could indicate, as the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro, why Ontario Hydro would be advertising in Great Britain for engineers in relation to their development of the nuclear plants and so on in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the advertisements of Hydro in Great Britain. However, I would think that these advertisements must be for special skills of some kind, and it could very well be that they are required for some extra-territorial work or interest carried out by Hydro, possibly in Europe.

Mr. Pitman: By way of supplementary, surely the minister would agree that by advertising for senior technical engineers in environmental control, chemical and metallurgy, fuels and waste management, viability in statistics, these could be found here in Ontario?

Mr. MacDonald: Is Hydro going to clean up Europe?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get the information for the hon. member. I am sure that this may very well include our nuclear programme and therefore that is the reason we need people with very high skills and why we may be advertising outside Ontario. I will get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: As a further supplementary, I might say to the minister it "has created a number of vacancies in the central thermo services group at our head office in Toronto" —in Toronto! I wonder if the minister could indicate whether—he may think he can treat this with levity, but there are a number of unemployed engineers, an increasing number of unemployeed engineers in Ontario, and one cannot but be surprised.

I wonder if the minister could indicate whether there is no training programme in Ontario Hydro which would enable them to provide at least a degree of specialization, if indeed there are these specific skills available to them in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There could very well be a training programme or an orientation programme, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Hydro, when hiring or before hiring, wants to have people with very high technical and skilled training and discipline. That is why, possibly, they are advertising for this type of personnel outside of the province. I am sure the same advertisements must be open, of course, to engineers within the province.

Mr. Lewis: Where? Where was it placed?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I said when this question was originally asked, Mr. Speaker, I will have to get the information for the hon. member. Right now, as the hon. member can see, I am pretty well guessing.

Mr. Pitman: There are nuclear engineers in Peterborough out of work.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. T. Reid: Has the Minister of Energy and Resources Management been in touch with the Minister of University Affairs who has in his files, available through Dr. Wright,

a total inventory of students in engineering in the Province of Ontario at the undergraduate and graduate level, specified by discipline? Had the minister asked for this information before placing an ad in a foreign country which, in effect, will cut out jobs for graduates of Ontario universities?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is no. But I am sure Ontario Hydro was aware of the engineers available in this province and if there are any openings that are available in Hydro these engineers are given every consideration.

Mr. T. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister care to guess that Ontario Hydro would have been in a position five years ago to know its skilled manpower needs today, in view of the long-term nature of their projects, particularly in the nuclear power field?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would think they would have a very general idea. The programme depends on the allocation of money, particularly in the nuclear field, but I would say that they would have a general idea.

Mr. T. Reid: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would it therefore not have made sense for the minister responsible to have made known to the Minister of University Affairs of five years ago that certain manpower requirements at this high level would be needed?

Mr. Speaker: I think this is hardly a question of urgent public importance. It is five years ago.

Mr. T. Reid: It is of importance because engineers are coming out of college who cannot get jobs because people like the minister are advertising in the UK.

Mr. Speaker: As a supplementary question, I hardly think it is proper.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is it is a ridiculous question, and the hon. member knows it is a ridiculous question. Ontario Hydro is a pretty autonomous commission, and Ontario Hydro advertises for personnel—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —continuously, year after year. It places notices and information in the various universities!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Universities and the university students, particularly engineers, know exactly each year, particularly at this time of year, what Ontario Hydro's needs are. There is no question of one minister talking to another minister.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Tell us where they advertised in Ontario for the same jobs?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The hon. member is out of order.

The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. S. J. Randall (Don Mills): Try the employment office.

USE OF LASER EQUIPMENT AT WINDSOR UNIVERSITY

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of University Affairs. When will he answer the question that I asked about one month ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Spence: —in regard to laser equipment owned by the University of Windsor and used by private enterprise—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Spence: —and which other contractors feel is unfair competition?

I guess the minister does not hear me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: He is asleep again.

Mr. Spence: I wonder when the Minister of University Affairs will answer my question in regard to laser equipment used by a contractor in private enterprise which other contractors feel is unfair competition? Is this true, Mr. Minister?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The laughing minister.

Hon J. White (Minister of University Affairs): How is that again?

Mr Spence: Mr. Speaker, when will the Minister of University Affairs—

Mr. Speaker: I think it is hardly necessary to repeat the question, the time has expired anyway.

Mr. Pilkey: Saved by the bell.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Ruston: The Minister of University Affairs ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. Randall: Laughing all the way to the bank.

Mr. MacDonald: To which country?

Mr. Lewis: On which side of the border?

Mr. Speaker: Have you finished?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, presenting reports.

Mr. Sargent: Offtrack betting?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence presented the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission on actions against representatives of deceased persons.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is a request by the law reform commission, Mr. Speaker, that we amend in one small particular The Trustee Act, and as soon as the opportunity presents itself, I will be presenting such an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this is really a housekeeping bill containing two sections. The first amendment will require a person paying money into the Supreme Court for the credit of an infant or a mentally incompetent person, or a person of unsound mind, to provide the accountant and the official guardian with the information necessary for the performance of functions of their offices.

Section 2 is the amendment suggested by the Law Reform Commission. It provides for the continuance of action inadvertently commenced against deceased persons and implements the report that I just tabled in the House a few moments ago.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT, 1971

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, The Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this bill revises The Law Enforcement Compensation Act of 1967 and changes the name of that Act to The Compensation for Victims of Crime Act and changes the name of the board to the Criminal Victims Compensation Board.

It also calls for an increase in the membership of the board and gives alternatives to the board respecting hearings of claims. It adjusts the compensatable damages based on the experience of the board. It improves the procedures of the board. It raises the maximum lump sum award that the board can grant and it also provides for agreement with the government of Canada respecting contribution to the cost of compensation and other matters.

In general, it changes the name of the board and it increases the amount payable that the board can grant. We hope it improves the procedures for the carrying on of the board.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have another happy occurrence to bring to the attention of the hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Not another one!

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister is resigning?

Mr. Lewis: Maybe it is the Republic of South Africa day.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Tomorrow will be a special day of significance for the Philippine community in this province. Saturday, June 12, marks the 73rd anniversary of the Philippine independence.

Mr. Lewis: How is it that the present Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) never did this when he was Provincial Secretary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister know that he missed Sarawak's birthday yesterday? And that the Burmese are about to celebrate theirs?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): What has the member against the Philippines?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is not interested in people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like at this time to recognize the special contributions and skills of the industrious Philippine people which they have brought to Ontario. The Philippine community in Ontario is small in number when compared to some of the other groups.

They started to arrive here in 1965 and now number about 12,000, but it is of interest that an impressive 45 per cent who come to Ontario are skilled professionals. Many have made their mark here as doctors, nurses and administrators, having benefited considerably from the excellent education system of the Philippines and of which we are now presently the beneficiaries.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the charm and graciousness of the Philippine women is something to behold, and their graceful dancing is outstanding within this city.

The community in Toronto will be celebrating this independence day anniversary tomorrow evening at the Knights of Columbus Hall on Sherbourne Street.

Mr. Lewis: That is about as patronizing as the minister has been all session.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sure that members, if not the leader of the—

Mr. Lewis: We are just tired of this rot.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and other members of the House, if not the leader of the NDP—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister should not be politicking in all directions!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —will want to join with me in extending to the senior Philippine government representative of Ontario, trade commissioner J. C. Alvaro, the congratulations and best wishes of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and privilege. This party—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There surely can be no point of order nor point of privilege, since no privilege has been breached. It is quite within the authority of the hon. minister, in view of his portfolio, to make such announcements and there certainly can be no point of order or privilege.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, the minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: All right. The point of privilege is that the minister said, "If not the leader of the New Democratic Party." He had no right to say that at all.

An hon. member: Certainly not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party had expressed his dissatisfaction with it.

Mr. Lewis: No, sir, I was not expressing my dissatisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An hon. member: You have no point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking to the point of privilege—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking to the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I got up in a very serious vein to bring to the—

Mr. Lewis: Call him to order. It is a point of order.

An hon. member: Not in a very good mood today.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is recognized?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I did not even state any point of privilege. I merely rose to say that, just as yesterday and every other day the minister does it, we obviously in this party associate ourselves with any independence day and cultural event, any commemorative ceremony or moment which brings some—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order; I am speaking to the point of privilege—

Mr. Deans: It is a statement.

Mr. Lewis: I am speaking—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough West had risen on what he thought was a point of order or privilege. He had explained what he thought to be the privilege. I believe that the hon. member should finish what he wants to explain to be the point of privilege. I so far have not seen that there is any at all, but I will listen to his explanation.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The hon. member should resume his seat.

Mr. Lewis: Therefore, we in this party are perfectly willing to and perfectly happy to associate ourselves with all such events. We are simply offended, and that is what I was expressing—

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Lewis: —at the crass, political sentimentality with which the minister invests every statement, and solely for political purposes.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has indicated his point. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege or the point of order raised by the leader of the NDP, Hansard will record the cynical, caustic interjections which I find completely offensive—

Mr. MacDonald: —and the blatant political exploitation of ethnic groups.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to a statement—

An hon. member: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —which I made which was perfectly in order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the matter should be dropped at this point. There are no points of privilege or order at all.

Mr. Lewis: The way in which the minister has—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I never take the leader of the socialist party's judgement in that regard.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is a drip.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 17th Order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS
(continued)

On vote 604:

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 604, I believe. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, continuing from last evening, I would like to invite the comment of the minister, in respect to the communication which the members of the Legislature received a couple of days ago from the Ontario Retail Gasoline Association, which is requesting the government of Ontario to introduce legislation to ban all sales promotions, involving giveaways and discriminatory discounts in the sale of gasoline.

These giveaways are being forced upon the retailers by the oil companies, and that fact is backed up and buttressed by the figures which are given here, that 84 per cent of the retailers are now participating in oil company promotion, but their survey shows that 92 per cent of these people would favour legislation to ban all oil company-sponsored giveaway promotions. The average cost of these giveaways is one cent per gallon. The fact that 92 per cent of the dealers are opposed to the giveaway promotions, while 84 per cent of them do participate, conclusively demonstrates the fact that some oil companies exert coercion and pressure to make their dealers participate in the promotion at the dealers' expense.

I point out that the promotions do not create new customers. That, I think we can all understand, because the number of motor cars is pretty well fixed over any one period. They simply shift customers from one dealer to another, with the result that the dealer who does not participate is in fear of losing business, and so he is forced into the racket.

Of course, they point out, too, that this advertising is often directed at children, as so much advertising is, with the hope that they will pester their parents into switching gasoline brands or stations, and they point out this is a form of blackmail which should be prohibited.

The association points out that it has written governments. On June 16, 1970, they wrote to Prime Minister Robarts and enclosed a copy of a letter to the oil companies on the subject of asking for an end to promotional gimmicks, and again, in reply to this letter the Prime Minister answered on June 18, 1970, and said that the hon. A. B. R. Lawrence, QC, Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, was investigating the degree to which this matter falls under the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am in agreement with the hon. member's debate on this, but have we not already covered this subject rather fully in the first vote?

Mr. Young: Not in this case. This is a matter of the consumer's interest. All I want to say to the minister is that 11 months later the minister is evidently still investigating this matter and we have heard nothing on it. We would hope that the minister will look into this matter and give the retailers an answer. It seems to me that this kind of promotion is completely uncalled for.

Only the consumer is going to lose in the end. It must be incorporated finally into the cost of gasoline and promotions like this, like the green stamps and the other things, are only adding to inflation, adding to the cost of living, and should be, in my opinion, prohibited. I wonder if the minister would comment?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to comment. I have received this letter, this brief, that the hon. member has referred to only very recently, of course. It has been in the last few days. It was addressed to the Prime Minister.

I have not had an opportunity to particularly study the content of this brief, at least to the extent of being able to make a recommendation or an expression of opinion to my colleagues in cabinet. I noted that it had been referred to my predecessor some time ago on the matter of jurisdiction.

I might tell the hon. member that we have discussed this with the hon. Ronald Basford; we have written him about it. There are some broad questions of jurisdiction, and there is, I think, certainly an area in which definitely the federal government should be involved.

The hon. member knows my attitude some few years back with respect to trading stamps which have largely disappeared from the scene, in spite of legislation. I have the same attitude with respect to this sort of gimmick, but I have not had an opportunity myself to—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What about your department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have been discussing it with the federal people; we have written to Mr. Basford as I stated. I would expect to be making some representations to my own cabinet on this matter shortly.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to go back. Last evening I was just about to ask a question of the minister in regard to matters that were raised by the member for Yorkview. He was discussing last evening the sale of carpeting.

Some months ago—in fact, about a year ago—I raised with the then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) unusual practices that were going on that involved the Ontario Carpet Company and its advertising. I asked at that time in the Legislature, by way of a question, whether the department had had any complaints prior to the one that I was raising about the operation of that company.

The answer as I recall was that there had been no previous complaints. Taking that at face value, I then assumed that the experience that my particular constituent was having was isolated and that perhaps it was something that ought not to be pursued any further.

I am now convinced that that is not so. I am now convinced that there have been a number of complaints, perhaps not dealing specifically with that company, but in the general area of the sale, by way of advertising, of wall-to-wall and other kinds of carpeting by companies that are set up under individual names but which, in actual fact, are part of an overall carpeting operation.

What concerns me is that if the advertising is not illegal, it is certainly misleading. The manner in which advertising is done in the Province of Ontario by a great many companies in this field and other fields is misleading. It is not easily understood. There are

so many big words like "free" with tiny words like "warranty" and you never know exactly what applies to which.

In the case that I was talking about, the people had purchased the carpet, they had had it laid on the floor. Within a few months they found that it was wearing so badly that it required replacing. Opon going to the company involved, they discovered that what they thought was free installation was free underpadding. Reading the ad, it was not clear.

When they went to receive a new carpet to replace the one which they had purchased, they were informed that they would be given a credit of some kind for the unused portions of the existing carpet. They would then have to pay again to have it installed. They would have to pay the additional price, but they could only have this done if they bought a carpet of higher quality.

In other words, the warranty would not apply to a carpet of similar quality. They would only be permitted to make an exchange, provided they went into further expense. That further expense, as I say, included an additional expense for the fitting and laying of the new carpet—the taking up of the old one and the laying of the new one.

Of course, the minister's new legislation will cover some of this, to some extent, but it is time that the Province of Ontario took a very serious look at the whole area of advertising of products in this province.

When I have raised this previously with the minister, the answer has always been that it falls fairly well within the jurisdiction of the federal government. I suspect that even if that were the case, strong representation by the Province of Ontario in any regard would certainly have some direct effect on the decisions that are made by the government in Ottawa.

I want to say to the minister about this that he is going to have to set up some form of investigative office to investigate the claims that are made by any number of operations set up solely, it appears, to circumvent the law—the subsidiary companies set up as a part of an overall company that can go bankrupt over-night without any substantial losses —advertising that is really misrepresenting the product that is actually available and misrepresents to a great extent the substantiality of the company doing the selling.

It appears, because of the size of the ads and the numbers of advertisements being run and the pressure that is being put on, in all media, that the company in itself is a company of some substantial backing when in actual fact it is not. It is simply a front operation for other operations behind the scenes.

The minister, of course, can answer that at some point later. I just want to raise it with him, in this regard and in regard to advertising, I want to ask the minister—and I understand from a newspaper article which maybe was raised some time previously during these estimates—he can direct me in that regard if it was—I want to ask the minister if he has done any investigation into the area of the advertising that is presently being undertaken by the loan and trust and banking corporations, particularly as it affects the kind of advertisements that are put forward in regard to the borrowing of money for vacations at such and such a place: "Barbados is only a visit to your local bank away" or "There is no place you cannot go with the assistance of your friendly loan manager"—that kind of advertisement?

I see more and more people becoming financially embarrassed, perhaps not by the advertising but by the freeing of credit. I am very concerned, because I am convinced that the availability of money for loan purposes, for matters which are to be considered perhaps luxuries, is part of the reason why we are facing the inflationary spiral that we are facing. I think we have encouraged to a very great extent over the last number of years, people to go into debt. We have encouraged people who in actual fact could hardly, if at all, afford to borrow the money that they are borrowing. There has not been a nearly careful enough check made on the ability of the individual to repay.

I have an example that was brought to my attention only a week ago, of a family who found themselves in the situation that they owed money to the bank—no, to the General Motors Acceptance Corporation—for a car, to one finance company for consolidated bills, to another finance company for another purchase that they had made, and when you totalled it all off, they found quite truthfully—and it is their own fault to some extent—that they really did not have the income to meet the obligations that they had undertaken.

And it is basically because there is such a push being put on at the moment by lending institutions to encourage people to borrow money. The moneys that are spent by the banks today in advertising loans, is, in my opinion unjustified. I feel that in the area of borrowing money all that is required in terms

of advertising is simply to say that an operation is in the business of lending money and that the only kind of advertising that ought to be permitted is advertising which states very clearly the terms of the money, the conditions under which the borrowing may be obtained, and the location of the place in which the operation will take place.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The NDP should not advertise either, then.

Mr. Deans: That is obviously irrelevant.

Mr. MacDonald: They do not have the money.

Mr. Deans: What I am saying is that—

Mr. K. C. Bolton (Middlesex South): Good wine needs no bush.

Mr. Deans: —I do not think we should be permitting advertising to take place that is obviously encouraging people into debt.

Mr. Sargent: The banks are the most cutthroat operation in the world.

Mr. Deans: You take a look at the advertising—the member says the banks are the most cut-rate operation in the world.

Mr. Sargent: Cutthroat, I said.

Mr. Deans: Cutthroat—that is what I said too. Two years ago the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce spent $1,311,000 in advertising.

Mr. MacDonald: More than The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Deans: The Bank of Montreal spent $1,291,000 in advertising—and there are others; I could go through them all. The Bank of Nova Scotia spent $790,000, and the Royal Bank of Canada spent $930,000 on advertising to encourage people to borrow money—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I thought they also encouraged you to save money.

Mr. Deans: No. I suspect that what happens is the advertising houses or agencies that do the advertising compete with each other to see how they can draft up the opportunities to borrow in such a way that will encourage everyone to go dashing down to the closest loan operation and get their hands into the till.

Mr. Sargent: What about the sign on your truck? That is advertising.

Mr. Deans: There is not nearly enough attention paid to the ability of people to pay. I would like to see some representation made by the Province of Ontario in this regard to request that advertising of funds for lending purposes be limited strictly to the terms of the loans that are available and to the locations of the houses advertising them. I think that in itself would help to cut down some of the problems that we are facing in the field of bankruptcies.

I want to say that I have always been concerned.

On another subject, about the attitude of the department of consumer protection. In the 3½ years that I have been in the Legislature, I have felt almost consistently that the department was not in the area of protecting consumers in actual fact—I am going to qualify it—and it is only in the last six or eight months or so that I have begun to feel that the department was moving with some force toward the protection of the consumer—and not nearly enough.

I notice in the province the difference between this jurisdiction and other jurisdictions is so obvious when it comes to protecting the consumer. I got a little clipping from a newspaper that came from Barbados in the West Indies, and I want to read it to you because it shows the difference in attitude over the protection of the consumer in the marketplace. It says:

> Simpson's Foodfair of Worthing, Christchurch, was fined $75 payable in seven days. The Foodfair offered to a price control inspector on January 14, a one-half-pound package of Kerry Gold table butter for 50 cents, two cents above the scheduled price.

In the same article it says that:

> A gentleman was fined $24 after pleading guilty to unlawfully and maliciously inflicting grievious bodily harm on another.

It seems that they are more concerned in that jurisdiction about the protection of the consumer than perhaps they are about the protection of the human life. But, nevertheless, they are certainly concerned about protecting the consumer and they pursue people who break the law and they pursue them vigorously and they inflict reasonable penalties on them.

In Ontario we do not pursue the people who break the law; the law is so full of loopholes that inevitably the person who is

aggrieved is forced to take it into court by himself. Rarely if ever, does the Province of Ontario pursue into court individuals who have broken the law.

The carpeting company is one example where it would be quite simple to say to the companies, "You either operate in a more acceptable manner or we will not permit you to operate in the province because you must be licensed." It was suggested to me, when I was dealing with the department on the carpeting issue, that the department could take that kind of action, that it might involve quality and advertising and then say to the company upon applying for a licence to sell in the Province of Ontario that "it is subject to certain conditions which, if not met, will mean that the licence you have, will be revoked, and that you will not be able to open another storefront operation to circumvent the law." I suggest to the minister that should be done.

I want to turn to one final point and I will not be very long. I want to send something to the minister so that he can have it to read at some point. I received a brief from a gentleman in Hamilton and it is particularly related to warranties on new cars —new car warranties. This may well, the minister might say, not fall within the jurisdiction of his department, but I suspect that we can tie it in in such a way that perhaps we can overcome some of the difficulties.

It is extremely difficult to tell exactly what it is that you have purchased when you purchase a new car warranty; it is hard to tell what is covered. You do not know until you go in to ask whether or not what has happened to the automobile, what damage has been inflicted, is covered by the warranty. I do not intend to read all of this to you. I will let you read it yourself. But I refer you to the brief beginning, the part of it beginning "Dear Mr. Inglis." It is the first letter in a series of letters. On the back of that—the last sheet of that portion is a portion out of a warranty. Do you have it? Now in this warranty it says—it is called a new vehicle warranty—about line 8 or 9.

> The obligation of the company under this warranty shall be satisfied and fulfilled by any authorized dealer repairing or replacing any part or parts of the vehicle.

And so it goes on. This gentleman purchased a new car. Prior to purchasing it he did what most people do, he shopped around. He went from dealer to dealer, spoke with them about the purchase and attempted to get the best price. He finally discovered that if he went out of town he could purchase a new automobile for the price that he had been offered a used automobile in the dealership in Hamilton. So he purchased the new car. He signed, he made a deposit, and he then had entered into an agreement to purchase the new car.

Having done that, the company with whom he had been discussing the purchase previously, and who had not been able to meet his price, called him up and suggested that they would meet the price. "Cancel the other, we will meet your price." He said, "No, I have entered into an agreement. I do not want to cancel out. I am quite satisfied with the way it is. I will take the car I have ordered. I am sorry for your inconvenience but, after all, I did tell you that I wanted the best price, and I got it." The company then said to him, as the letters will show, "That is fine then. You go ahead, but do not expect to get that car serviced here." But the warranty says quite clearly that the car may be serviced at any of the dealers of the parent company. It says so quite clearly. In fact, it even says on the front of the advertisement:

> All MGs—

which it happened to be—

> —are backed by five British Leyland parts depots and 150 dealers coast to coast. See the dealer nearest you.

This man has now gone through any number of months of dispute after dispute attempting to have repairs effected to the automobile that he purchased. And it is wrong.

There is something wrong with the operation of a company and with the protection that we afford, when an individual purchasing a car for which there is a warranty is forced to travel out of the city in order to have service done in complete contradiction to the conditions set out in the warranty.

I will not burden the House with reading into the record all of the information that I have, but I want to say to the minister that if he would read this over very carefully, and if he would care to comment to me on the matter by letter or in the House, I would be satisfied.

I want to suggest some way of dealing with the problem. I think that if we had a law in the Province of Ontario that made it mandatory for companies operating in this province to file with the department a copy of their warranty together with an explanation thereof, it would then be possible

for any individual having a complaint—and particularly companies that have their head offices outside of the country altogether and are very difficult to pressure—then it would be possible for an individual purchasing the product, in this instance a car, to come to the department and say, "I have a warranty for this car. I want to know what that warranty will accomplish. I want to know what I get for that warranty." If they have a complaint, the department then can investigate it; and if the complaint is legitimate and if the company is flagrantly abusing its privileges of selling in this province, then this province has the right to disallow the operation to continue.

I think the warranty a person gets is as important as the sales contract itself, because if the product does not stand up and if the company refuses to live up to what is contained in the warranty, then in actual fact the whole deal is of little value.

All I ask of the minister is that he give consideration to having it mandatory in this province that all warranties, particularly those of companies operating within the province but having offices outside and particularly in the automobile field, are filed with his department together with a complete explanation. Then the department could pursue the matter and the people who are purchasing would feel as if they were being protected; that would be proper consumer protection. And I leave it with the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have a few remarks. I am not going to try to go into this extensively. The hon. member has indicated, in respect to the particular case of a car, that I could examine it; I would need to, of course, and then I will either get in touch or answer him in the House.

With respect to advertising and particularly in relation to the rugs, I have just a few comments. The hon. member wondered what we were doing and if these complaints were coming to us. If he looks at the report which I tabled prior to entering these estimates, he will find on page 9, where we give statistics as to complaints received, that there were 119 complaints received by the department in 1970 and, I think I may say, dealt with, relating to rugs, floor coverings and drapes.

As to his remark that he wondered if we were really looking after the consumer, those complaints are received under The Consumer Protection Act. They do not include used cars. They do not include real estate, licensing of mortgages, mortgage brokers, real estate transactions and all the other various things that we do. They do not have anything to do with insurance complaints. Those are 119 complaints with respect to that one thing; rugs, drapes, floor coverings—and you will notice a total of 3,000 complaints under The Consumer Protection Act.

As regards advertising, that was raised by another hon. member last evening. I suppose one could suggest that, in addition to the power, we do now have to look at advertising and to pass upon it, to take exception to it.

I suppose we could require all proposed advertising to be filed with us, to be examined first. That was a suggestion that someone had made, but I think that would be completely impractical and not feasible. I do not believe it is for the department to examine everybody's advertising and to try to pass upon it.

Mr. Deans: I did not ask it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would draw to the attention of the hon. member section 31 of The Consumer Protection Act, 1966, which is an Act which I produced as Attorney General. Section 31 reads as follows:

> Where in the opinion of the registrar any seller or lender is making false, misleading or deceptive statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet, or similar material, the registrar may order the immediate cessation of the use of such material and any such order is subject to review and appeal in the same manner as an order respecting registration.

Mr. Deans: May I ask you a question? I was wondering, when the department attempts to determine whether advertising is perhaps misleading, to whom do they go when they make that determination? You and I may well—or you may well, I will not include myself—you may well sit down and with the legal mind that you have, decide that the advertising is fine, but have you ever gone out and spoken to people who have very limited education and who read it and who take out of it an entirely different meaning?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We look at certain of the advertising. Most of it, I think we would be prepared to say, would come in by way of complaint, but we have the consumer protection bureau as part of our department.

We are—and I think this is one of our great forward steps—sending out, in addition to the other information we publish, brochures, which we put out. We are now

sending our caravan around the province to acquaint and educate people with not only the services we offer, but the things that they can do in dealing with complaints.

We can order that advertising be removed —that they desist from publishing it. If it is published then that becomes a contravention of the Act and subject to a substantial penalty in the next section—a fine of not more that $2,000 or imprisonment for a term of not more than one year or both. If it is a corporation the fine is $25,000 maximum instead of $2,000.

Mr. Deans: How many prosecutions have there been?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot give it at the moment; I will get it. I just wanted to pursue that. I say we could do other things by passing on advertising beforehand but I do not know if it is the function of government, even if it were feasible, to do that; to say to that extent to business, "Here is the way you must write your ad. We will advertise your goods for you."

Mr. Deans: No. I did not ask for that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. I think you would agree with me. When we came to warranties, I do not believe it is a function of government to say to a manufacturer or a merchant "We will write your contract to the extent of saying how far your warranty should go, for what length of time it should extend, how comprehensive it should be."

The hon. member has suggested that the warranties should be filed with us, so that we may examine them. Supposing a company says, "We will warrant our piece of goods, our chainsaw or the carpet sweeper for a month, for two months, for three months," is it up to government to stand between the buyer and seller and say, "Your warranty—we do not like it; it should be six months"?

Mr. Deans: No.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the purchaser must be educated, if we help that way. He must be aware; he should read the warranty; he should read the terms of the contract. I do not think it is up to government to make the terms of a contract. I think perhaps the hon. member wants to interject. I will permit him to do so.

Mr. Deans: I say I did not suggest that. What I said was that in the case—and I am thinking particularly, I could probably isolate it at the moment, of matters of automobiles. There are a lot of difficulties over warranties on automobiles. It seems to me that if the warranty were to be filed together with an explanation of intent, in order that a person could then come to the department and say "This is what I assumed it meant. What did the company say it meant?" you do not get the runaround that is obvious in this particular case—and, I suspect, in many others.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: First, again going back to the question of parties to the contract. Government has a function to assist, protect, explain and receive complaints and investigate. But there must be an area surely—and I am sure this must remain—where the parties make a contract. One party says, "I warrant or I guarantee certain things"; if that is said, however unsatisfactory it may be to the extent that it goes and the time it covers, it is a bargain; it is a term. Do not forget we do have courts.

I am not suggesting that everybody must be driven to the courts but the government cannot—except through the administration of justice through its courts—see that contracts are carried out and that is part of government. That is part of my colleague's duties, the Attorney General's, that if bargains are broken, if warranties are not lived up to, that is a term of contract and the court is there to enforce it.

I am saying to you, how far does the hon. member wish this department go? To rewrite the warranty, to say it is not satisfactory?

Mr. Deans: What I am saying is that there are conditions established in this province under which a company may operate. Some of those conditions are that it complies with the law.

In fact, all of those conditions are that it complies with the law. It is not inconceivable that the law should say that, as part of your operation, as part of your permission to operate in the Province of Ontario, it is necessary that you file with us the warranties in order that we can ascertain at some point whether or not—you see the only way you know whether a company is operating, let us say, properly—and properly may mean that only three or four per cent or one per cent of its customers are dissatisfied, because that may be the only percentage that needs the warranty. It may be the only percentage that comes across the difficulty.

But the only way that you can determine whether it is operating within the law is if there are complaints. If a person complains

and discovers that there really is nothing that the department can do, because it does not have any power within that field, then that pretty well nullifies any possibility of future complaints. I think that if a person purchases something, just as they can complain that the contract is not in keeping with the contracts that are available, they should be able to come to the department and complain about the fact that the warranty which served as part of the condition that allowed the company to operate in the province is not being complied with.

The company would be far more susceptible to living up to its contract if it felt that by ignoring the contract and warranty, it could well terminate its right to operate in the province. It would be far more susceptible to maintaining its relationship with the purchaser, as a good relationship, if it felt that the Province of Ontario takes an interest in whether or not it operates properly. It would be, if it thought that some poor soul was going to hire a lawyer to try to get a $25 job done to repair something in an automobile. You know, and I know, that the example before us—British Leyland Motors—are certainly not going to move heaven and earth to meet the request or complaint of some whose bill may total $50 and whom they know quite well is not likely to drag them into court for it. In any case, they could afford better lawyers. But if they felt that the Province of Ontario looked with some severity upon the deviation from the conditions as set out in the sale and that the province might well revoke their right to sell, then they would pay more attention and then they would be more careful in what their salesman said in terms of what applies in the warranty and in the sales contract. That is what I am asking for.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have noted the hon. member's suggestion and I will keep thinking about it and considering it with my department. I see some possibilities, but I see some difficulties, too, in going as far as he suggests that we do. I would just like to speak very briefly about his comments on banking. We did, I think, argue or discuss advertising, particularly banking. Credit extension generally comes in the previous vote and we had quite a discussion about the facts about the reason for the extension of credit, inducing people to take credit, the difficulties they get into and how you get them out.

I must say I do not think you can condemn advertising, whether it is by banks or other industry at all. Perhaps you could contain it. You can certainly restrain it. You can require that it be factual, that it be honest, not misleading and not deceptive, but I think it has been held and accepted—I know it has been held—down through the years for a long time that advertising may be inducive and speak in glowing terms and that no one really expects a general statement of advertising to be proven, such as the example that the hon. member gave of Bermuda being just a street corner away, so come over to the bank, and you are there. I cannot see that that is wrong. Nobody believes that Bermuda is on the next street corner. They know what it means—come to the bank and get some money, or your vacation is available to you, and so on.

Mr. Deans: How about the advertisement that says: "No matter how much you borrow, we always come through with more"?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce—

Mr. Deans: I am going to sing it for you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —said there were some political parties—he mentioned one that held out paradise in their advertising, but he did not believe it all. Maybe he had a point.

Mr. Deans: I get the message. Very subtle.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think we have to allow certain latitudes.

Mr. Sargent: The minister had better see the bank taking the profits and giving it to the stockbrokers. That is the meaning of advertising.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think we have to have some latitude. I agree with the hon. member that we can examine, but, first of all, banking, as such, is not provincial jurisdiction. Banking and bills of exchange and all that, interest and so on, is federal. We have certain controls on advertising and I think it would apply to the bank, if we found that that advertising was such—not just what we call a "puff ball" type of advertising—that has always been permitted from a way back in the early days of British trade and commerce and the courts have held that there is nothing wrong with that—I think people are expected to discount it and be sensible about it and not believe every glowing term they read in an advertisement. That is about all I think I can offer at this moment. I will consider the suggestion the hon. member has made in these matters.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are a few topics that I wanted to discuss with the minister.

Mr. Sargent: I will see the members next week.

Mr. Deans: I will be back in a second.

Mr. B. Newman: The first two; we did cover fairly well the other day the retail gas dealers' request for the elimination of give-away promotions. I do not intend to repeat that at all at this time, Mr. Chairman.

However, I would like to turn to the minister's annual report. In studying it, I notice that the first and the major problem still is the magazine subscription difficulties; 511 out of 2,994 complaints received. Probably 20 per cent—no, I should not say 20 per cent—but 16 per cent of the complaints were as a result of individuals selling magazine subscriptions.

Apparently, it has mutiplied substantially over the previous reporting year; almost more than doubled in its intensity. The steps that we have undertaken over the past year apparently are not effective enough. Is the minister thinking of strengthening his regulations concerning the sale of magazines and the salesmen involved in magazine subscriptions? May I have an answer from the minister at this time on that?

An hon. member: More bad practices. No knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps that we have a pretty effective surveillance and inspection in our branch with respect to that. The increase, I grant you, has doubled in the year 1970 over the year 1969. That is in the number of complaints.

I think probably that is largely due to the fact that people are more aware that we are available and can help them. Perhaps, too, because the magazine trade or the magazine salesman, is in a very proliferating game or part of business. I do not think that it is due mainly to any other reason than that people are aware that we can help them. We get these complaints. I cannot conceive of anything more we can do. We have licensing provisions. We have an examination branch. We assist in getting results in these things.

I might just mention, you know, that many of the things which come in, you see in the newspaper "Action Line" and so on; that type of thing. Those are sent in great numbers to the Financial and Commercial Affairs Department and we get the results. Sometimes, the newspaper gives us credit.

Quite often it does not mention the fact that they just shot it around to Financial and Commercial Affairs and we pursued it and got redress and brought satisfaction to the person who wrote to the newspaper. I will look at our law, at the way these complaints are treated, and see if there is anything further I think we may do.

Mr. B. Newman: If there is some way that you can strengthen the legislation, it certainly would be really to the better of all.

The item that really causes me concern is the home driveway paving, and home improvements and repairs. I have noticed that they likewise have doubled and when you combine the two, this is probably the most serious consumer complaint that you do receive. I know I have received quite a few back home. Apparently these people seem to prey on the elderly.

Both of the items are sort of seasonal; they start coming to the fore with the warm weather months. I just wondered if it would not be a good idea maybe to have some type of advertising in the press throughout the province that when spring does roll around, be careful; now is the season for the slick-tongued salesman who is going to sell you a new chimney, a new roof. You name it and he will sell it to you. Most of us can resist that type of a salesman, but the senior citizen falls easy prey to the slick tongue of some sharpy. May I have the minister's comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am told, Mr. Chairman—and I know this is a fact—we do send out bulletins on this as well as other matters with a warning and suggestions. They are very widely distributed, they reach a lot of people through organizations in all communities of Ontario.

Again, I have to say this, while the hon. member is right that people are taken, particularly elderly people, I think the great way to win this situation is by education, by information and if we could just train the consumer. You cannot be taken if, when the chap comes and says, "We will pave your driveway" they could just be aware enough to say, "All right. I want to know exactly

what you are going to do. Put it in writing that it is going to be pavement of a certain type, so many inches thick, to extend so many square feet on the whole surface, and it is going to cost me so much money. I'm to pay it on certain terms when the job is done. If I don't pay it, what the interest rate is over the waiting period," and so on.

If people would only insist on the terms of a contract the benefit would be that if the person required to perform the contract does not measure up, they have the remedy. But what happens is they come in and say, "Let us pave your driveway" and it is a word-of-mouth thing and away they go; there is nothing you can hold them to at all. Even lawyers are guilty of making that kind of contract in relation to their own home affairs. It is like the cobbler whose children are always lacking shoes. This is quite a common thing. So even education and instruction does not cover it all.

But I will look at that also and see if there is anything further we may do.

Mr. B. Newman: The area that really disturbs me the most, Mr. Chairman, is where it affects the senior citizen.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister says there is a fairly good consumer education programme undertaken by this department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is one of the things that we stress in our Consumer Caravan. I hope the member has taken a look at it. He will find that the brochures, the information we have there, the people who are there to talk to you when you go in, stress these contracts of paving and siding, all that sort of thing. There is information there on them and advice given, not only by the bulletin but by the people who are manning the caravan.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I noticed the minister's caravan and I know it does a good job. It is a worthwhile method of consumer education, but the senior citizens that I refer to cannot get to the caravan. When the caravan came to my city, it was outside of the city really, it was at the Devonshire shopping centre, whereas the senior citizens are generally concentrated in the downtown core. They do not have vehicles to get down to see a caravan. My thought would be, likewise, not all of these senior citizens have the ability to travel any distances to get into a senior citizens' centre, where as they do read the newspapers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am interrupting I know, but we send out a special senior citizens' bulletin covering this very point among others, in advising and warning senior citizens. I think those are reaching almost entirely the number of senior citizens we are aware of. We are trying to reach them and keep them aware of trying to avoid these pitfalls.

Mr. B. Newman: I would assume that you would be trying to reach them, but apparently you are not reaching them with the methods you are employing today. So you might have to rethink your whole programme.

The next item I wanted to discuss concerns appliances such as air conditioners, electric stoves, televisions. I brought this up last year with the previous minister, and that is the idea that the appliance when it is for sale in the store should have on it the date of the appliance. In other words, the person should know that he is buying a 1971 air conditioner or a 1970 or a 1969. He should not go into the store and buy an appliance and find out when he got home and examined the back of it that it was a model two years old and maybe outdated in the type of operation and outdated in efficiency.

There should be something provided with the purchase of the appliance to indicate to the buyer that this is a 1970 model; not a model number because the model number does not mean a darn thing to the purchaser. He cannot equate it either for the year of manufacture or the year it is being put on sale, representative as being a 1971 model appliance, or a 1970, or you name the year. But I think the year should be on.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will permit, I remember the member for Humber last evening said, "Do not pass the buck to the federal government." But it is a fact that federal jurisdiction extends to certain things, and we have to respect they have the responsibility to do so. I just thought I would mention to the hon. member that there is in the federal House at this time—I believe it is at the second reading stage—a bill, introduced by the hon. Mr. Basford through his Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for dating, labelling, and packaging and, I believe, something to do with content as to weight. I have not the actual details. I am not certain. I cannot recall whether that is the content of the bill, but this area is being covered and is actually

in course of progress in legislation at the federal level. So I think, at least, I will say this. I am hopeful that the federal legislation will go the whole way and that we will not have to deal with it and that the federal legislation will be adequate and effective. If it is not, we have some jurisdiction to move in.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I must say to you that at this hour I have to conclude the study of these estimates, and the House for the next hour will be engaged on budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this budget debate. I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, you fill that chair in a very able manner and I am pleased to see you there when I am giving this budget speech.

I would like to bring to the attention of the members that the planned government spending for the coming year is one of the highest in this history of this province—$4.26 billion and this is at a time when many of the Ontario taxpayers are worried that they will not be able to pay their taxes and fearful, many of them, of losing their homes.

When I talk to my constituents, I find the greatest concern among the people is high taxation, and I have no doubt that the same is true for a large segment of the population across the Province of Ontario. Ontario is said to be one of the richest of the provinces —50 per cent of the federal taxes are collected here. We are the most industrialized province in the Dominion of Canada. We have nearly all the car manufacturing plants in Canada. We have quantities of minerals, great forests, and still we have a deficit this year, or are going to have, of $415 million, the largest deficit in the history of the Province. Of course, I realize this deficit financing will give some relief to our taxpayers for the next year, but this enormous debt will hang over our heads in the future. Here, I would like to mention that the estimated interest on the public debt for the year 1971-1972 is $81.6 million. For the last four years, it has totalled almost $260 million in interest.

Mr. Speaker, the last four years in this province have been very productive years, and yet the interest alone on the public debt has reached this astonishing figure. It makes a person wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we have been progressing as we should. It makes you wonder just how big a debt this government would have incurred on our behalf had we been a poor and underdeveloped province.

The problem of unemployment is naturally of great concern to all of us. The cleaning up of our parks and the clearance of dead elm trees along Highways 400 and 401 has given employment to many and, of course, the removal of these ugly dead trees has improved the landscape along these routes.

There is one point I would like to mention here, about which many people in this province are concerned. The government set the wages for people employed on clean up programmes at $2.57 an hour, considering this to be a fair wage to enable a man to feed his family and maintain his home. However, there are still a considerable number of citizens in Ontario who are receiving only $2 an hour. These people are discontented and surprised that the government should permit payment of wages below what they have themselves stated to be a fair and living wage.

We hear a lot about Ontario as "A place to stand, a place to grow." Fine words indeed, Mr. Speaker. For some of our citizens this means a place to stand aside and watch others more fortunate, though no more able and no more hardworking than themselves get ahead; a place to grow more and more concerned about the future in this province under the present government.

They say he who pays the piper calls the tune, but in Ontario today the Conservatives call the tune and the people of Ontario pay the piper. They pay and they pay. It is not a very merry tune these days, and the taxpayers of this province are heartily sick of it.

They are heartily sick of a government more concerned with highfaluting ideas than bread and butter issues. The majority of people in this province want the opportunity to earn a decent living; to be able to take care of their families properly; to make sure they are provided with a good education, any medical attention they need; and a safe and well-ordered society in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, another matter I would like to draw to your attention is the five per cent investment tax credit on machinery and equipment which was announced in the budget a few weeks ago, and which is supposed to be a powerful incentive to business expansion and the provision of new jobs. It seems this scheme will result in a loss of $125 million in revenue to the province, but what is $125 million more or less to this government?

Now, of course, I am not a financial wizard, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. minister, but as a layman I find it hard to believe that this tax credit proposal will create the jobs which are so badly needed in Ontario at this time. Unemployment is causing real hardship in the province today, and I think this tax measure will more likely create jobs in other countries, because most of the machinery which will benefit is manufactured outside Canada.

What we need to do is provide jobs for our citizens now—today—not at some distant future, after the foreign manufacturers of machinery have counted their profits, after their workmen have taken home their fat pay packets. Then, again, perhaps some of the machinery will replace workers in many of our companies, causing even more unemployment.

Is this tax credit system the best idea the government can come forward with to help the people in the province in these very difficult times? After 28 years of experience it makes you wonder what they would have proposed if they were just beginning.

When is this government going to take action to relieve the working people of their tax burden? When are they going to do something to stimulate building of more homes, highways—complete highways, I mean, not expensive, half-finished white elephants? When are they going to bring in legislation to make sure that more of our minerals are processed here in Ontario, to prevent our natural resources being shipped out of Canada to be manufactured into finished products, which are afterwards sold back to us in this province and in this country? For instance, the steel which is manufactured elsewhere from our raw materials and which we buy back for the construction of our new buildings here in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, our towns and villages are coming to a very difficult and important period at this time. Many of them are in the process of building water pipelines from lakes; constructing badly needed sewerage systems. The cost of these projects is causing grave concern to many citizens because of the high taxes which are necessary to cover the cost. Many people are wondering just how long they will be able to afford to keep their own homes. Many people in the small communities of Ontario have not earned high wages over the years and have been unable to save for their later life. Many people are on pensions without any other income. The ever-increasing costs of education and the tax for essential water and sewage projects are causing great concern to many people.

The councils of our towns and villages have very little actual control of the business of their municipalities. I have been told by local mayors that they have control of about only 12 per cent to 13 per cent of their budgets. The rest is controlled by the Ontario government by virtue of the system of grants which are given if the municipalities undertake this project or adopt that programme.

I would like to point out to the minister that the municipalities have been misled by the government about the costs of county school boards, when we have segments of our population refusing to pay their education costs, about the taking over of the assessment of our municipalities, and the wide fluctuations of education levies on municipalities.

We have heard time and time again that the equalization factor used has proved itself to be very unfair and unjust as a method of comparing the taxable resources of the municipalities and is largely responsible for pushing rural taxes beyond any reasonable limit now making itself felt at the county level.

I have an article here from the Dutton Advance, a fine local paper in my own community, which says that equalization is a mockery and the blame must be laid squarely on the shoulders of the Conservative government in Toronto which took over complete responsibility for assessment last year.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Tell them how much tax rebate you got on the farm.

Mr. Spence: Not too much.

Mr. W. Hodgson: How much?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Enough to make it worthwhile though.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Spence: I would like to invite the hon. member home over the weekend. I would take him out and let him see for himself.

Mr. W. Hodgson: I would like to go.

Mr. Spence: I would treat him like a real gentleman and when he comes back to this House he could get up and make a speech.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: About what?

Mr. W. Hodgson: About how much money you have down there.

Mr. Spence: Not too much.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Make us jealous.

Mr. Spence: The Ontario government—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is there any place you would rather be?

Mr. Spence: There are a lot who would like to move out, when the taxes come in.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Out of Kent? Move to Elgin.

Mr. Spence: We are not really well off; it is a false rumour.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government has stated that the federal government is centralizing power and taking it away from the provinces. It would certainly be true to say that the present Ontario government is centralizing power in its own hands, and taking it away from the local municipalities. What about assessment—

Mr. W. Hodgson: That is not so.

Mr. Spence: What about assessment, what about county school boards and the present plans for regional government? It is obvious to the taxpayers of this province that regional government will increase their taxes, and with the skyrocketing school taxes, the people are concerned about present government policies.

The present Ontario government has apparently become so involved in the business of being a government—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They have the power.

Mr. Spence: —that it has forgotten what it is all about. Ministers and departments have become so carried away with the fact that they represent the government that they have forgotten that government is supposed to represent the people. Government is a means to an end, not an end in itself.

At this time, when the people of the province are so concerned with high costs and inflation, combined with high unemployment, the government should start using a little practical common sense. They are so busy telling other people and other organizations where they go wrong that they do not bother to put their own house in order.

Mr. Sargent: Right. Build another Ontario Place. That is all we need.

Mr. Spence: A half-hearted attempt has been made to establish a central purchasing agency for The Department of Public Works. Why is this organization not put into full working operation? Why is it not used to purchase the equipment and supplies used by the government departments of this province? It has been shown many times that a central government purchasing agency of this kind can save considerable money—

Mr. Sargent: They can save $10 million.

Mr. Spence: —rather than buying all over the marketplace. The government of the Province of Alberta estimates that by using its central purchasing agency it can save as much as $10 million a year.

The extravagance and waste involved in the first year's operation of the Medicare plan is fantastic.

The government has stated that OHSIP and OHSC will not be combined into one organization until 1972. This is certainly very disappointing. We all realize that this type of a scheme is an enormous undertaking but the confusion has been something to behold. No doubt, there will be some problems if the two plans are combined, but surely one tangled web to unravel is better than two separate ones.

The high cost of education has been talked about so often in this assembly that I do not wish to dwell on it today. However, I am concerned about the government's actions recently. I realize that they are all becoming somewhat upset. I will not be so unkind to say panicky at the prospects of the next provincial election. Nevertheless, action which they take with an eye to pleasing the public and catching the voters affects us all. There

has been a great deal of talk about the high cost of education. In fact, last January during the Conservative leadership race, the hon. member who is now the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) of this province stated that the projections of the government's revenue and spending over the next few years led him to believe we will price ourselves into bankruptcy unless something is done.

So what does this government do? Instead of pruning the budget for education purposes with intelligence and care, with some thought for possible consequences, they impose arbitrary economy cuts on education boards, regardless of whether the quality of education will suffer. People do not object to money being spent to give our young people the best possible schooling. They object to the money being wasted and frittered away on administrative costs and the unnecessary frills. The government's actions, in this respect, are rather similar to a surgeon performing a delicate operation with an axe instead of a scalpel.

Something with which we are all very concerned at this present time is the attitude of this government toward local municipalities. This has been demonstrated once again by the way in which the Spadina decision was brought down by the provincial cabinet, after some 99 major engineering decisions based upon firm and final commitments to proceed. We also had a majority ruling by the Ontario Municipal Board in favour of the continuation, and then we had this complete about-face by the cabinet—

Mr. Sargent: This alone will defeat the government—the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Spence: —which left all those people who believed in decentralization of authority—

Mr. W. Hodgson: We showed concern for the little people.

Mr. Sargent: All the Toronto members are going down the pipe.

Mr. Spence: —and municipal autonomy amazed and disappointed. Mr. Speaker, the real issue is not whether the Spadina continues or is scrapped but whether any local politician can seek office and responsibility with any hope of being treated with dignity and respect. There is probably no wiser or more experienced supporter of local government around these days than the Metro chairman, Mr. Ab Campbell, yet the way in which he has been treated in regard to this decision—

Mr. Sargent: He should always ask—

Mr. Spence: —is really a slap in the face, not only to him and his colleagues in Metro but to every municipal politician throughout the province. People will no longer wish to seek election to office at the local level—

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Mr. Spence: —if they know that they run the risk that sometime in the course of their careers, they may have to face a rebuke of this kind—

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: —a setback of this magnitude. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly surprised to read an article in the Globe and Mail on June 2, reporting that our provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), speaking to the Association of Mayors and Reeves in North Bay—and, Mr. Speaker, I have been associated with mayors and reeves for a good many years and have always had the highest respect for those gentlemen—but I must say the provincial Treasurer made an extraordinary statement when he said that he was discouraged at the quality of local municipal leadership. Why would someone—

Mr. Sargent: What a disgraceful thing to say!

Mr. Spence: —who has reached the position of Treasurer of the Province of Ontario want to belittle our local municipal leaders in this way?

He calls himself an elder statesman of the municipal world—

Mr. Sargent: He sounds like the mayor of Hanover.

Mr. Spence: If this is an example of his ability as a statesman, we must all thank our lucky stars that our hon. friend has restricted himself to the provincial field and is not representing his country in the international arena. Why, Canada would be at war with the whole world by now!

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislature for the past 16 years. It is unbelievable to me that a representative of the government would attack the municipalities like this. When he presented the budget in this assembly a few weeks ago he attacked the federal government. It would seem the only government that is perfect in his eyes is the provincial government here in Ontario.

I have listened to many speeches over the years, and I have never before seen so much rushing around trying to find someone to blame for what is happening in this province. First the federal government is to blame, now the poor quality of local leaders is to blame. Who next?

Mr. Sargent: He was a councillor down in Chatham. That is as far as he could get down there.

Mr. Spence: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will the members of the government turn on one another, perhaps pointing a finger first at this minister and then at that one? I am afraid it is a disease, Mr. Speaker, and I hope this disease is cured in a very short order.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Does the member think it is catching from Ottawa?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): There are not as many resignations as in Ottawa.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I would not be fair, I would be remiss, if I did not say a word or two about agriculture. Agriculture is facing a bleak situation.

I must say the prices that the farmers get for some of their products are ridiculous—and there is no easy cure to be found—for so many of our farmers, the hog producers who are producing pork below the cost of production, the egg producers who are producing eggs at less than the cost of production.

I must say, a few days ago I read in the paper where they had dumped 10,000 bags of onions at Erieau, Ontario, and now we find onions selling at 15 cents per pound in the big chain stores.

We know the apple producers across the Province of Ontario this year have gone through very difficult times. I know many apple producers who have been trying to sell their apples at $2 a bushel, and today we find in the chain stores three apples wrapped up in a cellophane bag priced at 59 cents.

These are just some of the things that agriculture is facing.

Mr. Sargent: The farmers are not getting it.

Mr. Spence: I think today some of our unemployment problems are on account of the farmers' purchasing power dwindling. They do not have money to buy the goods and new machinery that are needed in order to operate. I must say that if the farmers do not receive more of the consumer's dollar in the future there will be more factory doors closed and there will be more unemployment across the Province of Ontario.

There are many things we can suggest, but I must say something has to be done in order to improve the net income of agriculture across the province. It is an important study.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let us hear those suggestions.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Minister, I would say that this government should pay 80 per cent of the cost of education across this province. That is one thing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That has nothing to do with farm prices.

Mr. Spence: That would reduce costs. But I say too, Mr. Minister, the cost of input, I am afraid, is out of line with the net return the farmers get.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: When is the hon. member going to tell us how to increase farm prices?

Mr. Spence: I think we should go into it and make a study of it. And another thing is transportation, which I asked the minister about. I think, as a layman, that transportation is an area where we could improve income to agriculture. I am not a wizard. I do not know. But I think we have got to make an effort. Maybe we have got to have a supply management.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Right. Does the member believe in it?

Mr. Spence: I believe in supply management.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: So do I. How many of the member's colleagues do?

Mr. Spence: Well, we do have difficulties do we not, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Sargent: What is the Minister of Agriculture and Food doing about it?

Mr. Spence: We have got to try something. The purchasing power of the farmer is dwindling and the farmers are going out of business. Many of them are in dire circumstances. I know the minister is sincere. I am not critical of him. It is no easy problem,

but we must make an effort to see if something cannot be done to improve the net income. It will take all of us, not only the minister, it will take all of us to come up with something that will improve this industry, and I know he is interested.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Elgin.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Mr Speaker, it is customary when taking part in this debate to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) on his budget for this fiscal year.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is a bad start.

Mr. McNeil: However, I would like to go one step beyond that. Not only has he skilfully presented a paper which will contribute to the continued growth and development of our great province, but he has done so in such a way that even the members sitting opposite cannot present any logical or sensible alternatives which would improve the programmes that have been set out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: The hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Nixon) Mr. Speaker, sweated before the eyes of the people of Ontario in his gallant effort to establish some sort of honest and sincere criticism of the provincial budget. He failed and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) fared no better.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That is nonsense and the member knows it. We have provided the government with 10 alternatives.

Mr. Sargent: I bet the Treasurer wrote that speech, too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: Just listen to some of the amendments proposed by the leader of the Liberal Party, and I quote:

> We regret the failure of the government to implement meaningful tax reform which would relieve the burden on the lower and middle-income groups, including farmers;
>
> Their (that is the government's) failure to establish realistic programmes to improve the environment, to increase housing and to stimulate northern development.

And so on.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party continued to persist in his efforts to tax big corporations practically out of business and to hand the profits over to the workers—particularly if they were union members. His amendments were very specific in this respect, and I quote:

> The failure to derive much greater revenues from Ontario resource industries and to channel a larger portion of these revenues to meet the needs of mining municipalities—

Mr. Stokes: Right! Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeil: The remainder of his amendments proposed such massive government expenditures that I hesitate even to guess at the final outcome. My only speculation is that it would require a complete government takeover of all business and industry revenues in this province to finance these programmes. But, after all, that is what the socialists want. They want a state-controlled society or is it perhaps a union-controlled society?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We want a just society.

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to run through the various so-called amendments of the leaders opposite. There is no point in doing so. Even if they were acceptable, they are to a degree not practical and, certainly, to a large degree, not within the reach of this province from a financial point of view.

This brings me to a most interesting point. Some people see no contradiction between demanding new, bigger and better services and, at the same time, complaining about costs. In 1969, the government kept a running account of the suggestions made in the Legislature for improving education services. The total cost of these suggestions added up to well over $1 billion, which would have doubled the education budget of that time. During the same session, I understand, there was not one single suggestion for cutting of any service. However, at the end of the session, as always, these very same people —and let me make no mistake about who they are, I am talking about the two parties opposite—were calling for reduced costs.

We, on the government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, believe that in order to progress—

Mr. Lawlor: The government trebled the estimates in 10 years and boasts about it.

Mr. McNeil: —to continue the growth and development of this province, we must continue to invest.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: However, we must invest properly and wisely. We cannot simply pluck up the taxpayers' money and go hell bent for election in all directions—certainly not in a lot of the directions that the opposition would have us go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: We do embark on well-planned programmes—programmes that, at times, come under heavy criticism, but in the end even the opposition members agree with them. As a result, we have a logical and sensible spread of finances, applied across the entire province for the greatest benefit of all our people.

My own riding of Elgin is an excellent example of this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): A very unfortunate riding.

Mr. McNeil: I would just like to point out some of the things that are being done in that great riding.

Mr. Sargent: Yes; it is a Tory riding; that is why.

Mr. McNeil: As the hon. members are surely aware, some time ago there was an extensive needs study on roads in this province. As a result of the needs study that had taken place in Elgin county, some 50 miles of county roads have been designated as development roads.

Mr. Sargent: What the government will not do for a Tory member—even kill the Spadina.

Mr. McNeil: This represents a construction programme of over $4.7 million. Incidentally, these roads are built by, and paid for, by the province under the supervision of the counties, and then turned over to the counties for maintenance.

An hon. member: That is legitimate. That is money well spent.

Mr. McNeil: This sort of thing might not mean very much to members living in urban areas, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: Ask me; I will tell the member.

Mr. McNeil: —but it is one of the greatest importance to us in the rural and semi-rural areas.

An. hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. McNeil: The future development of our communities is very much dependent on the availabilities of services. These roads are our lifeline, so to speak.

But the rural areas are not the only areas to have been benefiting in recent years from extra provincial government financing.

Mr. Sargent: What a job that is!

Mr. McNeil: It was only about a year ago that this government changed its policy on subsidies for roads in urban areas and now subsidizes 50 per cent of the cost instead of the 33⅓ per cent that was paid in the past.

Mr. Sargent: How much of that subsidy was available for Spadina?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): We killed it! It was going to cost $237,000,000.

Mr. McNeil: The Ontario Water Resources Commission is also carrying out an extensive programme in Elgin. At the present moment the new water treatment plant at Port Stanley is nearing completion. Total construction cost of this project is $3.7 million. There is a 12-inch pipeline from the treatment plant to Port Burwell which represents an additional investment of $1,150,000.

A tank is to be built in the middle of this pipeline at a cost of some $200,000 and the water distribution system at Port Burwell is being constructed at an expenditure of $280,000.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party has taken this government to task for failing to construct OHC dwellings at an appreciable rate.

Mr. Lawlor: If the member has to defend the indefensible he is doing it. The favourite disciple of patronage.

Mr. McNeil: I wish to dispute this and I would invite him to come down and have a look at our OHC developments in Elgin.

In the town of Aylmer, a town of 4,400 people, there are 36 senior citizen units in the pre-construction stage. Estimated cost of this project is $360,000. Another 15 family units are presently under construction and

it is estimated that another $225,000 will be spent by the government before these are brought to completion.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, I see! He is going to take this speech and publish it in the local paper.

An hon. member: Real progress.

Mr. McNeil: At Delhi, another town in the great riding of Elgin, we recently completed 15 senior citizen units at a cost—

Mr. Sargent: All brought to the people by the member for Elgin.

Mr. McNeil: —of $170,000. There are two other projects there which were constructed under the federal-provincial partnership.

St. Thomas has 147 family and 58 senior citizen units in existence. Seventy-five of the family units were constructed under the federal-provincial partnership. The remaining 72 units were completed by the OHC itself only last year at a cost of $1,054,000.

Mr. Lawlor: Hurrah for big government.

Mr. McNeil: The 58 senior citizen units were also brought to completion only last year. These cost the government $600,000.

Also in St. Thomas, one HOME subdivision of 97 lots has been marketed and a further 204 lots will be marketed in the future.

There is another area, too, Mr. Speaker, which I deem to be of great importance that has been undertaken by this government. On May 14 of this year, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) announced this government's approval of the preparation of detailed plans for new Ontario Police College buildings at Aylmer. You will recall that at one time it was rumored that the new college would be located elsewhere. I am very pleased that it will remain in Elgin.

Mr. Lawlor: The member really went to work there!

Mr. McNeil: This new college is to be designed to meet the present and future needs for police training in Ontario, to ensure that the quality of policing in the province will continue to improve in the manner that has been made possible in the past.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McNeil: It will be a much larger facility and one designed to meet the needs of the future in every way.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order. I think that this boasting of what a Tory member can get is a sad reflection on the budget debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: Jealousy will get you nowhere.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Speaker, there are many more programmes carried on by the government, much to the distress of the opposition, that benefit our people. For example, the provincial Treasurer in his latest budget announced a change in succession duties which virtually eliminated such duties on many estates.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member if he could possibly repeat the last four paragraphs.

Mr. Lawlor: We heard him, it is okay.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: The exemption for widows and widowers has increased from $125,000 to $250,000.

The 15 per cent surtax for close relatives has been eliminated and these preferred beneficiaries are not liable if the value of the estate is less than $100,000.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): A tremendous programme.

Mr. McNeil: The exemption for non-commutable annuities has been raised from $1,200 to $10,000 aggregate.

Another important aspect to the budget, Mr. Speaker, was in inclusion of nursing homes and home care services in the Ontario health care programme, to be effective in April, 1972. There is certainly a fee of $3.50 per day for those who can afford to pay it. I am in accord with this, as it is only common sense that those who can afford to pay this amount should pay it.

Incidentally, the cost of this benefit will be $50 million in 1972, and it is expected to rise to $100 million by 1975.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It should be starting right now.

Mr. McNeil: With respect to rebates for basic shelter. Elgin county last year received well in excess of $53,000 during the year 1970. This government has also undertaken a programme of farm tax reduction in which Elgin alone had some 5,020 rebates amounting to something like $489,000 in 1970, and we expect it will probably be greater next year. This will help the hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Stokes: It all goes to prove that this government took too much from them in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Spending power. Distribution of wealth. That is not taking too much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. McNeil: These are municipal taxes.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We need tax reform; that is what we need.

Mr. McNeil: What I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if a person only took Elgin riding as an example, there would be no question that this government is doing a great deal for the people of this province.

On the other hand, a great deal of our money extracted by the federal government is being pumped into the mainstreams of other provinces.

Mr. Sargent: That is sick.

Mr. McNeil: I am pleased with our past record. I am even more pleased with the outlook for the future, Mr. Speaker. It is the intention of this government, namely the Davis government, to build an even greater Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: That is not what the Attorney General says.

Mr. McNeil: And we shall do so in spite of the untiring efforts of the two parties sitting opposite to throw a cloud of confusion over the entire effort. And Mr. Speaker, we shall succeed!

Mr. Lawlor: That was not bad.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, for a moment I thought the previous speaker on the budget debate would end up with the song, "We shall overcome, and we shall join hands," or something of that nature, but obviously he did not go that far.

It is very interesting to note that there are all sorts of strange voices being heard in the last few weeks; obviously there must be an election coming up pretty soon, because ordinarily—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Is that why the member is there?

Mr. Makarchuk: —for the last 3½ years they have been usually silent and now they are coming back to life.

Mr. W. Hodgson: That is because he is not around to hear us.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is the reincarnation of the fossils or however one wants to describe it.

An. hon. member: We hear him quite often, but never in his seat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: We will discuss the situation in Brant and Brantford in a while; we will get to that, Mr. Speaker, because we did have an election in that place which I should not ignore in this particular speech.

I just want to comment briefly on what the previous speaker said about this government, that it is organized to ensure the greatest benefits to all the people, or the greatest benefits are provided to all the people in the province.

To see how absolutely false—not only false but absurd—that statement is, all one has to do is look at the distribution of income in this province or in the country. We will find out that the bottom 20 per cent of the people in this country receive four per cent of the income; the next 20 per cent get seven per cent of the income; the next 20 per cent get 12 per cent of the income. You have 60 per cent of the people in this province receiving only 33 per cent of the income. The other, the next 20 per cent, gets 23 per cent of the income. If you are calling it the greatest distribution of benefits, look at the top group in our society, the top 20 per cent, and you find that it is getting 44 per cent of the income. This is the kind of distribution that we have.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Do these figures not bother you guys?

Mr. Makarchuk: The sad part about this, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: The sad part about this—as soon as they are silent in the rear—is the fact that since 1945 there has not been any change in those figures. The size of the pie has got larger, but the proportion going to the various groups in our society has remained the same. One of the things that our leader did, or tried to do, in his budget speech—of course, his message did not get across—but what he tried to do was bring about that kind of an equitable redistribution that is necessary. This does not mean taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into the pocket of another group, but it does mean things like lowering the premiums on OHSIP. A province such as Manitoba, which does not have the financial resources compared to Ontario, is able to provide coverage for its families at something less than $100 a year, in comparison with the $309 a year that the people in Ontario are soaked.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): There are other taxes.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, there are other taxes. There is no doubt about that.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): What is the tax rate in Manitoba?

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, there is a tax rate, but the point is that every individual in Manitoba making $11,000 odd, or less, pays less now than what he did before. I think that is important—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about hidden taxes?

Mr. Makarchuk: —and that benefits the people.

An hon. member: They are looking after the poor people.

Mr. Makarchuk: It benefits the great percentage, roughly 80 to 90 per cent of the people of the province. If you want to discuss the tax, and I know that you are very leery about discussing the taxes, you should have sat in the mining estimates where we discussed the taxes, where we find out that the mining industry gets away with paying something like 15 per cent tax on its profits. You who sit over there quite often express concern about the small businessman. Yet he ends up paying anything from about 40 to 75 per cent taxes on his profits. If you are going to have any concern for him, I think one of the places where you could start that concern is ensuring that the mining companies pay their fair share of taxation.

We are not asking them to pay more. We are saying that they should be paying proportionately the same amount as other businesses are paying in this province. The result, of course, would be that we would have a more equitable tax rate and, more than likely, less taxes on the smaller businessman and, certainly, smaller taxes, particularly municipal taxes, on the average taxpayer in this province. Now this is the kind of action that this government can take, but of course it owes its allegiance. We know where it is. It owes it to Inco and it owes it to Falconbridge and it owes it to Noranda. I am sure when the election will be coming by, they will be contributing to its coffers to help to finance the grand deception, which the government is going to try to mount in this province, to try to deceive the people so it would be returned to continue this kind of crass exploitation, not only of the people, but of the resources of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member sounds like Mao Tse-tung.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And all union people will be putting money into the NDP whether they want to or not.

Mr. Makarchuk: I never knew that the minister of Energy and Resources Management understood Chinese. Ordinarily Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The government is supported by the mining companies. We know about it. They are slipping money into its party treasury and its election campaigns—

Mr. Makarchuk: —a budget speech should bring some hope to the people of Ontario. The government budget speech was an exercise in deception. Of course, it was all planned. There was going to be that grand wave. There was going to be that leadership campaign, the euphoria from which was going to be carried over. The euphoria, incidentally, was strictly at the convention. It was not out there where the people were. The euphoria from that was going to be carried over into the Throne Speech, and that was demolished

within a couple of days. Your budget speech, of course, was demolished almost the day that it was presented. It was empty. It was deception.

Mr. Speaker, I have just spent three weeks in an election campaign—being involved in an election campaign, talking to a lot of people in this province—and never before have I heard so much disillusionment and frustration with the old political parties as there is in this province right now.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Does the member think one leaf makes a political autumn?

Mr. Makarchuk: It was not one leaf, if I may point out, it involved roughly 70,000-80,000 people, and that is not a leaf. A good cross-section, a microcosm of Ontario. It has an urban centre; it has small towns and it has a rural area. It represents a cross-section of Ontario. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, they are no longer prepared to permit the old parties to govern them or to follow them. Any credibility that you people had up to this time is being eroded or completely removed.

Mr. Gaunt: I will tell the member this, they are not prepared to put their confidence in his party.

Mr. Ferrier: We shall see.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, if that was the case, the result in Brant would have been different.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It shows that the Liberal leader is in jeopardy.

Mr. Makarchuk: The results in Brant would have been different. And I may point out that within the area of Brant riding, which takes in the area of the leader of the Liberal Party, the Liberals got 2,600 and the Tories got 2,100 votes and the NDP over 3,100 votes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: So this does not show any great credibility, particularly when this particular riding was supposed to have been the cradle of Liberalism—the large "L" Liberalism—in Ontario.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): It got pretty well rocked that time.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, the cradle got rocked. In fact, it more than likely got toppled over. I should point out that in the campaign, in the discussions with the farmers—and these are the chaps who work from dawn to dusk, working generally seven days a week—he was under the impression up to now that next year or the year after he eventually is going to get ahead of the game, that somewhere along the line you are going to have a chance to relax, that somewhere he is going to be secure.

Well, he is realizing now, he is finding out now that that is not the case. He is finding that every year his problems are greater. He is finding that he is having greater difficulty meeting the costs for his equipment, meeting the costs for repairs for his equipment. In most cases they are puzzled. They certainly are frustrated, and as I said earlier, they have lost faith in the old parties. The results in Brant very well portray this. The fact is that a lot of the rural polls voted for the NDP—in fact, we came on top in many of the rural polls.

The city worker is faced with similar problems. He again is concerned about his future. He is either out of work himself or he sees many of his friends are out of work. He is not too sure whether he will be next on the list or on the line to be fired. He sees plants being closed down around him.

In our case we had Westinghouse, which at one time employed something like 500 people. It is closing down in July and something like 250 people will be thrown out of work. We also had Sterling Actions and Keys, which closed down throwing 125 people out of work.

Both of them are branch plants of large American corporations. Both of the decisions to shut down the plants were not made by Canadians or in Canada. The decisions were made in the United States. In both cases this government has been notified of the circumstances, has been warned that this is what is happening, and in both cases the government did absolutely nothing.

You did absolutely nothing. You accepted the statement. And it seems to me that Westinghouse in Ontario has more to say about what happens to the people of Ontario than that government over there has. They just do not care.

Ordinarily one would expect the government to at least ask Westinghouse to justify the closing of the plant. Perhaps they could have looked at their books to see whether they were losing money. Perhaps they could have found out if there was alternative employment or if something else could be

manufactured in the plant; but they did nothing of that kind. The Department of Trade and Development was notified of this and they did absolutely nothing, with the exception of saying, "We are looking into the matter." They are looking into a lot of things, but they are not doing anything about them.

The situation regarding Sterling Actions and Keys was exactly similar. It was also tied in to the firm in Scarborough, which was owned by Aeolian Corporation of New York. The decision again was made in the United States.

We had a piano industry of some quality in Canada, but because of this decision we do not have a piano industry in Canada. Closing the Scarborough plant resulted in the loss of about 50 or 60 jobs. The Brantford plant resulted in the loss of 125 jobs. Pianos now, as I gather, will be manufactured in a new plant in Tennessee and they will be exported back into Canada.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): They make very good pianos in my home town. They still make them.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well they make very good pianos!

What I am saying is that they made very good pianos in this case too, but the government did nothing about the jobs; and they could have continued.

Again, there was a possibility that perhaps there could have been some rationalization between the Mason and Risch plant in Scarborough and the Sterling Actions and Keys plant in Brantford. It we had a concerned government it would have looked at this situation and perhaps could have consolidated it and perhaps preserved the jobs.

Maybe it would not have worked. Maybe it would have been uneconomic. We will grant that. But the thing is that the least the government could have done was to examine it and look into it—and they did not even do that.

Mr. Stokes: They bombed!

Mr. Makarchuk: The workers who have paid for this situation do not want welfare. They do not want unemployment. They want to work, and they are looking for work. But as far as this government is concerned, it is doing absolutely nothing.

I should mention that there are other segments of our society involved in the campaign; these are the students. I am sure most members here have had students come up to them and ask, "What are we going to do for the summer? Where are we going to get jobs?"

And we look at this miserable little SWEEP programme. How many jobs is that providing for the number of students who are looking for jobs in Ontario? And what does this government intend to do about it?

Absolutely nothing! They slough it off. They throw us a token programme and ignore it.

A lot of these students are planning on going to school next year. They had hopes of earning some of the money at the jobs they would have during the summer to pay for tuition and residence costs. Unfortunately they have been put in the position by a government that supposedly cares—that supposedly is doing great things for Ontario—they have been put in a position where they cannot afford to go to school next year.

In addition to that, the government is talking about cutting back the student grants and loans programmes.

Is that what the people of Ontario want? They certainly do not and they have demonstrated this very amply and very strongly in the Brant by-election. There was not any difference there between the Liberals and the Conservatives. There was a coalition—they tried to establish a coalition—but it did not work too well because the people realized what it is all about, and they are realizing it all through Ontario right now. If the gentlemen opposite want to call the election tomorrow, if they want to call it in October or out of fear—for I presume they are fearful of calling an election in October—perhaps they are going to wait until next spring, but we are prepared for it and the people out there are realizing what is going on.

Getting onto the budget again, I should comment that this budget did absolutely nothing in terms of jobs. There was nothing in the budget that would increase the number of jobs—

Mr. Stokes: They bombed!

Mr. Makarchuk: —in the Province of Ontario.

Many things can be done to ensure that there are jobs in the country. Other countries are using various techniques of economic planning, public spending and government involvement to ensure that jobs are available.

I suggest we perhaps look at this morning's Globe and Mail, which reports that Switzerland has an incredible rate of unemployment of .0015 per cent. Let that sink in and compare this with the areas of Canada where in our depressed areas we have up to 20 per cent unemployment. In other areas it is 10 per cent and the national average is running around seven per cent.

What is the difference between here and there? The difference is that in Switzerland there is some involvement of the government to ensure that the economy is operated in a manner that will provide jobs.

There is no involvement here. There is a hands-off policy. Let private enterprise do it.

Well, private enterprise is not doing it. If private enterprise is not doing the job then it is time the government should step in in some cases and ensure that jobs are available; because the people want work and the people deserve work.

We spent about four or five days in the mining estimates trying to elicit some kind of information from the new Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier).

It is a very important department. A great deal of the wealth—$1.6 billion I think was the last figure—in Ontario is generated in the mines. And it also generates many jobs, but not as many as there certainly could be and not as many as we would like.

We tried to get some indication from the minister of that department as to the direction in which the mines department would go, as to what the government is going to do, first in terms of taxation, in terms of making the mining companies pay a fare share of their profits in taxes. Not any more than any other business is paying, but proportionately the same amount.

He refused, and there was nothing. The government is not prepared to change it.

I said earlier that the government is probably looking for its slush funds for the next election. It has got them organized, and I know they will be coming from that area of our economy.

The other point we tried to get out of the minister was what he was going to do about having refining and smelting, about having a great percentage of that done in Ontario. Again the government is going to wait until private enterprise does something about it. There are no plans for the government either to build a smelter itself or do so jointly in private and public enterprise. There is nothing wrong with that—it is being done in other provinces, and Manitoba is a good example —to ensure that jobs are being created in Ontario.

This is a very concrete, definite method of ensuring the jobs, of using our resources for our people to provide jobs for ourselves. But again, the government sloughed it off. It is not doing anything about it.

It could also start planning some of the economy, and not just the refining. The government could start looking at it in terms of secondary processing of the material, in terms of fabricating of material, of fabricating it into sheets, into tubes, into ingots and so on, and in making various alloys. This again will provide a greater number of jobs.

Mr. Lawlor: The government would rather fabricate other things.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member's party knows all about that.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, if you wish I will adjourn the debate.

Mr. Makarchuk moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What is the minister going to fabricate now?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Nothing but the truth, the whole truth, and the member knows the rest of it.

Mr. Lawlor: Plain and full disclosure!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with the considerations of the estimates of Financial and Commercial Affairs. It is the intention of the government to do some legislation, second reading and in committee work. That will be followed by the consideration of the estimates of The Department of Revenue.

In committee outside the House, Labour is presently under consideration and that will be followed by Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Lawlor: May I just ask, does the minister intend to go into Committee of

the Whole House—he mentioned second readings, but how about the bills that are pending as far as the whole House—in committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In committee? Those are the ones we are referring to.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is going to attack those—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is right.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We get the whole ball of wax on Monday!

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 11, 1971

Special meeting of provincial health ministers, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 2637

Uniformity of standards re people practicing in health field and health disciplines, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Gaunt 2638

Committal of Merrick Neuhoffer to Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, question to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Gaunt 2638

Guidelines to Metro hospitals in construction programmes, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis 2638

Ontario's cost share in improving sewerage facilities along rivers flowing into Great Lakes, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Sargent 2640

Reassessment of role of denturists re dental profession, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence and Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. MacDonald 2643

Father unable to apply for custody of children in family court, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mrs. M. Renwick 2644

Inability to commit banks for full $20 million mortgage financing, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Peacock 2644

Distribution of keg beer in four-gallon containers, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. B. Newman 2645

Receiving letter from National Energy Board chairman re export of power, question to Mr. Kerr, Mr. T. P. Reid 2646

Why Hydro advertising in Great Britain for engineers, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Pitman, Mr. T. Reid 2646

Use of Laser equipment at Windsor University, question to Mr. White, Mr. Spence 2647

Presenting report, law reform commission, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 2648

Trustee Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading 2648

Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971, bill intituled Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading 2648

Commemorating anniversary of Philippine independence, Mr. Yaremko 2648

Estimates, Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Wishart, continued 2650

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Spence, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Makarchuk 2660

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Makarchuk, agreed to 2672

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2673

JOU[illegible]RAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIREC[illegible]URNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2